

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

I.d) No Impact.

The existing lighting in the parking area includes approximately 20-foot high light standards, which illuminate the parked vehicles, but not the adjacent walking trail or slough. The existing lighting, which was approved by the City of Belmont and BCDC, would not be modified as part of the project. Thus, the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, and no impacts would result.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

II.a) No Impact. In September 1982 the Belmont City Council certified a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and approved the Island Park Project, Rezoning approximately 68-acre area from A (Agriculture) to PD (Planned Development), which allowed construction of a mixed-use/commercial/park/residential complex, including the subject site. The project site was not used for farmland at that time, and has since been fully developed as a commercial use. Review of the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program on the California Resource Agency’s website indicates that there is no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the project site or in the surrounding area. Therefore, the project would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use and no impacts would result.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6)

II.b) No Impact. Review of the Title Report submitted with the project applications indicates that a Williamson Act contract does not encumber the subject property. No impact would result.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6)

II.c) No Impact. The proposed project involves no physical improvements. No farmland exists on site or in the surrounding area and thus no impacts would result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6)

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

III.a) through III.e). No Impact.

The proposed project involves no physical improvements, and thus no emissions or objectionable odors are anticipated and no impacts would result.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) 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
c) 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

Initial Study- Autobahn Motors Rezoning

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. Biological Resources - Would the project:				
d) 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
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
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

IV.a through IV.f) No Impact.

The project site is adjacent to the Belmont Slough, which may contain sensitive plant or animal species. However, potential impacts to sensitive species were reviewed in an Environmental Impact Report prior to the development of the project site and no additional physical improvements (grading, tree removal, drainage or lighting modifications, etc.) are proposed as part of the project. Therefore, no impacts would result.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. Cultural Resources – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?				X
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

V.a through V.d) No Impact.

Initial Study- Autobahn Motors Rezoning

The paved project site would not be further disturbed, and thus no cultural resources would be impacted by the project.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 12, 13, 14)

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
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

VI.a through VI.d). No Impact

Belmont General Plan Seismic Safety Element: The City of Belmont addresses seismic and geologic safety through its General Plan policies, conditions of project approval, the environmental review process and building permit issuance. The Scismic Safety Element of the General Plan states the goals are to:

1. To minimize the risk of loss of life, injury and property damage from earthquakes, floods and other natural hazards affecting the community.
2. To continue to obtain and incorporate into City decision-making information delineating geologic, hydrologic and seismic hazards.

Policy 1 states that the City require investigations by both registered soils engineers and engineering geologists prior to issuing building permits for any new construction. The City implements this policy in conjunction with their Subdivision Ordinance requirements.

Initial Study-- Autobahn Motors Rezoning

Belmont Municipal Code Section 530, Chapter 9.3 (b): The City, as a requirement of the subdivision application (Municipal Code Section 530, Chapter 9.3 (b)) and the Director of Public Works under the authority of the Municipal Code Chapter 9-26 (a) and (b) requires the preparation and peer review of a project specific geotechnical report. As a matter of law, the geotechnical report and the City's peer review and any requirements resulting from the peer review are required of the project as a condition of project approval and building permit issuance.

Site Geotechnical Investigation: A geotechnical investigation was submitted for the project site, prior to the construction of the existing improvements. The City's geotechnical consultant conducted a peer review of the report and the city issued geotechnical clearance for the existing improvements. No additional physical improvements are proposed as part of the project, which would continue the use of a remnant piece of land for the parking of cars. Therefore, no geotechnical impacts would result.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 15)

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials - Would the project:				
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

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials - Would the project:				
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?				

VII.a, VII.b and VII.c) No impact. Nesbitt Elementary school is within a 1/4 mile of the project site. However, the site is separated from the school by a divided highway, (Highway 101) and the proposed project would not entail the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, no impacts would result.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)

VII.d) No Impact. Review of the California Department of Toxic substance Control website indicates that the proposed project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, no impact would result.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 17, 18)

VII.e) No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan. San Francisco International Airport is the nearest public airport to the site. It is located approximately 7 miles to the northeast of the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in safety hazards associated with airports.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)

VII.f) No Impact.

Private aviation facilities located within the vicinity of the project site include San Carlos Airport, located approximately 2.5 miles south of the site. The proposed project would not include any additional physical improvements, and the existing light standards within the parking area are approximately 20 feet in height, far lower than building within the surrounding mixed-use area. Therefore, no impacts would result.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)

VII.g) No Impact. The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The site plans were reviewed by the Police and Fire Departments and found to provide adequate emergency access. No impact would result.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 17)

VII.h) No Impact. The project would not 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 as the project site is not within an urban/suburban/wildland interface zone. No impacts would result.

(Sources: 1, 4, 3, 4, 17)

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
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

Regulatory Framework

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Storm Water Discharge Permit: The City of Belmont is a member of the San Mateo Countywide Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPP), an

organization of the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) of San Mateo County holding a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water Discharge permit. STOPPP's goal is to prevent polluted storm water from entering creeks, wetlands, and the San Francisco Bay. As with most communities, Belmont does not treat storm water. Consequently, the City requires the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMP's) for new development and construction as part of its storm water management program, as levied through standard City conditions of project approval.

The City requires the implementation of the following measure to ensure compliance with its NPDES Storm Water Discharge permit:

For new development and construction projects, the City requires the implementation 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 BMP guidelines are available at Belmont City Hall. The City also requires an agreement with the applicant that ensures the permanent and on-going maintenance of water quality control improvements by the applicant and/or project site owner(s). Refer to the Bay Area Storm Water Management Agencies Association (BASMAA) Start at the Source Design Guidance Manual for Storm Water Quality Protection (available from BASMAA @ 510-622-2465 for a comprehensive listing of required measures. Typical storm water quality protection measures include:

- a) Walking and light traffic areas shall use permeable pavements where feasible. Typical pervious pavements include pervious concrete, porous asphalt, turf block, brick pavers, natural stone pavers, concrete unit pavers, crushed aggregate (gravel), cobbles and wood mulch.
- b) Parking lots shall include hybrid surfaces (pervious material for stalls only), concave medians with biofilters (grassy swales), and landscaped infiltration/detention basins as feasible.
- c) Landscape design shall incorporate biofilters, infiltration and retention/detention basins into the site plan as feasible.
- d) Outdoor work areas including garbage, recycling, maintenance, storage, and loading, applicable storm water controls include siting or set back from drainage paths and water ways, provision of roofing and curbs or berms to prevent run on and run off. If the area has the potential to generate contaminated run off, structural treatment controls for contaminant removal (such as debris screens or filters) shall be incorporated into the design.

State Water Quality Control Board's General Permitting Requirements: The City of Belmont requires through conditions of project approval, project compliance with the State Water Quality Control Board's general permitting requirements which requires the applicant to secure a Construction Activities Storm Water General Permit, complete a Notice of Intent (NOI) and prepare and obtain approval of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The state issues a Waste Discharge Identification number within 10 days of receipt of a complete NOI and SWPPP. The applicant is then required to submit copies of the NOI and SWPPP to the City of Belmont, Public Works Department, prior to issuance of building and/or grading permits.

VIII.a through VIII.j). No Impact.

The existing development of the project site was reviewed and approved in 1994 and constructed in 1998, in keeping with all stormwater and drainage requirements required by the City of Belmont, the Regional

Initial Study – Autobahn Motors Rezoning

Water Quality Control Board, and BCDC. In addition, the FEIR adopted for the project considered the potential impacts of flooding and inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The proposed project would not modify any existing improvements, and thus the project would have no adverse impacts on Hydrology or Water Quality.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 17, 19, 20)

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

IX.a) No Impact. The proposed project would involve no construction and thus could not divide an established community. No impact would result.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 17, 19, 20)

IX.b) No Impact. The project site is designated as Mixed Use – East Belmont in the General Plan. The existing automobile sales/service facility use is consistent with this General Plan designation. The project site has been fully developed in accordance with the Los Costanos Community Development Plan and the City’s General Plan, consistent with the following General Plan Goals and Policies.

Mixed Use Development

2056 Goals

1. *To permit integrated and creative development of the land in East Belmont north of Marine World Parkway in a combination of public and private uses.*
2. *To protect the sensitive ecological environment of the Baylands.*
3. *To enhance opportunities for water related recreation.*
4. *To increase the City's tax base and enhance housing opportunities*
5. *To adapt the type, location and intensity of development of the area to the natural and manmade features and constraints and opportunities of the site and surrounding lands.*

2057 Policies

1. *The City shall seek the coordinated development of the land in East Belmont in a mix, of uses including water related recreation, sports facilities, housing, offices and other commercial activities.*

Commercial Areas

2025 Goals

1. *To provide space for commercial activities in locations with good vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian access available public services, adequate parking and compatible adjacent uses.*
2. *To promote commercial development, which meets the needs of local residents for convenience goods and services and which is fiscally beneficial to the city.*
3. *To improve the attractiveness and functioning of existing commercial areas through such means as landscaping and design controls, and provision of adequate parking, sidewalks, bike paths and bike racks.*
4. *To provide opportunities for commercial employment in attractive, landscaped environments*

2026 Policies

1. *Commercial and office uses should be located on or near major thoroughfares to discourage traffic in residential neighborhoods and should include sufficient off-street parking to prevent disruption of traffic flow on major streets.*

IX.c) No Impact. The project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan as the Project Site is not within either type of planning or resource conservation area.

(Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 17, 19, 20)

X. Mineral Resources - Would the project:				
Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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