



**INITIAL STUDY and
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

for the

**MONTE CRESTA ROAD
EXTENSION PROJECT**

CITY OF BELMONT
MARCH 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	1
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED	6
DETERMINATION.....	6
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	7
I. AESTHETICS.....	7
II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES	10
III. AIR QUALITY.....	10
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	12
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES	16
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....	16
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.....	22
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	23
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING	26
X. MINERAL RESOURCES	28
XI. NOISE.....	28
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.....	29
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.....	30
XIV. RECREATION.....	31
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC	31
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	32
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	34
INFORMATION SOURCES	36

APPENDICES

A.....	Biological Resources Report
B.....	Cultural Resources Report
C.....	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

LIST OF FIGURES

1. REGIONAL LOCATION	3
2. ROAD EXTENSION PLANS.....	4
3. ROAD CROSS SECTIONS.....	5
4. EXISTING VIEWS OF THE SITE	8
5. PHOTOSIMULATION OF PROPOSED ROADWAY EXTENSION	9



CITY OF BELMONT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title: **Monte Cresta
Roadway Extension Project**
2. Lead Agency Name
and Address: City of Belmont
1070 Sixth Avenue, Suite 302
Belmont, CA 94002-3893
3. Contact Person(s)
and Phone Number(s): Gilbert Yau, (650) 595-7467
Senior Civil Engineer
4. Project Location: Monte Cresta Drive
adjacent to APN 045-2430340
5. Application Number(s): 00-1085
6. Project Sponsor's Name
and Address: Damon Campbell
2355 34th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116
7. General/Specific
Plan Designation: Roadway: Public Roadway
Adjacent Parcels: Hillside Residential and
Open Space
8. Zoning: Roadway: Public Roadway
Adjacent Parcels: HRO-2 - Hillside Residential
and Open Space
9. Project Description:

The applicant is proposing an approximately 104-foot-long, two-lane extension of Monte Cresta Drive from its existing terminus approximately 1,000 feet northwest of Barclay Way, below (west of) All View Way in the San Juan Hills area of the City of Belmont. The project location is shown on Figure 1, Project Location Map. The site is currently an unimproved roadway/pathway primarily used by local residents as an open-space recreational trail. The roadway extension has been designed to comply with the design standards of the City's Hillside Road Standards – San Juan Hills, as specified in Section 7-13 of the City Municipal Code, Items (e) 4 through 8. The roadway would be a total of 38 feet in width, including

two 10-foot wide travel lanes, two 5.5-foot-wide parking lanes, two two-foot-wide curb and gutters, and one four-foot-wide sidewalk. A two-foot wide planter strip would be included on the east side of the new roadway. The roadway extension would be supported/protected by retaining walls on both sides, which will require an Encroachment Permit from the City of Belmont. These walls would range from two to six feet in height. The project also would include access to three potential driveways, as well as underground extensions of water, storm sewer, sanitary sewer, gas, and electric utility lines. It also would include street lighting. The project would require cut and fill of 196 cubic yards of material, to be balanced on the site. Construction of the roadway would occur over a period of about three months. Details of the proposed roadway extension are indicated on Figures 2 and 3.

The roadway would provide access to three currently inaccessible residentially designated lots just west of the western terminus of Monte Cresta Drive (APN's 043-243-340, 043-165-180 and 043-242-210). Two of those lots (west of the proposed new roadway) could potentially be developed with small houses (limited to 900 to 1,200 sq. ft. each, including garages, unless a development transfer is granted by the Planning Commission and City Council) while the lot east of the proposed extension could be developed with an up-to 3,300 sq. ft. house.

10. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project site is located in a hillside residential area of the San Juan Hills area of Belmont. Lands to the north, west, and east of the site are primarily undeveloped residentially designated parcels; the paved portion of Monte Cresta Drive to the south of the project site has been developed with hillside residences.

11. Other agencies whose approval (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreements) is required include: Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and Regional Water Quality Control Board.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and Permit

Insert Fig 1, Location map

Insert Fig 2: Extension Plan

Insert Figure 3, Cross sections

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Public Services
	Agriculture Resources		Hydrology/Water Quality		Recreation
	Air Quality		Land Use/Planning		Transportation/Traffic
X	Biological Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Service Systems
	Cultural Resources		Noise		Mandatory Findings of Significance
X	Geology/Soils		Population/Housing		

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	X
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	
I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION , including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	

Gilber Yau, Senior Civil Engineer

Date

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Issues:

I. Aesthetics - Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	

- a) The project site is currently an undeveloped, unpaved road and path surrounded by naturally vegetated hillsides on three sides, and by low-density hillside residential development on the fourth side (see Figure 4). The project site affords panoramic views of the San Juan Hills and Canyon and Sugar Loaf Mountain in San Mateo. These views include both developed hillsides and canyon areas, and heavily vegetated natural areas.

The proposed project would develop and widen an existing unpaved road (See Figure 5). Development of the roadway extension would be visible in the foreground from the existing terminus of Monte Cresta Drive as well as houses upslope on Monte Cresta Drive and All View Drive. It would be visible in the background in views from houses located across the canyon to the west of the site. The primary visible features of the roadway would be the retaining walls and paving.

The project also would facilitate development of up to three single-family houses, one of which could be up to 3,300 square feet, and the remaining two of which could be 900 to 1,200 square feet (based on preliminary slope-density calculations and not including any development transfer). Any application for house development would be subject to the City’s Design Review standards. Although the project would convert the roadway from a narrow unpaved track to a wider, urban roadway, and possibly lead to the development of up to three single-family houses, it would be visible as a small extension of existing urban uses on Monte Cresta Drive and therefore would not result in a significant change in the character of the site.

The project would include street lighting to City standards. The project may result in a negligible increase in light and glare generated from lights of automobiles using the roadway, as well as lighting from any houses constructed near to the road. The proposed project would include a planting strip along the east side of the road. Assuming the project street lighting adheres to the City performance standards for glare, the potential effects of nighttime lighting from the proposed use would be minimized to a less-than-significant level.

Insert Fig 4 – site photo

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Fig 5: Slip sheet for site photosimulations

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

- b) There are no exceptional scenic resources on the site. The project would result in the removal of some native vegetation, including some small oak trees. This is discussed further under Biological resources, below.
- c) See item a), above.

II. Agriculture Resources - Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

a, b, c.) The site’s agricultural potential is limited by steep slopes, poor soils, and surrounding residential and open space uses. It includes no Williamson Act parcels. There is no agricultural use on-site or in its vicinity. Therefore the project would not adversely affect any existing agricultural operations or conflict with Williamson Act designations.

III. Air Quality - Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including				X

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

a, b, c, d) The proposed roadway extension would, by itself, not generate any additional vehicular traffic. Should the theoretical maximum of three new houses be constructed after the roadway is extended, up to 30 new daily trips are possible. This level of new traffic would not create a significant impact because it does not exceed thresholds established by the City of Belmont.

Project construction would generate short-term emissions of criteria pollutants, including suspended and inhalable particulate matter and equipment exhaust emissions. The BAAQMD does not require quantification of construction emissions, but considers any project’s construction-related impacts to be less-than-significant with appropriate implementation of BAAQMD basic dust-control measures. Due to the limited grading required for proposed roadway extension, implementation of the following basic control measures (which are required on sites of three acres or less) will reduce temporary air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level. Construction of up to three houses adjacent to the project roadway extension also would be subject to these measures:

1. Water all active construction sites at least twice daily.
2. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
3. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.
4. Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
5. Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

Due to the steep slopes adjacent to the site, and the high erosion potential, we also recommend that the BAAQMD’s “Enhanced Control Measures” (required for sites larger than four acres) be applied to the project site:

6. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

7. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).
8. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.
9. Install sandbags or other erosion-control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
10. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

The City's standard conditions of project approval will require that the aforementioned dust/erosion control measures be employed at the site to reduce dust emissions and soil erosion to acceptable levels during construction.

e) Construction of the proposed roadway extension would not involve any equipment or operations that would be likely to result in significant odor impacts.

IV. Biological Resources - Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?		X		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS?				X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree		X		

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

preservation policy or ordinance?				
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

a, b, c, d) A biological resources assessment of the project site was prepared by Wood Biological Consulting (October 14, 2004; see Appendix A). The study area, including both the proposed roadway extension site and the three possible house sites, covers approximately one acre situated near the top of a southwest-facing slope overlooking San Juan Canyon. The predominant vegetation type on site is non-native grassland. Extensive stands of chamise chaparral dominate much of the surrounding canyon, and this plant community extends to the edges of the study area. Scattered oaks are also present on site. The study area itself is contiguous with undeveloped slopes of San Juan Canyon and the San Juan Hills. San Juan Canyon is contiguous with the City of San Mateo’s Sugar Loaf Mountain Open Space Preserve and Laurelwood Park.

The study area does not support any special-status natural communities regulated by state, federal, or county legislation/policies. No riparian areas or wetlands are present on site.

A total of 19 special-status plant species have been recorded from the project region. None of these were detected during the present late summer survey. Of these, 12 of the target species are not considered to have any potential for occurrence on site due to a lack of suitable habitat and/or the fact that they would have been detectable during the present survey. The remaining seven target species are considered to have a low potential for occurrence on site. These species would not have been detectable during the present survey and a spring rare plant survey is recommended (see Mitigation Measures, below).

A total of 24 special-status animal species have been recorded from the project region. Based on the geographic range and habitat affinities of the target special-status animals, none is considered to have a high potential to be directly affected by development of the road extension or the home lots. Three special-status bird species, loggerhead shrike, Allen’s hummingbird, and California thrasher, are considered to have a moderate potential to nest within or immediately adjacent to the study area. Other common migratory bird species are also likely to occur within the habitats on site. To avoid accidentally harming migratory birds, which are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, a preconstruction nesting bird survey should be conducted (see Mitigation Measures, below).

One high profile animal, the federally listed endangered mission blue butterfly, is considered to have a low potential for occurrence due to the presence of larval host plants (silver bush lupine) on site. There are several small silver bush lupine plants near the NW corner of the upper lot, above the road cut, and in the western portion of the western lot

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

below the road cut. The lupines would probably not be affected by the road grading and construction, but could potentially be affected by future house construction. Because the project site is within the historic range of the subspecies, host plants occur on the site, and small isolated grassland patches have the potential to harbor relictual populations (Arnold pers. comm.), the presence of mission blue butterfly cannot be ruled out and further study is warranted (see Mitigation Measures, below).

No other special-status plant or animal species are considered to have a high potential for occurrence on site and no further studies are necessary

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation IV.1. There is a moderate potential for the occurrence of nesting passerines on site, impacts to which are regulated by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the State Fish and Game Code. Construction or disturbances, such as road or trail construction, tree trimming or removal, should be restricted during the migratory passerine breeding season (February 1-August 31). Prior to clearing or grading during the nesting season, a survey to determine the presence of active nest sites for passerines is warranted. If nesting passerines are observed, an appropriate buffer zone would be needed around any active nest to prevent mortality of young through nest abandonment. Depending on site conditions, no-construction buffer zones are typically 100 feet for passerines and 200 feet or more for raptors.

Mitigation IV.2. A preconstruction nesting bird survey should be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 30 days prior to any grading or land clearing operations. If nesting birds were present, tree trimming or removal would be restricted until such time as the young birds have fledged.

Mitigation IV.3. Presence/absence surveys be conducted for mission blue butterflies during the flight season, which extends from March through the end of June. We recommend that at least three site visits be made by a qualified entomologist, during which larval host plants should be inspected for adults butterflies, eggs, larvae and evidence of larval feeding damage. If presence of mission blue butterfly were confirmed, consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) would be required before grading could proceed. Specific mitigation measures would need to be developed in consultation with the USFWS.

e) The Belmont Tree Ordinance requires a permit to remove or excessively prune protected trees. Protected trees are listed in the Ordinance and include oaks, bays, buckeyes, Monterey cypress, redwoods, giant sequoia, and madrones with at least one trunk of ten inches or greater (DBH, or diameter at breast height). Permit review considers a number of factors, including the condition of the tree, safety hazards posed, interference with utility services, necessity to cut, move, remove or excessively prune the tree, topography,

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

number of existing trees in the vicinity, and number of trees that can be adequately supported on the site. Issuance of a permit may require replacement at up to a 3:1 ratio with approved 24-inch trees, posting of a bond, or payment of in-lieu fees to the City Tree Planting Fund.

The City Arborist has surveyed the project site and has provided a report on the condition of existing trees in the project area (Walter Levinson, December 27, 2004). The development plan for the proposed roadbed itself would not result in the removal any protected trees. However, proposed hillside area work above the proposed roadway could affect or destroy a single protected coast live oak (13- inch DBH), located on the uphill side of the dirt road on parcel 043-243-340. In addition, three protected and two unprotected coast live oaks on the two downslope lots could potentially be affected by subsequent homebuilding activities. Loss of these oaks is considered by the City Arborist as a significant negative biological impact. Future house building permit applicants would be required to obtain a City permit and comply with conditions in order to mitigate this impact. Another protected live oak (Oak #2), located about 15-20 feet past the end of the proposed roadway extension, could be affected by project construction activities. The City Arborist has identified a number of conditions to mitigate the potential impact on this tree (see Mitigation IV.4, below).

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation IV.4. As detailed in the City Consulting Arborist’s report, a full perimeter of six-foot high chain link fence shall be erected around the canopy dripline of Oak #2, at least ten feet out from the dripline foliage. Professional-grade silt-fencing with built-in wood stakes shall be installed around the outside of the chain link perimeter by digging a shallow trench as per package instructions. At least three waterproof 8”x11” signs shall be affixed to the fence around tree #2 stating “Tree Protection Fence: do not alter or remove without written permission from City arborist. Call (650) 697-0990).

Mitigation IV.5. Tree removal fees shall apply to all trees measuring 6-inches in diameter or greater to be removed as a part of the project as per the 2004 Master Fee Schedule, “Tree Removal Fees – Development Projects”. Mitigation plantings shall apply as per the Belmont Tree Ordinance. The exact number of replacement trees shall be determined by the City.

f) No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans have been adopted for the project site.

V. Cultural Resources – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in				X

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

15064.5?				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

a, b, c) A cultural resources assessment was prepared for the site and vicinity by Holman & Associates (October 1, 2004, see Appendix B). That report concluded that there are no recorded sites, historic or prehistoric, within the project site, and a walkover indicated that there is no evidence of prehistoric and/or historic use of the proposed roadway extension site and adjacent potential house sites. As such, the proposed project would have no impacts on cultural resources.

VI. Geology and Soils - Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or			X	

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	

The City of Belmont’s Municipal Code, Section 7-12, requires determination of geotechnical hazards and preparation of geotechnical reports for proposed development activities in the San Juan Hills area prior to issuance of a building or grading permit. Pursuant to these regulations, the geologic conditions at the roadway extension site have been evaluated in a number of geotechnical investigations prepared for the project applicant. In addition, peer reviews of these reports have been prepared by the City’s consulting geotechnical engineers, and a geotechnical engineer retained by concerned neighbors. These reports are listed and their conclusions are briefly summarized below:

- Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers. July 6, 2000. Report, Geotechnical Investigation, Planned Residence at APN 043-243-110 and 043-243-100, Belmont, CA. Evaluated the applicant’s proposed residence adjacent to the eastern edge of the proposed roadway. This study included three borings on these parcels, and concluded that the site is suitable for the development of the then-proposed house.
- Cotton Shires & Associates, November 8, 2000. Geotechnical Review re: Campbell Extension of Monte Cresta Drive, and Residence at Lots 5, 6, and 7 (including APN 0043-243-110 and 043-243-100). This City-commissioned peer review addressed the July 6, 2000 Earth mechanics Consulting report as well as a roadway improvement plan dated July 7, 2000 (approximately 120-foot roadway extension). This report concurred with the Earth Mechanics Consultants study that the then-proposed roadway extension, driveway, and house are geotechnically feasible with utilization of appropriate design criteria and identified additional geotechnical data that would be needed prior to finalizing foundation and retaining wall design.
- Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers. October 18, 2001. Report, Geotechnical Investigation, Planned Monte Cresta Drive Extension, Belmont, California. This report addressed the then-proposed 1,800-foot extension of Monte Cresta Drive (connecting the two currently improved sections of that roadway). This study included an additional 11 borings and concluded that “the site is suitable for the proposed road extension” but would require careful coordination between the geotechnical consultant, civil engineer, and contractor. (p. 3).
- Earth Mechanics Consulting, October 22, 2001. Geotechnical Consultation, Proposed Residence at APN 043-243-110 and 043-242-100, Belmont, CA. This letter report presents the applicant’s geologist’s responses to Cotton Shires &

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Associates, November 8, 2000 comments on the July 6, 2000 Earth Mechanics Consulting report. It includes a supplemental geotechnical investigation of the proposed roadway extension, as well as additional geologic investigations regarding the adequacy of the proposed setback for the garage of the then-proposed house east of the proposed roadway extension.

- Michelucci & Associates, Inc. December 18, 2001. Re Geotechnical Consultation, Possible Roadway Below Property, 2707 Sequoia Way, Belmont, CA. This is a neighbor-commissioned peer review of the Earth Mechanics Consulting October 18, 2001 and other pertinent literature. It identified certain omissions in the Earth mechanics report and concluded that the then-proposed extension was possible but required additional reconnaissance and study by a registered engineering geologist.
- Cotton Shires & Associates, Inc, January 23, 2002. Re: Geologic and Geotechnical Review, Aubain, Proposed Roadway and Driveway Entrances, Monte Cresta Drive Extension (APN 0043-160-350). This is the City’s consultant’s peer review of the October 18, 2001 Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers report as well as improvement plans for the then-proposed 1,800-foot Monte Cresta Drive extension (Lizuriaga Taylor Engineers, September 14, 2001). This report concluded that “the initial roadway improvement plans and initial site geotechnical information do not adequately describe the extent of site geotechnical constraints, nor illustrate the locations of necessary engineering measures required for project construction” The report adds that “Establishment of the proposed roadway extension is constrained by areas of slope instability....[including] previous landslides and ground with the potential for future landsliding.” (p. 3). This study also considers the then-suggested approach for roadway grading inappropriate for this hillside without supplemental investigation, and expressed concern regarding cumulative effects of grading for the roadway and the up to 26 houses that would be accessed by it.
- Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers, September 18, 2002. Geotechnical Consultation, Proposed Residence at APN 043-243-110 and 043-242-100, Belmont, California. This report confirms and concurs with the City Geologist’s findings that two potential debris flow areas exist on or near the roadway alignment and the possible house site upslope of the roadway. It further concludes that “the physical constraints are such that a stable road cannot be reasonably constructed through to a paved road”, and that “the cost to mitigate the potential debris flow areas so the road could be built would impose an economic hardship on the property owner” (p 2).
- Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers, December 23, 2002. Geotechnical Consultation, Proposed Residence at APN 043-243-110 and 0043-243-100, Belmont, CA. This report responded to specific geotechnical data requests made by the City Community Development Department on November 27, 2002. Specifically,

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

it concludes that the proposed roadway extension would be geologically stable as per section 7-12(d) of the City of Belmont Municipal Code.

- Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers, August 16, 2004. Geotechnical Update Letter, Proposed Residence at APN 043-243-110 and 0043-243-100, Belmont, CA. This one-page letter confirms that all past reports and findings by the applicant's consultants are still applicable and do not require modification or updating.

Geologic Conditions and Hazards

a.i) No known faults cross the project site, and the closest mapped "active" fault in the vicinity of the site is the San Andreas Fault, located about two miles to the southwest (Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers, July 6, 2000). The Belmont Hills fault is located 1.4 miles east of the site. Therefore, fault rupture at the site is very unlikely.

a.ii) The project geotechnical engineers anticipate that the site "will be exposed to strong earthquake shaking during the life of the proposed improvements." (Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers, July 6, 2000) This potential impact will be reduced to a less-than-significant level for the roadway by proper engineering, and, for the houses that may be constructed after the roadway is improved, construction in accordance with the provisions of the Uniform Building Code.

a.iii) Liquefaction is a "liquefying" of the ground under strong seismic shaking. Liquefaction occurs in water-saturated, loose, granular soils (such as sandy soils) The materials encountered in on-site borings consisted of a thin layer of sandy clay overlying bedrock. The project geotechnical consultants consider these materials as having a low potential for liquefaction, and therefore a low potential for damage to any site improvements from liquefaction. (Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers, July 6, 2000).

Lateral spreading (or lurching) is another type of ground failure that is generally caused by liquefaction. It involves movement of large surficial blocks of soil as a result of subsurface liquefaction. Lateral spreading tends to develop on gentle slopes and moves towards a free face, such as an incised channel. Because the site has a low potential for liquefaction, the applicant's geological consultants consider the risk of lateral spreading to be low. (Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers, July 6, 2000).

The probability of secondary hazards such as tsunamis, seiches, etc. is low due to the site's hillside location and distance from large bodies of water.

a.iv) William Cotton and Associates (1985) mapped potential debris flow (PDf) areas on the northwest portion of the lot to the north of the proposed roadway extension (See Figure 2), as well as at the western edge of the proposed extension. These areas are described by Cotton as "Steep to very steep terrain mantled with a thick cover of soil, colluvium, and landslide debris that is susceptible to rapid downslope movement in the form of debris flows

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

or earth flows.” The City’s geotechnical consultants noted that “a 20-foot wide shallow landslide (less than approximately 6 feet in depth) was observed 12 feet downslope of the roadway near the western terminus of the proposed roadway improvements. This landslide is consistent with the PDf designation illustrated on the San Juan Hills Ground Movement Potential Map” (Cotton Shires & Associates, November 8, 2000)

The applicant’s geotechnical consultant initially recommended that the roadway extension not cross the debris flow areas, and judged “that the potential debris flow areas will not impact the planned access road as long as the road is stopped east of the mapped potential debris flow area”. (Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers, July 6, 2000). The City’s consultant noted that, “from a geotechnical perspective, the roadway could be extended through the PDf zone just beyond the currently proposed end of roadway utilizing a stout downslope retaining wall.” The project includes both upslope and downslope retaining walls along its entire alignment, and stops short of (does not intersect – see Figure 2) the mapped PDf area. Therefore with the incorporation of retaining structures identified in applicant’s geologic reports and geotechnical plan review by the City’s Geotechnical Engineers (per Cotton Shires’ November 8, 2000 report, p. 3), this impact is considered less than significant.

The mapped driveway and building envelope of the possible house upslope of the proposed roadway extension, as well as the other two lots where houses could be built, also are outside of the mapped PDf areas and are not subject to these hazards.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation VI.1. The applicant shall comply with all recommendations in the applicable Earth Mechanics Engineers Geotechnical Reports, as summarized in the Cotton/Shires December November 8, 2000 letter report. Specifically, any supplemental geotechnical Information deemed necessary by Cotton Shires shall be provided for their review and approval. In addition, the applicant’s geotechnical consultant shall review and approve all geotechnical aspects of the project construction and grading plans (i.e., site preparation and grading, site drainage improvements, and design parameters for foundations, retaining walls, street pavement, and driveway) to ensure that their recommendations have been properly incorporated. The results of the plan review shall be summarized by the applicant’s geotechnical engineer in a letter to be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading, encroachment, and building permits.

b) Project runoff, if uncontrolled, could add to erosion in gullies and drainages downslope from the roadway extension. The applicant’s geotechnical report notes that energy dissipators, such as rip-rapped stilling basins, may be required to reduce erosion where drains or culverts discharge into drainage ways. The City of Belmont is a member of the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPP), an organization of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County holding a

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Discharge permit. Construction on the site is subject to the City’s NPDES permit for Stormwater discharge. Under that permit, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan must be prepared for review and approval by the City’s Public Works Department prior to start of construction. That Plan would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

c) See responses to items aii, iii, and iv, above.

d) The applicant’s geotechnical report recommends, as part of the project, over-excavation of existing loose soils, subgrade preparation, and placement of engineered fill under the roadway. (Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers, July 6, 2000). This would eliminate any hazards associated with potentially expansive soils.

Compliance With San Juan Hills Area Plan Geologic Review/Hazards Policies

The City’s San Juan Hills Area Plan (pp. 35-36) establishes policies with respect to geologic hazards. Specifically, the Plan requires geotechnical investigations to accompany applications for development. As summarized at the beginning of this discussion, those investigations have been prepared for the project and peer reviewed by the City’s geotechnical consultants.

Geologic Hazards Policy 3 requires that land uses adhere to policies established in Table 6 of the Plan. The proposed roadway site is not within any of the restricted land use designations indicated on the Table. Infrastructure Policy 8, which requires mitigation of moderate geologic hazards prior to road improvement is essentially identical to Geologic Hazard Policy 5, above.

Geologic Hazards Policy 5 requires mitigation of geologic hazards in areas categorized as Pdf prior to the development of roads. A portion of the residential lot above the proposed roadway extension is designated PDf, however no development is proposed in that area. The Plan also required that development density consider slope characteristics. This resulted in the City adopting slope/density limits in the HRO-2 zoning area. These are addressed in the Land Use and Planning section of this Initial Study, below.

Natural Resources Policy 10 encourages preventing road alignments that cross creekbeds. The proposed alignment does not cross any creek beds.

Natural Resources Policy 11 identifies the establishment of grading design standards that minimize changes from natural grades and include stabilization planting prior to the rainy season, minimizing erosion. The project grading would be at or near existing grade and, include erosion control/stabilization in compliance with the NPDES permit.

Natural Resources Policy 12 restricts earthmoving operations during the winter to minimize erosion.

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials - Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X	

a-g) The proposed roadway extension would not involve the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials (other than standard construction materials), nor would it emit any hazardous substances. It is on undeveloped open space and is therefore highly unlikely to contain any contaminated sites that would be a hazard to the public or the environment. It

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

is not subject to an Airport Land Use Plan and, as a flat roadway, would not result in a safety hazard with respect to aircraft. There are no private airstrips in the project vicinity. The approximately 104-foot roadway extension would not interfere with any emergency response plans.

h) The roadway would not expose people or structures to fire hazards; people currently use the existing unpaved roadway. If the houses accessing the roadway are constructed, they would be subject to urban/wildland interface fire hazards. Any proposed houses would be subject to fire safety requirements of the South County Fire Department, who would review all plans as part of the City’s Design Review process. Sprinklers, vegetative buffer zones, and other fire-safe measures may be required as a part of this review. See also discussion of Fire Protection under Section XIII, Public Services, below.

VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality - Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide			X	

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X	

a, c, d, e, f) At present, the project site is comprised of vegetated slopes and exposed earth on the existing road/path. Slopes ranger from nearly level to very steep. The proposed alignment does not cross any identifiable drainage channels. With the proposed project, about 4,000 square feet of the site would be covered with impervious surfaces (asphalt and concrete). Construction of up to three houses and driveways could add another approximately 4,000 - 6,000 square feet of impervious surfaces. This would add minimally but incrementally to runoff from the project area.

The roadway would include storm drainage facilities to connect to existing drains in the existing paved portion of Monte Cresta Drive. It is uncertain as to whether these facilities have sufficient capacity to accommodate surface runoff from the proposed roadway extension. Therefore, the project is proposing to detain all post-development 10-year storm runoff onsite (see Mitigation Measure VIII.1, below). This mitigation would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

The City of Belmont is a member of the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPP), an organization of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County holding a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Discharge permit. STOPPP's goal is to prevent polluted stormwater from entering creeks, wetlands, and the San Francisco Bay. As with most communities, Belmont does not treat stormwater. Consequently, the City requires the implementation of Best Management Practices for new development and construction as part of its stormwater management program (see Mitigation VIII.2, below).

Mitigation Measures

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Mitigation VIII.1. The project storm drainage design facilities shall be designed to detain all post-development increased storm-water peak flows on-site. This post-development runoff shall be calculated using a 30-minute time of concentration to determine the pre-development site runoff for a ten-year storm event and subtracting it from the post-development ten-year storm event runoff with a 30-minute time of concentration. The resulting increased runoff shall be directed to an on-site detention facility.

Mitigation VIII.2. The project shall comply with City of Belmont standard conditions of approval, which require that a drainage plan be submitted which includes drainage patterns on the site and from adjacent properties. The City will require the following condition of approval to ensure compliance with its NPDES Stormwater Discharge permit:

- *For new development and construction projects, the City requires the implementation of Best Management Practices for Construction (BMP's) to ensure the protection of water quality in storm runoff from the project site. In brief, the measures presented in the BMP handbook address pollution control and management mechanisms for contractor activities, e.g. structure construction, material delivery and storage, solid waste management, employee and subcontractor training, etc. The handbook also provides direction for the control of erosion and sedimentation as well as the establishment of monitoring programs to ensure the effectiveness of the BMP's. The Best Management Practices guidelines are available at the Belmont City Hall.*

b) The project would not use or otherwise affect groundwater resources. The project's impervious surfaces are relatively small and therefore would not significantly affect infiltration of rainfall into groundwater.

g, h, i) The project site is located on a ridge high in the San Juan Hills and is not subject to flood hazards.

j) The project site is high on a ridge and distant from any water bodies. Therefore it would not be subject to tsunamis or seiches. A portion of the site would be subject to debris flows; this is addressed in Section VI., Geology, a) iv, above.

IX. Land Use and Planning - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
---	--	--	--	---

a) The project would be an approximately 104-foot road extension in an existing residential neighborhood and therefore would not divide a community.

b) The Belmont General Plan and Zoning Ordinance currently designate the project site as a public roadway. The adjacent residential parcels are designated Hillside Residential and zoned HRO-2 (Hillside Residential and Open Space). Under this zoning, single-family residences, private stables, and ancillary structures may be developed. Although final slope density calculation have not been made for the lots adjacent to the roadway, the maximum house size on the lot upslope of the proposed extension would be 3,300 square feet, and maximum development allowable on each of the smaller downslope lots would be 900 to 1200 square feet each (excluding any transferred development rights). The project is subject to grading plan, and tree removal permit approval by the Planning Commission as part of the required project entitlements. Any houses proposed to access this roadway extension also would be subject to these requirements, as well as Design Review.

The San Juan Hills Area Plan establishes policies for unimproved roadways in subdivided areas. Relevant geologic policies have been addressed in that section of this Initial Study. The project’s conformance with other relevant Plan road policies are addressed below.

Policy 9: This policy encourages avoidance of steep slopes, stands of substantial trees, and creeks/riparian corridors in order to minimize road improvements to protect natural resources. The proposed roadway is sized and located to minimize its effects on steep slopes, avoids most trees (see Section IV, Biological Resources) , and does not cross any creeks or riparian corridors.

Policy 10: This policy requires property owners to resolve the design and financing of road improvements along the entire unimproved road on which their property is located prior to receiving a building permit for a new structure or enlargement of an existing structure. This requirement is intended to assure safe access for emergency vehicles and the construction of safe roads and adequate storm drainage facilities. This policy sets out two possible means for property owners to accomplish this objective; 1) to submit acceptable design, geotechnical, and financing information for approval by the City, or; 2) to submit a plan for improving a section of a roadway between an existing paved road and an area where existing physical constraints make further road extensions infeasible or undesirable. Examples of these constraints are extremely steep slopes and moving deep landslides. Under this latter approach, the applicant must submit: 1) a roadway design plan, 2) evidence that the road will be geologically safe, 3) a method for financing, 4) a plan for access for properties located along the rest of the unimproved road, and 5) evidence of support by the affected landowners. These approaches/requirements have been codified in the City’s Hillside Road standards, discussed below. The applicant is proposing the second

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

approach for approval of this roadway segment. Although no specific ‘Plan for Access’ has been provided, the applicant’s engineers have confirmed that the proposed project’s retaining walls will not block any future possible extensions of the roadway. However, as discussed below, such access may not be feasible because of geological constraints.

Policy 16 advocates establishment of Hillside Road Standards. The City has adopted those standards and incorporated them into its Municipal Code (Section 7.13), as discussed below.

The Belmont Municipal Code establishes Hillside Road Standards for the San Juan Hills area (Belmont Municipal Code Section 7-13). Under those standards, in order for the City Council to adopt a plan for improvement of an unimproved road segment, a plan must include all of the items specified in Section 9 of these standards, as well as a report signed by a licensed geotechnical engineer concluding that the physical constraints are such that a stable road cannot be reasonably constructed through to a paved road, including a description of the constraints and an evaluation of the costs and impacts of overcoming the constraints. These statements are included in the Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers, September 18, and December 22, 2002 reports (See Geology section, above). The City Council must then make a series of findings, including concurring with the geotechnical engineer’s conclusions and recommendations for access to properties abutting the part of the road that would not be improved (Section 10A).

c) The project site is not subject to an NCCP or HCP.

X. Mineral Resources - Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

The Belmont General Plan does not identify any regionally or locally-important mineral resources within the City of Belmont.

XI. Noise - Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise			X	

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

a-d) Construction: Proposed grading construction of the roadway extension (and possible new house construction) would result in temporary noise increases due to the operation of heavy equipment. Construction noise sources range from about 76 to 85 dBA (Leq) at 50 feet for most types of construction equipment with slightly higher levels of about 88 to 91 dBA (Leq) at 50 feet for certain types of earthmoving equipment. If noise controls are installed on construction equipment, the noise levels could be reduced by 1 to 16 dBA, depending on the type of equipment.

The potential for construction-related noise increases to adversely affect nearby residential receptors would depend on the location and proximity of construction activities to these receptors.

The Belmont Noise Ordinance (Ordinance 938) restricts construction activities to the hours of 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM on weekdays and 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM on Saturdays. No construction activities shall be allowed on Sundays or specified holidays. In addition, this ordinance also requires all gasoline-powered construction equipment to be equipped with an operating muffler or baffling system as originally provided by the manufacturer, and no

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

modification to these systems is permitted. No specific noise limits are identified by this ordinance.

However, this ordinance declares that construction activity and certain maintenance equipment operation outside of given hours generates noise and sound levels that are excessive and unreasonable, in accordance with the noise Compatibility Guidelines in the City’s Noise Element. With the City’s required conditions of project approval, noise impacts during construction should not be significant.

Operation: The vehicular and pedestrian use of the roadway would not cause the ambient noise levels to substantially increase. The possible new residences will be a compatible use for the area and not create a significant increase to the existing noise generated by adjacent residences on Monte Cresta Drive.

e, f) The project site is not in an area covered by an airport land use plan or in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

XII. Population and Housing - Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

a-c) The proposed roadway extension project would cause no direct change in population or housing. The project could facilitate the development of up to three new single-family residences with access adjacent to the proposed extension. This would insignificantly affect the City’s housing stock. The project would not provide access to the remaining 23 lots along the undeveloped portion of Monte Cresta Drive, however it would not preclude further extension of Monte Cresta Drive. It should be noted that further extension is substantially constrained by geologic hazards. No displacement of people or housing would occur with the proposed project.

XIII. Public Services -				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of				X

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?			X	
Police protection?			X	
Schools?			X	
Parks?			X	
Other public facilities?				X

a) Public services are currently provided to the adjacent residential neighborhood on the developed portion of Monte Cresta Drive. The roadway extension project would not directly increase demand for public services such as fire and police protection. The possible development of up to three houses adjacent to the roadway extension would add slightly to the demand for these services, as well as schools and parks. The roadway would be public, and would require routine repairs and maintenance by the City. Because the roadway would be new, built to current City standards, and carry minimal traffic, this impact would be less than significant.

XIV. Recreation -				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

a, b) The roadway extension would not result in demand for any parks facilities. As noted under XIII, Public Services, above, the possible development of up to three houses adjacent to the roadway extension would add slightly to the demand for parks. The project

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

will not be displacing recreational facilities nor would construction of the project increase use of existing public recreation facilities. Thus, the project's effect on public recreation facilities is expected to be insignificant.

XV. Transportation/Traffic - Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				X
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

a-d) Local access to the subject site is provided by Highways 280, 101, and 92 via Ralston Avenue and Cipriani Street to Monte Cresta Drive. The proposed project would extend Monte Cresta Drive by about 104 feet and allow for the development of up to three houses. The street extension would not generate any traffic other than short-term construction vehicles. If the houses are constructed, they would generate up to 30 trips per day. This level of trip generation would not adversely affect roadway capacities or safety.

e) The Fire department has reviewed the project plans and has expressed no concerns regarding emergency access to the site.

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

- f) The proposed extension includes parking lanes on both sides of the roadway. In combination with the City’s off-street parking requirements. This would assure that local parking needs would be adequately met.
- g) Construction of the proposed extension would have no effect on alternative transportation policies. It would include sidewalks to allow pedestrians to continue to access the unpaved portion of Monte Cresta Drive.

XVI. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?			X	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

a, b, e) The City of Belmont wastewater collection system is part of the publicly owned infrastructure maintained by the City. Wastewater flows in Belmont are collected from 15

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

drainage basins and pumped to the South Bay System Authority (SBSA) Treatment Plant in Redwood Shores for treatment. SBSA is owned by the cities of Belmont, Redwood City and San Carlos, and the West Bay Sanitary District. The South Bay Systems Authority (SBSA) plans to expand its existing wastewater treatment capacity to meet the demands of expected growth. Planned recycling of the treated wastewater may decrease the volume of discharge to the bay.

The roadway extension would include a six-inch sanitary sewer line to serve any houses constructed adjacent to it. The sewer line would stub out at the edge of the roadway for possible future extension (although the geologic report for the project notes that such an extension is considered infeasible). The line, and downstream collection and treatment facilities, would not be affected by development of the roadway, and would be minimally affected by construction of up to three houses adjacent to the extended roadway. Therefore, impacts on wastewater would be less than significant.

c) Runoff from the proposed new roadway would follow curbs and gutters to an inlet about 800 feet south of the site. As described in Mitigation VIII.1, above, the project proposes to detain all increased storm-water flows from the 10-year storm in onsite detention facilities.

d) The roadway extension would not require any water supplies other than for short-term construction activities. The Belmont County Water District would provide water service to the any houses built along the roadway expansion. The District would determine if it has adequate pressure and volume to serve any new houses with existing facilities at the time such houses are proposed.

f, g) Browning-Ferris Industries (BFI) provides domestic solid waste collection services for the City of Belmont and would serve the project site. Solid waste from the City of Belmont is collected and conveyed to the San Carlos Transfer Station. Accumulated waste materials are then hauled via Highway 92 to the Ox Mountain Landfill site in Half Moon Bay. The landfill site is anticipated to operate until 2030 under its current permits. The roadway extension would not generate solid wastes, and the three possible houses would add minimally to solid waste generation in the City. Therefore this impact would be less than significant.

XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance -				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate		X		

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration – Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

Potentially Significant Impact
 Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated
 Less Than Significant Impact
 No Impact

important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

a) As noted in the Biological Resources discussion, there is a small chance of federally protected animal species occurring on the site. This IS includes mitigation measures to survey for, and protect, those species.

b) There are no planned, approved, or reasonably foreseeable proposals for additional developments along the undeveloped portion of Monte Cresta Road north of the site. Buildout of that roadway is substantially constrained by landslide and debris flow hazards.

c) As discussed above, the project would not result in any substantial adverse affects to humans.

INFORMATION SOURCE S

1. San Juan Hills Area Plan, March 1988
2. City of Belmont General Plan Noise Element, July 23, 1996
3. City of Belmont Zoning Ordinance
4. City of Belmont Municipal Code, Section 7-13
5. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines, Table 6, December 1999
6. South County Fire Authority
7. City of Belmont Public Works Department
8. Wood Biological Consulting, Biological Assessment for the Proposed Monte Cresta Drive Road Improvement Project Site, Belmont, San Mateo County, California, October 14, 2004
9. Levison, Walter, Consulting Arborist, Memo, Proposed Monte Cresta Road Extension Project Impacts to native Coast Live Oaks
10. Holman Associates, letter report 'Re Cultural Resources Study for the Monte Cresta Road Extension Project Initial Study, Belmont, San Mateo County, California,' October 1, 2004.
11. Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers. July 6, 2000. Report, Geotechnical Investigation, Planned Residence at APN 043-243-110 and 043-243-100, Belmont, CA.
12. Cotton Shires & Associates, November 8, 2000. Geotechnical Review re: Campbell Extension of Monte Cresta Drive, and Residence at Lots 5, 6, and 7 (including APN 0043-243-110 and 043-243-100).
13. Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers. October 18, 2001. Report, Geotechnical Investigation, Planned Monte Cresta Drive Extension, Belmont, California.
14. Earth Mechanics Consulting, October 22, 2001. Geotechnical Consultation, Proposed residence at APN 043-243-110 and 043-242-100, Belmont, CA.
15. Michelucci & Associates, Inc. December 18, 2001. Re Geotechnical Consultation, Possible Roadway Below Property, 2707 Sequoia Way, Belmont, CA.
16. Cotton Shires & Associates, Inc, January 23, 2002. Re: Geologic and Geotechnical Review, Aubain, Proposed Roadway and Driveway Entrances, Monte Cresta Drive Extension (APN 0043-160-350).
17. Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers, September 18, 2002. Geotechnical Consultation, Proposed Residence at APN 043-243-110 and 043-242-100, Belmont, California.
18. Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers, December 23, 2002. Geotechnical Consultation, Proposed Residence at APN 043-243-110 and 0043-243-100, Belmont, CA.
19. Earth Mechanics Consulting Engineers, August 16, 2004. Geotechnical Update Letter, Proposed Residence at APN 043-243-110 and 0043-243-100, Belmont, CA.

Appendix A

Biological Resources Report

Appendix B

Cultural Resources Report

Appendix C

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program



**NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE and
NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY FOR PUBLIC REVIEW**

April 8, 2005

LEAD AGENCY:

City of Belmont
One Twin Pines Lane, Suite 385
Belmont, CA 94002-3893

PROJECT TITLE:

Monte Cresta Roadway Extension Project

PROJECT LOCATION:

Monte Cresta Drive
Adjacent to APN 045-243-340

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is proposing an approximately 104-foot-long, two-lane extension of Monte Cresta Drive from its existing terminus approximately 1,000 feet northwest of Barclay Way, below (west of) All View Way in the San Juan Hills area of the City of Belmont. The roadway would provide access to three currently inaccessible residentially designated lots just west of the western terminus of Monte Cresta Drive (APN's 043-243-340, 043-165-180 and 043-165-170).

FINDINGS/DETERMINATION: The City has reviewed and considered the proposed project and has determined the proposed project could have significant impacts with respect to biological resources and soils and geology, but that the impacts will be reduced to less-than-significant levels by incorporation of mitigation measures for the design, construction, and operation of the project. The mitigation measures are described in the project's Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and the project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program that will be adopted concurrently with the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: A 30-day public review period for the Mitigated Negative Declaration will commence on April 18, 2005 and end on May 18, 2005 for interested and concerned individuals and public agencies to submit written comments on the document. The

Draft Negative Declaration and the supporting Initial Study are available for review at: Public Works Department, One Twin Pines Lane, Suite 385, Belmont, CA 94002-3893. Any written comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration must be received at the address below within the public review period:

City of Belmont
Department of Public Works
One Twin Pines Lane, Suite 385
Belmont, CA 94002-3893
Attn: Gilbert Yau, Senior Civil Engineer
(650) 595-7467

It is anticipated that the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration will be considered at the Belmont Planning Commission meeting In July or August, 2005. The hearing will be duly noticed.