



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PLANNING DIVISION

NOTICE OF PREPARATION

TO:	Interested Agencies, Organization, and Individuals
FROM:	City of Menlo Park, Community Development Department 701 Laurel Street Menlo Park, CA 94025
CONTACT:	Deanna Chow, Senior Planner Phone: (650) 330-6733 Fax: (650) 327-5403 Email: dmchow@menlopark.org
SUBJECT:	Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 75 Willow Road Project
<p>As the Lead Agency, the City of Menlo Park will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the above-referenced project. The purpose of this Notice of Preparation (NOP) is to seek comments with specific detail about the scope and content of the environmental information to be evaluated in the EIR for the proposed project.</p> <p>An Initial Study (Environmental Checklist Form) for the proposed project is available online at www.menlopark.org and upon request by calling (650) 330-6733.</p> <p>The comment period is 30 days, from April 12, 2006 to May 11, 2006. Please send your response, including the name of a contact person, to Deanna Chow, Senior Planner, at the address shown above by May 11, 2006 at 5:30 pm.</p>	
PROJECT TITLE: 75 Willow Road Project	
PROJECT LOCATION: 75 Willow Road, Menlo Park	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	
<p>The proposed project site is approximately 4.52 acres and located on the north side of Willow Road between Middlefield Road and Waverley Street. The site is currently developed with a commercial office building, approximately 40,000 square feet in size, a parking lot, and mature landscaping. The applicant proposes to demolish the existing building, remove 105 of the existing 199 trees (including 46 heritage trees), relocate 12 trees (including 4 heritage trees), and construct 33 single-family detached residences with associated private streets and landscaping.</p> <p>The proposed project includes the following applications: 1) General Plan Amendment: Change from Professional and Administrative Offices land use designation to Medium Density Residential land use designation; 2) Rezoning: Change from C-1 (Administrative and Professional District, Restrictive) to R-3-X (Apartment - Conditional Development District); 3) Conditional Development Permit: Establish specific development regulations and review architectural designs; 4) Tentative Subdivision Map: Create 33 lots and associated common areas; 5) Heritage Tree Permit: Remove/relocate heritage trees and plant new trees; and 6) Environmental Review of the proposed project.</p> <p>The proposed changes require a recommendation by the Planning Commission and approval by the City Council.</p>	
Deanna Chow, Senior Planner	April 10, 2006



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PLANNING DIVISION

(650) 330-6702

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:**
75 Willow Road
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**
City of Menlo Park
Community Development Department
701 Laurel Drive
Menlo Park, CA 94025
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**
Deanna Chow, (650) 330-6733
4. **Project Location:**
75 Willow Road, Menlo Park, CA 94025
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**
SummerHill Homes
777 California Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94304
(650) 842-2306
6. **General Plan Designation:**
Existing: Professional and Administrative Offices
Proposed: Medium Density Residential
7. **Zoning:**
Existing Zoning: C-1 (Administrative and Professional, Restrictive)
Proposed Zoning: R-3-X (Apartment - Conditional Development Permit)
8. **Description of the Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including, but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)**

The proposed project includes the construction of three- and four-bedroom two-story homes with landscaped front yards, private rear yards, and on-lot driveway aprons. The homes would range in size from 1,700 square feet to 2,389 square feet, and would have a maximum height of 28 feet. The project would include the development of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) and formation of a Homeowners Association (HOA).

The proposed site plan consists of 33 single-family lots. Five of the lots would be developed with below market rate (BMR) units. The site plan incorporates a curvilinear looping street with irregular lot sizes and configurations so as to retain the significant existing trees on site. The lot sizes would range from

Environmental Checklist Form

75 Willow Road

Page 2

approximately 2,625 to 7,200 square feet, averaging approximately 4,675 square feet. In addition to the landscaped front yards and private rear yards, there would be approximately 9,200 square feet of common area park space. The area proposed for the homes and common area is approximately 164,000 square feet, or 3.8 acres. The proposed project would have a density of approximately 7.3 dwelling units per gross acre and 8.8 dwelling units per net acre. The floor area ratio (FAR) would be 42.7 percent and the building coverage would be 28.9 percent.

The proposed homes would be designed using four different floor plans, with multiple elevation styles. The homes would be placed at a variety of widths and depths on the lots to site the homes around the existing trees and create a diverse streetscape. Different garage orientations and entry configurations address tree preservation and avoid garage doors facing Willow Road. Each plan would have a two-car garage. Plans 1 through 3 would have two-car garages with typically two-car driveway aprons. The smallest plan, Plan 4, would have a two-car tandem garage and a minimum of a one-car driveway apron. Several lots in the proposed project would include long driveways where the homes are sited behind existing trees. The proposed project includes traditional architectural styles including design elements derived from the adjacent Linfield Oaks neighborhood and Sunset Publishing's campus. There would be 13 exterior designs plus various garage and entry configurations. The designs would use a variety of materials including stucco, cementitious siding or shingles, heavy composition shingle roofing, and wood windows. All homes would have fire sprinklers.

Site preparation and building foundations would be designed to meet the recommendations set forth in the geotechnical report, including excavation and re-compaction of expansive soils, use of specific foundation design (footings, post-tension slab, drilled cast-in-place concrete piers), concrete slab-on-grade floors, and a capillary moisture barrier. As a condition of approval, the project design would be required to adhere to current Uniform Building Code requirements.

Access, Parking and Circulation

Private Roadway

Vehicular access to the site would be provided from Willow Road via a private road. This project entry would be located approximately 400 feet from the intersection of Waverley Street and Willow Road. Willow Place is located approximately 240 feet west on the opposite side of Willow Road. The entry road would be 24 feet wide with rolled curbs. No on-street parking would be allowed on the roadway segment connecting to Willow Road. This roadway would intersect with a circular looping street, ranging from 20 to 28 feet wide with intermittent on-street parking, avoiding the existing trees. Homes fronting Willow Road would have garage access from the rear or side via the entry road or shared private driveways to avoid vehicular access from Willow Road; however, the main entrances of these homes would face out to Willow Road into the existing neighborhood.

Pedestrian Access

Both sides of the entry road into the site would have sidewalks. Two additional new walkways would connect pedestrians from the internal private street to the sidewalk along Willow Road. A looping sidewalk would be provided around the perimeter of the private street. Handicap access ramps would be included to facilitate bicycle and pedestrian circulation through the community. A potential public pedestrian/bicycle connection is proposed to legalize and improve the popular cut-through between the 175 Linfield property and 75 Willow Road if the two properties are redeveloped. There is an existing crosswalk at Willow Road and Waverley Street. Should a pedestrian/bicycle connection be created, way-finding signage would be included to direct individuals from the Willow Place Bridge to Willow Road and then by way of this crosswalk through the project site to Linfield Drive. A sidewalk would also be provided within the City's right-of-way along Willow Road.

Bicycle Access

A public access easement would provide Class III bikeway access on the private street through to the 175 Linfield property. There is an existing Class II bicycle facility along Willow Road.

Parking

Off-street Parking

Each home would have an attached two-car garage accessible from the internal road or shared driveway. Approximately 25 lots (Plans 1 through 3) would have two-car side-by-side garages and one- to four-car driveway aprons. Approximately eight lots (Plan 4) would have two-car tandem garages and a minimum of one-car driveway aprons. Several lots in the proposed project would include long driveways that would provide additional on-lot spaces. The garages and driveway aprons would provide a total of 130 off-street parking spaces. Project CC&Rs would require that garages be maintained clear for parking cars.

On-street Parking

The project would include 11 on-street parking spaces on the interior private road. Project CC&Rs and entry signage would indicate that on-street parking is for residents' guests only. In addition, there would be 13 public parking spaces off-site on Willow Road that could be used. On-street parking would be prohibited on the sidewalk side of the interior street because this area would be part of the designated fire access plan and would be posted as such. On-street parking would be restricted to the hours permitted on City of Menlo Park public streets and enforced by the HOA or Menlo Park police as appropriate.

All private streets, sidewalks, pedestrian connections, and shared driveways would be maintained by the HOA.

Proposed Landscaping

The site is currently planted with approximately 199 trees, including 102 trees that meet City standards for designation as heritage trees. Existing heritage trees include mature redwood, ash, camphor, maple, cedar, eucalyptus, and olive trees from 30 to over 100 feet high. As part of the development, 105 trees would be removed, including 46 heritage trees. Of the heritage trees to be removed, 36 are eucalyptus trees and four are stone pines. Several smaller and less healthy cedar and redwood trees along the eastern property line are also proposed for removal. Approximately 94 trees would be preserved, including 52 heritage trees. Eight Chinese elm trees (including one heritage tree) located in the rear parking lot would be relocated to serve as street trees within the project. In addition, three heritage olive trees and one non-heritage maple tree would be relocated on-site.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the City of Menlo Park's Heritage Tree Replacement Procedures, which delineate the ratio of trees a developer must replace for every heritage tree removed. [24] For residential projects, applicants who are granted approval to remove a heritage tree are required to replace lost heritage trees on a 1:1 basis. However, City staff may exercise discretion on the size and number of trees an applicant may be required to install. Given the number and size of existing trees on site, the replacement ratio for heritage trees will be a minimum ratio of 1:1 with larger sized trees. Accounting for the screening function of the existing eucalyptus trees, the existing tree overcrowding along the property's eastern perimeter, and the proposed on-site tree preservation plan, the applicant proposes an alternative tree replacement program that includes 69 new trees, 51 of which would be upsized from the City-standard 15-gallon to larger scale 24-inch and 36-inch box-size trees. In consultation with the project and City arborist, the project landscape architect would select these replacement trees. At the time of installation, the box-size replacement trees would be a minimum of 15 feet tall and five feet wide.

The project would provide a neighborhood park on the site, which would be created by removing the existing building and renovating its interior landscaped courtyard. The courtyard currently includes several types of trees and shrubs, with 12 trees (including four of heritage size). Species include redwood, Japanese maple, camphor, maple, and birch trees and range from 30 to over 100 feet high. This area, including the trees, would become visible and accessible to the public as a neighborhood park. The proposed park would include benches, paths and a fountain, and would have an area of approximately 6,700 square feet. A second passive park with benches and dog waste disposal receptacles would be located among existing cedar and redwood trees along the looping sidewalk in the northwestern portion of the site that borders 275 Middlefield Road. This passive park would be approximately 2,500 square feet.

As part of the tree replacement program, new street trees would be planted among preserved existing trees along the private street. All private front yards would be landscaped with trees, shrubs, and turf or groundcover. A combination of paving types would be used for driveways and walkways on the individual lots, including permeable pavers under existing tree driplines. The sidewalk abutting Willow Road would be

reconstructed to include a turf planting strip with new street trees along Willow Road to integrate with the existing Linfield Oaks neighborhood. In addition, the rose vine and split rail fence design bordering the adjacent Sunset Publishing site is proposed to continue the length of the proposed development along the Willow Road frontage. Automatic sprinklers would be installed for the site landscaping.

The HOA would be responsible for maintaining the Willow Road planter strip, interior common area landscaping, and the potential pedestrian path. The HOA would also be responsible for maintaining and monitoring the relocated trees during their reestablishment period. CC&Rs would include homeowner maintenance requirements and restrictions to protect preserved heritage trees on individual lots.

Site Lighting

The private streets would be lit with decorative downcast fixtures. These fixtures would include shields to minimize light intrusion. Street lighting levels would be consistent with City and safety standards. The project HOA would be responsible for maintaining the lighting.

Proposed Demolition

The proposed project would require demolition of the existing building (including foundation, concrete slab, and heating and air conditioning units) as well as removal of asphalt paving and landscaping. The project applicant would be required to conduct a survey for asbestos and lead-based paint prior to any demolition work; if such materials were found, they would be removed in compliance with Bay Area Air Quality Management District regulations before demolition could proceed. Salvage of any desired interior or exterior building materials and plants would be made through cooperation with Sunset Publishing for their campus as feasible prior to demolition. The project would comply with the City's Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling and Salvage Requirements Ordinance and would recycle at least 65 percent of the debris.

If demolition occurs during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species, the project biologist would conduct nest surveys on the site, as outlined in the Live Oak Associates biological report, prior to any demolition or site preparation activities. Prior to any building or tree removal, tree protection measures would be implemented on-site in accordance with project arborist Walter Bemis' arboreal reports and in conjunction with on-site consultation with the City's consulting arborist.

Grading

Grading activities would include demolition of existing building and removal of all existing foundations, slab-on-grade floors, basement structures, exterior concrete flatwork, and utilities that would interfere with the proposed new development. All voids would be filled with engineered fill as outlined in the Lowney Associates preliminary geotechnical report.

The site would require minor grading to create flat lots for the proposed homes and to provide proper storm water drainage and utility flows from the site. There is currently a low spot in the northeast corner of the parking lot that would be filled to bring it level with the surrounding area. Existing elevations on the site range from 52 to 59 feet above mean sea level. Proposed building pads would range in elevation from 56 to 59 feet above mean sea level. Proposed finished floors would be one foot higher than the building pads. Based on preliminary grading schemes, the proposed project would require a total of 7,278 cubic yards of cut and 13,399 yards of fill, which includes filling the basement of the existing building. Approximately 752 cubic yards of cut material (the existing parking lot asphalt) would be removed from the site; the remaining cut material would be re-used on site. Approximately 6,873 cubic yards of fill material would be imported to the site. Two retaining walls would be constructed: a retaining wall of up to 2.5 feet high would be installed along the western boundary and a retaining wall of up to 3.5 feet high would be installed along the northern boundary. This wall height would be reduced should the 175 Linfield property be redeveloped, as the existing grade on both properties slope towards the shared property line. Retaining walls will be block construction, with pier and grade beam foundations to be used under significant tree driplines at the direction of the project arborist.

If any archaeological resources, including human remains, were discovered during demolition, grading, or construction activities, the construction contractor would halt work in the area and consult with a qualified archaeologist to determine if the find is significant. If a find were determined to be significant, the construction

Environmental Checklist Form

75 Willow Road

Page 5

contractor would be required to consult with the City and the archaeologist to determine the appropriate response actions. If human remains were discovered, the developer would be required to comply with state law regarding notification of the County Coroner and consultation with Native American groups.

Drainage

The property currently drains through an existing 18- to 21-inch storm drain line, located in the rear of the parking lot at 85 Willow Road, which ties into the storm drain line along Middlefield Road. During normal rain events, storm water from the 275 Middlefield Road parking lot surface flows onto the 75 Willow Road site and into inlets located in the parking lot. During peak events or when storm water overflows the storm drain system and overland release is needed, excess water flows back into the 275 Middlefield Road parking lot. There is an existing storm drainage easement across 275 Middlefield Road.

The surface drainage plan for the project would direct drainage away from the proposed residential units and toward the proposed private street within the development. The proposed project would also reduce the impervious surface area compared to the existing conditions. The proposed drainage for the development would continue to flow into the existing 85 Willow Road line. It would be designed to a 10-year storm event with curb elevations not less than one foot above the hydraulic grade line (the level to which overflow water would rise). A proposed 12-inch storm drain line would be installed in the main loop road. This line would connect to the existing 18-inch line at 85 Willow Road and then to the Middlefield Road system through a private storm drain easement along the northern boundary of Lot 5.

On-site storm water quality treatment would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) including permeable pavers in driveways, rainwater gutters leading to splash blocks and then to on-lot permeable landscaping, and dry wells with overflow through curb drains, subject to geotechnical and arboreal conditions. In addition, a vegetated bioswale would be located along Lots 20 and 21. Creation of additional bioswales is problematic because of the need to preserve existing trees; there are large open space areas under drip lines where bioswales cannot be located because standing water would be harmful to the trees. Therefore, in addition to the on-lot BMPs and the bioswale, stormwater filtering inlets would be included to treat storm water prior to entering into the public system. The HOA would be responsible for maintaining all on-site storm drainage facilities and the project CC&Rs would include individual homeowner on-lot maintenance responsibilities and restrictions.

The applicant is preparing updated hydrology calculations. Hydrology will be addressed in the EIR.

Utilities (Sanitary Sewer & Water)

To serve the homes, the proposed project would install new eight-inch sanitary sewer lines within the entry road, looping internal street, and shared driveways. One connection would be made from the project entry to Willow Road. In addition, due to the elevation of the existing sewer line in Willow Road and the elevation of the 75 Willow Road property, a new eight-inch sewer line would be installed in Willow Road and Waverley Street to connect to the existing line. Ductile iron pipe would be used in the northern portion of the site in areas of shallow cover.

Water service would be provided by way of a loop system of eight-inch water lines connecting into the existing eight-inch Willow Road system via one connection in the project entry road and a second connection located in a public utility easement along Lots 23 and 24. An existing water supply well serving 85 Willow Road would be abandoned as part of the project.

Local Roadways

As described above, there would be one new entry road into the project. All existing driveways within and connecting to the project site would be eliminated and the sidewalk would be reconstructed to include a new planter strip and street trees, with a sidewalk separated from the roadway. To provide adequate sight distance for the project, landscaping in the existing median located in Willow Road would be replanted or trimmed as required to provide unobstructed visibility between three and eight feet above ground level. This median would remain in the City's right of way, but could be maintained by the HOA.

Construction Schedule & Operation

Construction of the project would begin after approval of the project by the City Council and would last about 12 months. During construction, the project contractor would implement a dust control program. The program would be applied to all construction activities involving grading, excavation, use of unpaved areas for staging, extensive housing of materials or building demolition including measures from Table 2 of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines as applicable and feasible. The project contractor would comply with the City of Menlo Park's Noise Ordinance. The City of Menlo Park would determine haul routes and exclude the Linfield Oaks neighborhood. In addition, the project would prepare, implement, maintain and monitor a storm water quality pollution prevention plan for construction activities.

In addition, development of the proposed project would require the following approvals:

1. Amendment to the *General Plan* Land Use Map for the site to change the land use designation of from Professional and Administrative Office to Medium Density Residential
2. Amendment to the Zoning Map for the site from Zone C-1 (Administrative and Professional, Restrictive) to Zone R-3-X (Apartment – Conditional Development Permit)
3. Conditional Development Permit to allow for adjustments to the zoning requirements in order to ensure special design features possible with the comprehensive planning of the site
4. Tentative Subdivision Map
5. Heritage Tree Permits

The proposed changes require a recommendation by the Planning Commission and the review and approval by the City Council. For graphics showing the site and project characteristics, please see the attachments to this Initial Study.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project site is located on the north side of Willow Road, between Middlefield Road and Waverley Street in the City of Menlo Park. The 4.52-acre site (Assessor's Parcel Number 062-422-130) is currently developed with a commercial office building, which is partially occupied by AT&T Labs. The site is generally flat with a low spot in the northeast corner of the parking lot.

The properties to the immediate east and south of the site are zoned C-1 and contain commercial office buildings and parking lots. Apartment buildings (zoned R-3 /Medium Density Apartments) are located immediately to the west and to the north, where the property was recently rezoned from C-1 to R-3-X. San Francisquito Creek and the Willow Place Pedestrian Bridge to Palo Alto are located approximately one-eighth mile south of the site.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Menlo Park Fire Protection District
West Bay Sanitary District
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

Land Use and Planning	Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics
Population and Housing	Energy and Mineral Resources		Cultural Resources
Geological Problems	Hazards		Recreation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water	Noise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance
<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	Public Services		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation and Circulation	Utilities and Service Systems		

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency.)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.

Signature	For the City of Menlo Park
Name, printed	Date April 10, 2006

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
- 5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration.

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
1. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposal:					
a. Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?			X		1,2,3
b. Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?			X		1,2,3
c. Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?				X	3
d. Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impact to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?				X	4
e. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?				X	1,2,3

EXPLANATION:

1a. According to the Menlo Park *General Plan*, the project site is designated for Professional and Administrative Offices and zoned C-1 (Administrative and Professional, Restrictive). [1,2] The proposed project would not be consistent with the existing *General Plan* land use designation and zoning.

The project sponsor proposes to amend the *General Plan* Land Use Map to change the land use designation from Professional and Administrative Offices to Medium Density Residential, and to amend the Zoning Map to change the zoning district from C-1 to R-3-X (Apartment – Conditional Development Permit.) The Conditional Development Permit would allow for adjustments to the zoning requirements in order to allow certain design features possible with the comprehensive planning of the site. This permit would be required to allow for a decrease in minimum lot area and a decrease in minimum lot dimensions, setbacks, number of parking stalls per unit, and minimum distance between structures. [3] Approval of the *General Plan* amendment, rezoning, and the approval of Conditional Development permits would reconcile inconsistency with the *General Plan* and Zoning.

1b. Refer to **1a** and to the other subsections of this checklist. As discussed elsewhere in the checklist, the project would not result in significant physical changes or issues in most environmental topic areas that could lead to policy inconsistencies. Therefore, the project would not conflict with most of the applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project. There could be significant aesthetic and traffic impacts; consistency with policies in those areas will be considered as part of the analysis in the EIR.

1c. Existing land uses in the vicinity of the project site include office buildings, apartment buildings, and parking lots. The proposed project includes the construction of three- and four-bedroom two-story homes with landscaped front yards, private rear yards, and on-lot driveway aprons. The homes would range in size from approximately 1,700 square feet to 2,389 square feet, and would have a maximum height of 28 feet. [3] The proposed residential units would be similar in height to other office buildings and residential units in the surrounding area. Compatibility impacts related to noise are discussed in **Section 10: Noise**, and impacts related to air quality (including dust and odors) are discussed in **Section 5: Air Quality**.

1d. According to the San Mateo *Important Farmlands Map*, the project site and adjacent sites are designated as Urban and Built-Up Land. [4] Furthermore, the project site is fully developed with a commercial building and paved roadways. Therefore, the proposed project would not affect agricultural resources or operations.

1e. Typically, this issue relates to the construction of, or placement of a dividing feature or barrier within an area of existing uses, such that the layout, land use pattern, or circulation within a community is affected. The project site itself does not constitute an established community, in that it is an office building. The project would replace the office building with a residential neighborhood, but there are already residential uses in the vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community.

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
2. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:					
a. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?			X		5,6,7
b. Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or major infrastructure)?			X		1,2,3,5
c. Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?				X	3

EXPLANATION:

2a, b. Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in population of approximately 81 residents (based on 33 residential units with an average household size of 2.45). [5] This increase in population would be less than one percent of the estimated population of Menlo Park in 2005. (The 2005 population of Menlo Park was 30,648 persons, up from 30,400 persons in 2004.) [6]

According to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Projections 2005, the population in the City of Menlo Park (and its Sphere of Influence) is expected to grow to 35,600 persons by 2010. [5] Near-term residential development projects (including approved residential projects at 110 and 175 Linfield Drive) include 336 net housing units, for a projected increase of 823 residents. [7] Thus, the cumulative population increase of the proposed project and near-term development would equal 904 persons. With this increase, the population of Menlo Park would be 31,552, which is below the ABAG-projected population.

2b. Approximately 81 new residents would be generated by the project. The project is not in an undeveloped area and would not require a significant expansion of infrastructure. The population accommodated by the project would directly contribute to growth in Menlo Park, but the numbers would be small. The project would not induce substantial growth in the area.

2c. The project site is currently developed with an office building. Implementation of the proposed project would replace the office buildings with 33 residential units. The City's below market rate (BMR) program requires that 15 percent of residential developments consist of BMR units. Five of the proposed units, or 15.15 percent of the total, would be developed and marketed as BMR units.

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
3. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:					
a. Fault rupture?				X	8
b. Seismic ground shaking?			X		8
c. Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?				X	8
d. Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?				X	9
e. Landslides or mudflows?				X	8
f. Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill?			X		8,10
g. Subsidence of the land?				X	8
h. Expansive soils?		X			8
i. Unique geologic or physical features?				X	10

EXPLANATION:

See next page

3a. The major active faults in the vicinity are the Monte Vista (which is within the Santa Cruz Mountains), San Andreas, and Hayward Faults, all of which are five miles or more from the project site. The project site is outside any Earthquake Fault Zone, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, and no known active or potentially active fault exists on the project site. The probability of fault rupture at the site is low. [8]

3b. Strong to very strong ground shaking from a moderate to large earthquake on one of the nearby faults is likely to be felt at the project site over the life of the project. However, the project is required to adhere to the current Uniform Building Code (UBC) regulations, which are intended to reduce seismic risks to an acceptable level. [8]

3c. Sand layers at the project site are sufficiently dense and/or have sufficient cohesion to resist liquefaction. There is little to no potential for lateral spreading or differential compaction at the project site. [8]

3d. Seiches are waves in enclosed bodies of water. Tsunamis are large oceanic waves. A review of area maps show that the project site is not adjacent to any large enclosed bodies of water, and is over 10 miles from the Pacific Ocean. The United States Geologic Survey (USGS) map of California Volcanoes and Volcanics indicates that no volcanoes are within 50 miles of the project site.[9]

3e. The project site is flat and not adjacent to any steep slopes. There is little to no potential for landslides or mudflows to occur at the project site.[8]

3f. The project site is flat and not adjacent to any steep slopes. However, the project would require minor grading to create flat lots for the proposed homes, and there would be only minor changes in ground elevation. Therefore, there is little to no potential for impacts related to erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions.[8,10]

3g. See **3c.** There is little to no potential for subsidence at the project site.[8]

3h. The project site is blanketed by about 23 to 27 feet of hard, low to moderately expansive clay, which has little to no potential for volume changes during seasonal fluctuations in moisture content. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure 3.1** would reduce potential impacts from expansive soils to a less-than-significant level.

3i. There are no unique geologic or physical features on the project site, which is located in an area of deep alluvial soils and has already been graded and developed.

Mitigation Measure 3.1

Expansive soils must be treated or replaced when forming the foundation support. If importation of off-site soils is required during construction, the project sponsor and its contractors shall avoid the use of expansive soils. The project sponsor's contractors shall keep soils moist at all times before and during construction by either covering exposed soil when construction is not active or regularly watering the exposed soil to maintain a consistent moisture level.

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
4. WATER. Would the proposal result in:					
a. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	X				3,11,12
b. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?		X			11,13
c. Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality, e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?		X			14, 15, 16
d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any			X		11

Environmental Checklist Form

75 Willow Road

Page 12

	water body?				
e.	Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?			X	11
f.	Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?			X	11
g.	Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?			X	11
h.	Impacts to groundwater quality?		X		11
i.	Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?			X	11

EXPLANATION:

4a. Locally, the project site is located within the sub-watershed delineated by Middlefield Road, Ravenswood Avenue, the Caltrain tracks, and San Francisquito Creek. The storm drain system that drains runoff from the sub-watershed discharges into San Francisquito Creek at Middlefield Road.[11]

Currently, the drainage system on the project site includes a series of six inlets along the west edge of the property. These inlets are connected with a single 18- to 21-inch pipe in the rear of 85 Willow Road’s parking lot that connects to a 36-inch storm drain line along Middlefield Road and then discharges to the creek approximately 1,500 feet to the south. [3] The 36-inch pipe discharges to San Francisquito Creek via two outfalls: a 36-inch outfall located at the end of Middlefield Road, and a 48-inch outfall located at the end of Baywood Avenue just downstream of the San Francisquito Bridge. The latter outfall was constructed as part of the drainage improvements for the Burgess Drive subdivision, located at the corner of Burgess Drive and Laurel Street. [11] The existing system has inadequate capacity for 10-year storm event flows.

The surface drainage plan for the project would direct drainage away from the proposed residential units and toward the proposed private street within the development. The proposed project would also reduce the impervious surface area compared to the existing conditions. The proposed drainage for the development would continue to flow into the existing 85 Willow Road line. It would be designed to a 10-year storm event with curb elevations not less than one foot above the hydraulic grade line (the level to which overflow water would rise). A proposed 12-inch storm drain line would be installed in the main loop road. This line would connect to the existing 18-inch line at 85 Willow Road and then to the Middlefield Road system through a private storm drain easement along the northern boundary of Lot 5. [12] The applicant is preparing detailed hydrology/hydraulic calculations using the Rational Method as required by the City of Menlo Park, with the 10-year storm used as the design standard. Drainage and related issues will be considered in the EIR.

4b. Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) produced by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) indicate that the project site is located within the FEMA Flood Hazard Zone X, described as an “area of 500-year flood with average depths of less than 1-foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile; and areas protected by levees from 100-year flood.” [13] As previously mentioned, the Middlefield drainage system has inadequate flow conveyance capacity for the peak flow for the 10-year storm event, resulting in localized flooding along Willow Road. Improvements have been identified to address the issue but the improvements have not been funded. [11] Therefore, there could be localized flooding in the vicinity of the project site, potentially affecting the proposed project. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure 4.1** would reduce the potential impacts from localized flooding at the project site to a less-than-significant level.

4c. The project site is located within the San Francisquito Creek watershed. San Francisquito Creek is considered the last riparian free-flowing creek and the last remaining run of steelhead trout (a federally listed threatened species) on the southern peninsula of San Francisco Bay. The creek is currently listed as impaired by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) due to excessive sediment/and siltation. In October 2003, the RWQCB released the San Francisquito Creek Sediment Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Project Plan. The primary water quality objectives of the plan were to reduce turbidity, sediment, suspended material, and settleable material in the watershed.[14]

The Clean Water Act (CWA) has nationally regulated the discharge of pollutants to waters of the United States from any point source since 1972. In 1987, amendments to the CWA added section 402(p), which established a framework for regulating non-point source storm water discharges under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).[15] The Phase I NPDES storm water program regulates storm water discharges from major industrial facilities, large and medium-sized municipal separate storm sewer systems (those serving more than 100,000 persons), and construction sites that disturb five or more acres of land.

To comply with the CWA, San Mateo County and the 20 cities and towns in the County formed the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (STOPPP). STOPPP holds a joint municipal NPDES permit from the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The permit includes a comprehensive plan to reduce the discharge of pollutants to creeks, San Francisco Bay, and the ocean to the maximum extent possible.

The project is required to comply with the Phase I NPDES program for construction activities. Construction activities that would be covered under the program include, but are not limited to: clearing, grading, demolition, excavation, construction of new structures, and reconstruction of existing facilities involving removal and replacement that results in soil disturbance. The project applicants can obtain coverage under the NPDES program by filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resource Control Board's Division of Water Quality Storm Water Permit Unit. Generally, a site is considered to be covered by the program upon filing the NOI and submitting the appropriate annual fee. The NOI must be submitted, and the permit obtained, before construction starts. In addition to submitting the NOI, the discharger must develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for construction activities and develop and implement a monitoring and reporting plan. Any project disturbing one or more acres of soil would be required to have a SWPPP based on the State standards. The SWPPP is a documented step-by-step process that outlines the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be implemented during construction to prevent sediment, hazardous materials, and other pollutants from entering the formal storm drain system. With the implementation of these requirements by the project, construction-related impacts to water quality would be less than significant.[14]

Once the project has been constructed, non-point source (NPS) pollutants from the project site could have detrimental effects on downstream waters. NPS pollutants are washed by rainwater from residential areas, landscape areas, and streets and parking areas into the formal drainage network. The most common NPS pollutants are sediment and nutrients. Other common NPS pollutants include pesticides, salts, oil, grease, and heavy metals. Pollutants from the project site would likely be consistent with suburban medium density residential areas, parking lots, and roads and would consist mostly of oil, grease, petroleum hydrocarbons, metals, and possibly nutrients. NPS pollutants from site runoff could have detrimental effects on downstream waters and the water quality of San Francisquito Creek.

The City will require the applicant to implement water quality treatment Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable, per the City's Grading and Drainage Plan Guidelines and Checklist.[16] This requirement has been incorporated into **Mitigation Measure 4.2** to reduce the potential water quality issues to a less-than-significant level.

4d-e. See response to **4a.**[11]

4f. The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) defines state groundwater basins based on geologic and hydrogeologic conditions. According to the DWR, the project site is located within the San Mateo Groundwater Subbasin. The subbasin is part of the larger Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Basin and is composed of alluvial fan deposits formed by tributaries to San Francisco Bay. This subbasin has a history of groundwater overdraft as early as the 1920s. Overdraft of the subbasin occurred until 1965 when supplemental surface supplies were delivered by the State of California from Hetch Hetchy Reservoir. Since 1965, imported surface water supplies have met approximately 90 percent of the demand in San Mateo County.

The California Water Service Company (CWSC) is the district agency responsible for providing water service for this area of Menlo Park. The CWSC's water supplies are derived from local reservoir water and purchases from the City of San Francisco. No groundwater wells would be required to serve the project site.

Generally, groundwater recharge occurs by infiltration of water from streams and by percolation of precipitation that falls directly on the ground. The proposed project would result in reductions in impervious surfaces at the project site. This decrease in impervious surface would result in a slight increase in groundwater recharge at the project site.

When compared to existing conditions, the proposed project would not result in the depletion of groundwater supplies nor result in a decrease in net recharge. No impacts to groundwater resources would occur. [11]

4g. See response to **4f.**

4h. See response to **4c.**

4i. See response to **4f.**

Mitigation Measure 4.1

The applicant shall provide detailed hydrology/hydraulic calculations indicating the estimated hydraulic grade line at the project site for the 10-year and 100-year storms. Top-of-curb elevations for each project shall be modified as needed (per consultation with the City) to meet City requirements. Finished floor elevations shall be modified as needed per consultation with the City. These revisions shall be made and approved by the City prior to Tentative Map approval.

Mitigation Measure 4.2

The project applicant shall implement Best Management Practices for water quality treatment on the project site to the maximum extent practicable, per the City of Menlo Park Grading and Drainage Plan Guidelines and checklist. Specific guidelines that would apply to the project site include (but would not be limited to) #1 (use of on-site infiltration as much as possible as a means of handling roof and site drainage); #4 (Design of the site drainage so the storm water will flow to on-site lawn or pervious landscaped areas, or detention/retention and filtration systems through vegetated/grassed swales or underground pipes), #5 (drainage from roof downspouts to on-site lawn or pervious landscaped areas, or detention/retention and filtration systems through vegetated/grassed swales), and #11 (use of on-site infiltration, vegetated swales or other comparable BMPs prior to discharge). The BMPs shall be shown on the drainage plan and reviewed by the City prior to approval of the Tentative Map.

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
5. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:					
a. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?		X			1,2,3,17
b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?		X			1,2,3,17
c. Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?				X	1,2,3,17
d. Create objectionable odors?				X	1,2,3,17

EXPLANATION:

5a-b. The BAAQMD is currently in non-attainment for the state and national ozone standards and the state respirable particulate matter (PM₁₀) standard. The San Francisco Bay Area Ozone Attainment Plan for the 1-Hour National Ozone Standard and the Bay Area 2000 Clean Air Plan have been prepared to address ozone non-attainment issues. No PM₁₀ plan has been prepared or is required under the State Air Quality Planning Law. Both the federal and state ozone plans rely heavily upon stationary source control measures set forth in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) Rules and Regulations. The overall stationary source control program that is embodied by the BAAQMD Rules and Regulations has been developed such that new stationary sources can be allowed to operate in the Bay Area without obstructing the goals of the regional air quality plans.

Construction activities such as excavation and grading operations, construction vehicle traffic on unpaved areas and wind blowing over exposed earth could generate fugitive dust emissions. Although these emissions would be temporary, they may affect local air quality. For construction phase impacts, the BAAQMD, the regulatory agency managing air quality in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, recommends that impact significance be determined based on consideration of the control measures to be implemented.

According to the BAAQMD, if appropriate measures are implemented to reduce fugitive dust, then the residual impact of development is considered to be less than significant. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure 5.1** would reduce fugitive dust emissions and other construction-related impacts to air quality to a less-than-significant level.

During operation of the project, air quality impacts would primarily be the result of increased vehicular trips and heating-ventilation-air conditioning (HVAC) units. Implementation of the project would result in 316 daily vehicle trips. According to the BAAQMD screening criteria, projects generating more than 2,000 vehicle trips per day would require a detailed air quality analysis because their associated emissions would likely be above the BAAQMD significance thresholds of 80 pounds per day of reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and particulate matter (PM₁₀). Although the number of vehicle trips generated by the project is under the BAAQMD thresholds, the predicted mobile source and area source emissions of the project were calculated using the URBEMIS2002 computer program available from the California Air Resources Board (*See Appendix*). The URBEMIS2002 program found that the project would generate emissions of ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ in very minor levels, well below the BAAQMD thresholds. These emissions are considered less than significant. [1,2,3,17]

5c. The project site is located in an area of the City that is completely built out with commercial and residential development. The project site is currently developed with an office building and parking areas. The proposed project is similar in use and physical design to other residential developments in the area. Although the construction of any building can alter localized air currents, the proposed buildings are relatively small in scale and height. Air movement, moisture, temperature or climate at the site are not anticipated to change substantially. Therefore, impacts related to air movement, moisture, temperature or changes in climate would not be significant. [1,2,3,17]

The proposed roofs and other unshaded surfaces on the project site could contribute toward "heat island" effects. Heat islands are the increases in temperature that occur when heat from the sun is absorbed by dark, non-reflective surfaces and radiated back into the air. Heat-island-generated increases of more than ten degrees have been documented in some urban areas. The project contribution toward this impact would be hard to measure and would be very small; therefore, the impact is considered less than significant. However, the City could encourage the developer to use highly reflective/high emissivity roofing and to maximize shaded areas on the project site.

5d. The project site is located in an area of the City that is completely built out with commercial and residential development. The proposed project is similar to other residential developments in the area. According to the BAAQMD, typical uses that may result in significant odor impacts include a wastewater treatment plant, sanitary landfill, transfer station, composting facility, petroleum refinery, asphalt batch plant, chemical manufacturing, fiberglass manufacturing, painting/coating operations, rendering plant, and coffee roasters. The proposed project does not include these land uses, and typical residential uses are not associated with nuisance odors. Thus, no significant air quality impacts related to odors would occur. [1,2,3,17]

Mitigation Measure 5.1

Basic Control Measures (for all construction sites)

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- 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.
- Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

Enhanced Control Measures (for individual or combined construction sites of larger than four acres)

- Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).
- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph).
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

Optional Measures (strongly encouraged at construction sites that are large in area, located near sensitive receptors, or which for any other reason may warrant additional emissions reductions)

- Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks and equipment, or wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site.
- Install windbreaks, or plant trees/vegetative windbreaks at the windward side(s) of construction areas.
- Suspend excavation and grading activity when sustained winds exceed 25 mph.
- Limit the area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time.

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES		POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
6. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:						
a.	Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	X				18
b.	Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?			X		18
c.	Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?			X		18
d.	Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?			X		18
e.	Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?			X		18
f.	Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X		18
g.	Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?				X	3

EXPLANATION:

6a. DKS Associates prepared the Menlo Park Linfield Middlefield Willow Area-Wide Transportation Impact Analysis Final Report dated March 2, 2006. The study was prepared according to the methodology recommended in the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines, prepared by the City of Menlo Park on August 14, 2002. The study evaluates traffic and transportation issues related to three proposed developments in the vicinity of the Linfield Oaks neighborhood. The three redevelopment projects are at 321 Middlefield Road (medical office), 8 Homewood Place (residential), and the project site, 75 Willow Road. The existing building at the project site was assumed to be approximately 25 percent occupied, based on recent observations of activity. Traffic currently generated at the project site was subtracted from the estimation of gross project trips. According to Table 5 of the DKS Associates report, the proposed project would generate a total of 10 net new AM peak hour trips, 19 net new PM peak hour trips, and 209 net new daily vehicle trips.

During the existing AM peak period, the northbound approach at Alma Street and Ravenswood Avenue (two-way stop controlled intersection) operates at an unacceptable Level of Service F. In addition, five study roadway segments currently serve a demand that is greater than the estimated daily capacity, based on roadway classification as outlined in the City of Menlo Park Circulation System Assessment (CSA) Document.

Under near-term conditions, without the proposed project, two intersections would not operate at acceptable levels of service, the northbound approach on Alma Street to Ravenswood Avenue during the AM peak hour and the intersection of El Camino Real and Ravenswood Drive during the PM peak hour. Similar to existing conditions, all but three study roadway segments would serve close to or greater than the estimated daily capacity for their respective classifications.

The DKS report does not analyze impacts from each project separately; the following analysis considers the three proposed projects together. The three projects would maintain the current levels of service standards at each of the study intersections with the exceptions of the intersection at Alma Street and Ravenswood Avenue during the AM peak period and at the intersection of El Camino Real and Ravenswood Drive during the PM peak period. The intersection of Alma Street and Ravenswood Avenue would operate at LOS F for the northbound approach. The addition of traffic to the east-west movement on Ravenswood Avenue would result in an increase of average delay to the northbound approach greater than the threshold of 0.8 seconds. During the PM peak hour, the intersection of El Camino Real and Ravenswood Avenue would continue to operate at the same LOS E as under the near-term conditions. However, the increase of average delay to the critical movements on local approaches would be greater than 0.8 seconds, which is considered a potentially significant impact.

The addition of daily traffic to local streets Linfield Drive, Waverley Street, and to several minor arterials such as Middlefield Road, Ravenswood Avenue, and Willow Road, would create potentially significant and unavoidable impacts due to these roadway segments already serving more vehicles than the recommended daily capacity. This is considered a potentially significant impact under the City's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines.

The transportation/circulation impacts, adequacy of the project circulation system and parking, and impacts to pedestrians and cyclists, will be discussed in the EIR. [18]

6b. Wilsey Ham calculated sight distance based on California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual Chapter 200, Table 201.1 and Figure 201.6. With a design speed of 25 miles per hour, the stopping sight distance at the intersection of the new private street and Willow Road is 164 feet. This is considered adequate for this design speed. The existing landscaped median would be modified to provide vertical sight clearance between three feet and eight feet above the roadway. [19] There would be no hazards to safety from incompatible uses such as farm equipment.

6c. The proposed project would not obstruct or alter any existing emergency vehicle route. The project entry roadway would be wide enough to provide emergency vehicle access to the site, and an additional emergency vehicle access would be constructed between the residential community and Willow Road. [18]

6d. Each proposed dwelling unit would have a two-car garage, with cars located either side by side or in tandem. The City's parking requirement for single-family residential units is two spaces, one of which must be covered. All spaces must be independently accessible. In addition to the covered parking spaces, each unit would have a driveway apron. Most of the aprons would be able to accommodate an additional two cars. Where tandem garages are proposed, the driveway apron would accommodate one car. [18] Eleven guest parking spaces would be located on-site along the proposed circular street within the project.

6e. Both sides of the entry road into the site would have sidewalks. A looping sidewalk would be provided around the perimeter of the private street. Handicap access ramps would be included to facilitate bicycle and pedestrian circulation through the community. A potential public pedestrian/bicycle connection is proposed to legalize and improve the popular cut-through between the 175 Linfield property and 75 Willow Road if the two properties are redeveloped. There is an existing crosswalk at Willow Road and Waverley Street. Should a pedestrian/bicycle connection be created, way-finding signage would be included to direct individuals from the Willow Place Bridge to Willow Road and then by way of this crosswalk through the project site to Linfield Drive. A sidewalk would also be provided within the City's right-of-way along Willow Road.

6f. Bus service in the project vicinity is provided by the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), Caltrain, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), and the Dumbarton Express Bus. Several routes serve the study area, with SamTrans lines 295, 296, and 83 almost adjacent to the project site. The bus routes serve Willow Road, Middlefield Road, Ravenswood Avenue, Laurel Street, and El Camino Real. The City of Menlo Park and Caltrain operate an employer shuttle service (Willow Road Area Shuttle) that connects the Linfield Oaks neighborhood and Menlo Park Caltrain Station. There are stops on Linfield Drive and Willow Road.

On-street bike lanes for both directions are provided on Middlefield Road, Willow Road, Laurel Street, and Ravenswood Avenue. Pedestrian crosswalks and signals are provided at all of the signalized study intersections. In the vicinity of the project site, there are sidewalks on the south side of Linfield Drive along the 175 Linfield Drive frontage.

In the vicinity of the proposed project, there are Class II bicycle facilities on Willow Road, Ravenswood Avenue, and Middlefield Road. On Laurel Street, there is a Class III facility between Linfield Drive and Burgess Drive, which becomes a Class II facility north of Burgess Drive. A Class II bikeway is a signed route, which provides a shared lane for bicycle use with pedestrian or motor vehicle

traffic. [18]

6g. The proposed project does not involve transportation or circulation elements related to rail, waterborne, or air traffic.

Mitigation Measure 6.1

The project applicant shall comply with the mitigation measures identified in the Menlo Park Linfield Middlefield Willow Area-Wide Transportation Impact Analysis Final Report prepared by DKS Associates on March 2, 2006, with any revisions as recommended by City staff.

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in:					
a. Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals or birds)?		X			20, 21
b. Locally designated species (e.g. heritage trees)?		X			22, 23, 24
c. Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?				X	20, 21
d. Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?				X	15
e. Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?				X	1

EXPLANATION:

7a. The entire project site is developed and/or landscaped. There are 199 trees on the project site (all of which were planted as landscaping). Tree species most common on the site include deodar cedar (*Cedrus deodara*), coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus* sp.), and white birch (*Betula pendula*); many of these trees occur in dense rows as they were originally planted to provide visual screening. Landscaping groundcover and shrubs on the site include English ivy (*Hedera helix*), lawns, chain fern (*Woodwardia fimbriata*), cultivated rose (*Rosa* sp.), and agapanthus (*Agapanthus* sp.). San Francisquito Creek (which is separated from the site by a 60-foot wide thoroughfare) is located approximately 270 feet southeast of the site. Other features adjacent to, or in the immediate vicinity of the site include roads, residences, parking lots, and commercial office complexes.

Review of the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDDB) and the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) database for the project quadrangle (i.e., Palo Alto) and the eight surrounding quadrangles (i.e., San Mateo, Redwood Point, Newark, Mountain View, Cupertino, Mindogo Hill, La Honda, and Woodside), identified 25 special-status plant species that have been documented in the project area. None of the habitat types associated with these special-status plant species occur on the project site. Given the absence of suitable habitat, no special-status plants are expected to occur on the site.

Review of the CNDDDB identified 26 special-status wildlife species that are known to occur in the project area (i.e., the nine quadrangles identified above). Due to the developed condition of the project site, suitable habitat for special-status wildlife species is limited. However, the existing office building on the site provides suitable roosting habitat for several special-status bat species, including pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), Townsend's western big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii townsendii*), and California mastiff bat (*Eumops perotis* ssp. *californicus*); these bat species are listed as California Species of Special Concern and are considered to be of special status pursuant to Section 15380 of the CEQA Guidelines. Should these bat species roost on the site, the demolition of the building could result in the loss of an active roost. The loss of an active bat roost would be a potentially significant impact. **Mitigation Measure 7.1**, applied to the project prior to construction-related activities and demolition of the office building, would reduce potential impacts to special-status bat species to a less-than-significant level.

The mature trees on the project site provide suitable nesting habitat for several special-status bird species (e.g., Cooper's hawk, white-tailed kite), but suitable foraging habitat on or adjacent to the property is absent. Therefore, it is unlikely that any special-status bird species nest on the site. However, the trees on the project site provide suitable nesting habitat for a variety of common bird species.

Construction-related activities could result in the direct loss of active nests or the abandonment of active nests by adult birds during that year's nesting season. Bird nests with eggs or young are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code. [20, 21] **Mitigation Measures 7.2 through 7.3** would ensure compliance with state and federal regulations protecting the active nests of native bird species.

7b. Walter Bemis, Consulting Arborist, prepared a Tree Survey Report for the project.[22] (The Tree Survey Report is on file and available for review at the City.) The survey report provides information on the health, location, and type of trees on the project site and recommendations on their preservation.

There are a total of 199 trees on the project site, of which 102 are considered to be "heritage" trees pursuant to Ordinance No. 928, Chapter 13.24 of the Menlo Park Municipal Code. The proposed project would result in the removal of 105 trees (of which 46 are heritage trees) and the relocation of 12 trees (of which four are heritage trees).

The proposed project would be required to comply with the City of Menlo Park's Heritage Tree Replacement Procedures, which delineate the ratio of trees a developer must replace for every heritage tree removed. [23] For residential projects, applicants who are granted approval to remove a heritage tree are required to replace lost heritage trees on a 1:1 basis. However, City staff may exercise discretion on the size and number of trees an applicant may be required to install. [23] City staff have indicated that a minimum replacement ratio of 1:1 with a majority of larger species (minimum 24-inch box) is appropriate given the existing number and size of trees and lack of space on the site.

Based on these ratios, the project would be required to plant a minimum of 46 replacement trees to offset the 46 heritage trees proposed for removal. Current landscape conceptual plans provided by the applicant show that the proposed project could feasibly meet these tree planting requirements and those set by City staff. **Mitigation Measure 7.4** would require compliance with the City's tree planting requirements and would ensure that the impact would be reduced to below a level of significance. [24]

In addition, a tree protection and preservation plan was included in the survey report to assist in the protection of the trees to be preserved during construction of the proposed project. [22] **Mitigation Measure 7.5**, applied to the project when construction activities could result in disturbance to trees, would reduce potential impacts to trees from disturbance to a less-than-significant level.

7c. The project site is completely developed; there are no designated natural communities on the project site.

7d. The project site is developed; there is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities on the project site and no aquatic features or other resources on the project site protected by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. [15]

7e. The project site is in an urban area, is completely developed, and is bordered on all sides by urban/residential development. Consequently, the project site does not link two or more large regional open space areas and is not considered to be part of a regional wildlife movement corridor. [1]

Mitigation Measure 7.1

No earlier than 14 days prior to the commencement of demolition activities, a survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if active bat roosts are present on the project site. If no bats are observed, then no further action would be required and demolition can proceed. Should an active roost be identified, a determination shall be made regarding whether the roost is used as a night-roost, day-roost, or maternity-roost. Should a night-roost be identified, the roost structure shall be removed during daylight hours while the roost is not in use. Should an active day-roost be identified, roosting bats shall be evicted through the use of humane exclusionary devices. Prior to implementation, the proposed methods for bat exclusion shall be approved by the California Department of Fish and Game. The roost shall not be removed until it has been confirmed by a qualified biologist that all bats have been successfully excluded. Should an active maternity-roost be identified (the breeding season of native bat species in California generally occurs from April 1 through August 31), the roost shall not be disturbed until the roost is vacated and juveniles have fledged, as determined by the biologist.

Mitigation Measure 7.2

The applicants shall retain a qualified biologist (with selection to be approved by the City) to conduct nest surveys on the site prior to construction or site preparation activities occurring during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species (typically February through August). The survey area shall include all potential nesting habitat on the project site within 200 feet of the grading boundaries. If the 200-foot distance encompasses trees on adjacent properties, the biologist shall survey the trees using binoculars.

The survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to commencement of construction activities.

Mitigation Measure 7.3

If active nests of bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code (which, together, apply to all native nesting birds) are present in the construction zone or within 200 feet of this area, temporary construction fencing shall be erected within the project site at a minimum of 100 feet around the nest site. This temporary buffer may be greater depending on the bird species and construction activity, as determined by the biologist. [20, 21] Clearing and construction within the fenced area shall be postponed or halted until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting.

Mitigation Measure 7.4

The project applicant shall comply with the Menlo Park Heritage Tree Ordinance and the City’s Heritage Tree Replacement Procedures, and the tree replacement ratios recommended by City staff. The final landscaping plan for the project shall reflect compliance with the ordinance and procedures, and the applicant shall demonstrate that the required number of trees have been planted prior to project occupancy.

Mitigation Measure 7.5

The project applicant shall adhere to the tree protection and preservation plan included in the Tree Survey Report prepared by Walter Bemis, Consulting Arborist. The plan includes measures related to the tree protection zone (TPZ), pruning and brush clearance, fencing and signage, fertilization, pest and disease control, and tree health and maintenance (including root cutting). [22]

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
8. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in:					
a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?				X	25
b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?				X	25
c. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the state?				X	25

EXPLANATION:

8a-c. The proposed project site is developed with an office building and parking. Redevelopment of this site with housing would constitute infill development and would not involve use of a “greenfield” site, or impacts to the associated resources. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans or use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner. (The Public Works Department offers rebates for purchase of energy efficient appliances, and project residents could participate.) With respect to mineral resources, the project site is currently developed and located in an urbanized area. There are no known significant mineral resources that would be affected by the proposed project. Per the City’s Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance, the project would be required to recycle approximately 65 percent of the debris.

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
9. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:					
a. A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?		X			26,27,28

Environmental Checklist Form
75 Willow Road
Page 21

b.	Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X	29,33
c.	The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?				X	26,27,28
d.	Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?				X	26,27,28
e.	Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass or trees?				X	29

EXPLANATION:

LFR Levine Fricke prepared a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Update Report (dated January 25, 2006) and Limited Phase II Subsurface Investigation Summary Letter (dated February 17, 2006) for the project. The Phase I assessment concluded that there do not appear to be significant environmental concerns with respect to current and historical hazardous materials use and storage at the subject property or off-site releases of hazardous materials.

Available historical information indicates that the site and vicinity were used for hay production from prior to the 1950s through the 1970s. The site was landscaped with trees and grass around 1970 and remained undeveloped until 1981 to 1982, when the office building was constructed. Historic site use for agricultural purposes may have included storage and application of pesticides and herbicides containing metals such as arsenic, lead, mercury, and organochlorine pesticide compounds. Although no direct evidence of pesticide use at the project site was discovered, LFR recommended that soil sampling and chemical analysis be conducted to assess whether these constituents are present. The Phase II investigation was performed to comply with this recommendation. Analysis of soil samples indicated that no detectable organochlorine pesticides were present in the samples and that arsenic, chromium, lead, and mercury were not detected or were present at levels at or below common background levels. LFR concludes that no further investigation was necessary. Based on these results, impacts on the project site are expected to be less than significant.

Two 2,000-gallon underground storage tanks were installed on the project site at an unknown date and were removed in May 1987. Soil samples collected from the excavation did not yield detectable concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons. No organic vapors were detected in soil samples collected from the excavation following the tank removals.

Two water wells, including a water extraction well and a water injection well, were reportedly installed on the project site in 1983 by Geoconsultants, Inc., to an approximate depth of 210 feet below ground surface. Erler & Kalinowski, Inc. (EKI) reported that the water extraction well is used for irrigation of the 85 Willow Road property and that the water injection well has not been used since 1987. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure 9.1** would ensure that the impact on the project site would be less than significant.

EKI's subcontractor, J.M. Cohen performed asbestos sampling in 1990. The investigation did not detect any asbestos-containing materials in the building. EKI recommends further sampling and investigation if future work requires removal of floor tile and building plaster. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure 9.2** would ensure that the impact on the project site would be less than significant. [26,27]

9a, c, d. The proposed project would replace the existing office building with a residential development. With the exception of common household cleaning solvents, paints, landscape fertilizers, and pesticides typically used in a residential setting, the proposed project would not involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. The potential for accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances is low to none with typical residential uses.

9b. The proposed project would replace the existing office building with a residential development. Implementation of the project would not interfere with any City emergency response plans or an emergency evacuation plan. Emergency response and evacuation would be under the jurisdiction of the Menlo Park Police Department and Menlo Park Fire Protection District.

9e. The project site is currently developed and surrounded by urban uses. The project would include landscaping typical of residential development. According to the Menlo Park Fire Protection District, the project site is not in a fire hazard area.[29]

Mitigation Measure 9.1

The project applicant shall remove the wells on the project site and properly abandon them prior to or as part of site redevelopment. The wells shall be abandoned according to the requirements of the Department of Water Resources and San Mateo County Environmental Health Services Division.

Mitigation Measure 9.2

Prior to demolition of the existing building, the applicant shall survey the building for the presence of asbestos and lead-based paint. If asbestos is found, the applicant shall comply with Bay Area Air Quality Management District Regulation 11, Rule 2 (Hazardous Materials, Asbestos Demolition, Renovation, and Manufacturing) when demolishing the building. If lead-based paint is present, the applicant shall determine whether paint must be separated from the building materials (e.g., chemically or physically). The paint waste shall be evaluated independently from the building material to determine its proper management. According to the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, if paint is not removed from the building material during demolition (and is not chipping or peeling), the material could be disposed of as construction debris (a non-hazardous waste). The appropriate landfill operator shall be contacted in advance or determine any specific requirement they may have regarding the disposal of lead-based paint materials.

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------

10. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

a. Increase in existing noise levels?			X		1,18,30
b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?		X			31,32

EXPLANATION:

10a. The Menlo Park *General Plan* Noise Element provides information on land use compatibility for community noise environments. Figure 4 from that report indicates that for residential use, an exterior L_{dn} (Day-Night Noise Level) of up to 60 dB(A) (A weighted decibels) is normally acceptable, an L_{dn} from 60-70 dB(A) is conditionally acceptable, and an L_{dn} of 70 dB(A) or higher is unacceptable.[1]

Two short-term (15-minute) noise measurements and two long-term (24-hour) noise measurements were taken to characterize existing noise levels at the project site. These measurements were taken during peak hours (between the hours of 4 PM and 6 PM). The short-term noise levels or " L_{eq} " (the average A-weighted sound level measured over a given time interval) are between 64.1 dB(A) along Willow Road (Site 2) and 55.7 dB(A) on the interior of the site (Site 1). As a general rule, in areas where the noise environment is dominated by traffic, the L_{eq} during the peak hour is roughly equivalent to the L_{dn} at that location. Here, the existing L_{dn} at the project site was measured at 63.5 dB(A) along Willow Road and 54.2 dB(A) on the interior of the site, which is between the conditionally and normally acceptable thresholds for community noise exposure. As noted later, future noise levels at the project site are not expected to be substantially different from the existing measured noise levels. For these reasons, the project would not be exposed to noise levels in excess of those established in the *General Plan*.[30]

The proposed project would involve the development of residential units that would be similar to other uses in the vicinity and would not significantly increase existing noise levels. However, the project would generate additional traffic that would add to traffic levels on roads in the area. Generally, in order to cause an appreciable change in noise levels, traffic levels must double. A doubling of traffic levels would cause a 3 dB(A) increase, which is considered a perceptible change in noise. Willow Road would be the primary source of roadway noise on the project site. Existing noise levels from Willow Road have been calculated to be 59.2 dB(A). Implementation of the project would generate 107 additional trips on Willow Road resulting in a 0.1 dB(A) increase in noise levels on-site. Because an 0.1 dB(A) increase would not be perceptible and 59.3 dB(A) is considered normally acceptable by the *General Plan*, on-site impacts from roadway noise would be less than significant.

Noise-sensitive uses within the project vicinity primarily include residential developments along Willow Road, Linfield Drive and Waverly Street. Traffic generated by the project would be distributed along these roadways, among others. According to DKS

Associates, the project would generate a net of 209 daily vehicle trips (316 daily trips from the proposed project minus 107 existing trips). As discussed previously, increased traffic on Willow Road would not result in a significant noise increase. Existing noise levels along Linfield Drive have been calculated to be 56.3 dB(A), based on average daily traffic levels. Implementation of the project would not generate additional vehicle trips along Linfield Drive resulting in no change to existing noise levels at sensitive receptors along that roadway. Existing noise levels along Waverly Street have been calculated to be 55.5 dB(A), based on average daily traffic levels. Implementation of the project would generate an additional 10 vehicle trips along Waverly Street, resulting in no change to existing noise levels at sensitive receptors along that roadway. This change would also not be perceptible. Therefore, the expected increase in average noise levels at noise-sensitive uses as a result of future traffic would be imperceptible (less than 3 dB(A)), and the project would not cause a significant impact related to a substantial change in ambient noise in the vicinity. For a discussion of construction noise, see **10b**.

10b. See **10a**. Construction activities for the proposed project could result in increased short-term noise levels. These noise levels would be temporary and would occur intermittently during the 12-month construction process. After demolition of the existing building, the site would be graded and voids would be backfilled with engineered fill. Since the site is relatively flat, the grading period (the noisiest period of construction) would be short in duration (30 to 45 days).

The closest sensitive receptors to the project site are multifamily residences to the south of the site. The homes are located just beyond the site boundary, and are separated from the site by a fence and trees. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has compiled data on typical noise levels of construction equipment, which indicate that noise levels generated by heavy equipment can range from 76 dB(A) to 89 dB(A) at 50 feet.[31] Based on the types of equipment used, duration, and proximity, the construction activities of the proposed project could result in intermittent (outdoor) noise levels of up to 89 dB(A) at the nearest sensitive receptors. The applicant would be required to comply with the City of Menlo Park Noise Ordinance, which would limit noise levels from construction to 85 dB(A) or less, on weekdays only (construction noise is not allowed on holidays or weekends) between the hours of 8AM and 6PM.[32] In addition, **Mitigation Measure 10.1** identified below would require the applicant to use standard noise reduction control measures such as mufflers, use of silencers, shields, ducts, and engine enclosures. These are technically feasible measures that would reduce the noise levels of the construction equipment to 75 to 80 dB(A) at 50 feet. As with all construction equipment, noise levels would diminish rapidly with distance from the construction site at a rate of approximately 6 dB(A) per doubling of distance. Therefore, project construction noise impacts from activities on the site would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Based on preliminary grading schemes, the proposed project would require a total of 7,278 cubic yards of cut and 13,399 yards of fill. Approximately 752 cubic yards of cut material (the existing parking lot asphalt) would be removed from the site; the remaining cut material would be re-used on site. Approximately 6,873 cubic yards of fill material would be imported to the site. Fill dirt is typically hauled to a site in trucks with a 12- or 24-cubic yard capacity. Using the smaller trucks, project construction would involve about 573 round trips (6,873 cubic yards divided by 12 cubic yards) or 1,146 trips total over the 30-to 45-day grading period. With a 30-day grading period, there would be about 19 round trips (38 total trips) each day. The noise levels produced by heavy-duty trucks such as haul trucks can reach 82 dB(A) at 50 feet from the noise source. **Mitigation Measure 10.2** would prevent significant impacts from haul truck noise by requiring that the project contractors use main arterials for the haul routes.

Mitigation Measure 10.1

The project applicant shall incorporate noise reduction measures into project construction activities. These measures may include, but shall not be limited to, the use of mufflers and other devices on equipment, locating stationary construction equipment away from sensitive receptors, shutting off idling equipment, notifying adjacent residences and businesses in advance of construction work, and installing temporary barriers around construction noise sources.

Mitigation Measure 10.2

The project construction contractors shall use designated haul routes for all hauling-related trips to and from the project site. The routes shall be chosen by the City with the intent of minimizing noise impacts.

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
11. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:					
a. Fire protection?			X		29
b. Police protection?			X		33
c. Schools?			X		7,34,35
d. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?				X	36
e. Other governmental services?				X	36

EXPLANATION:

11a. Fire services to the project site are provided by the Menlo Park Fire Protection District. The firehouse nearest to the project site is Firehouse 1, which is also the District Headquarters. Firehouse 1 is located at 300 Middlefield Drive, less than one-quarter mile from the project site. In the event that Firehouse 1 could not respond to a fire call at the project site, Firehouse 6 at 700 Oak Grove Avenue would respond. Firehouse 1 has one fire engine, one ladder truck and one battalion chief vehicle. Typically, Firehouse 1 is staffed with nine full-time firefighters each day. Firehouse 1 provides firefighting, emergency medical technician (EMT) and Advanced Life Support (ALS) paramedic services. According to the Fire District, Firehouse 1 would be able to provide fire protection services adequately to the project site with current staffing and equipment.[29]

11b. Police services to the project site are provided by the Menlo Park Police Department. The Police Department is located at 701 Laurel Street, and is less than a mile from the project site. The Police Department employs 50 sworn officers and 21 non-sworn staff (dispatchers, records officers, parking officers, code enforcement officers, evidence/traffic coordinators, a secretary and an administrative assistant). Equipment includes 21 patrol vehicles, one speed trailer, and one DUI trailer. According to the Police Department, they would be able to provide police services adequately to the project site with current staffing and equipment.[33]

11c. The project site is served by the Menlo Park City School District (the elementary school district) and the Sequoia Union High School District. The schools serving the project site include Laurel School (grades K-2), Encinal School (grades 3-5), Hillview School (grades 6-8), and Menlo Atherton High School (grades 9-12).[35] Project development would generate approximately 21 additional students (9 elementary students and 12 high school students).

State law (Government Code 65996) specifies that the payment of a school impact fee (prior to issuance of a building permit) is an acceptable way to offset a project's effect on school facilities. In Menlo Park, applicants wishing to build residential projects can either negotiate directly with the affected school districts, or they can make a "presumptive payment" based on the rate applicable at the time the development is approved for the residential units (currently \$2.24 per square foot). In the case of the proposed project, the Sequoia Union High School District and the Menlo Park City School District would share the fee.[34] The school districts are responsible for implementing the specific methods of mitigating school impacts under the Government Code. The school impact fees and the school districts' methods of implementing measures specified by Government Code 65996 would partially offset the costs of serving project-related increases in school enrollment.

The proposed project would result in increased enrollment at the schools noted above. State law requires that impacts to schools be mitigated through the payment of fees. The project would comply with the school impact fee requirements of the State of California and the City of Menlo Park. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to school facilities.

Project and cumulative development combined would result in an additional 283 housing units served by the Menlo Park City School District and 283 housing units served by the Sequoia Union High School District.[7, 34, 35] Based on the ratios noted above, cumulative development would generate an additional 76 elementary school students and an additional 99 high school students at the schools noted above. However, all developers would be required to comply with school impact fee requirements. Therefore, the project and cumulative development would not result in significant impacts to school facilities.

11d-e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roadways and other governmental services, is already being provided to the project site by the City. The City of Menlo Park Public Works Department will continue to maintain the public roads in the vicinity of the

project site. The streets for the project on-site circulation would be private and would be maintained by the project HOA. [36]

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:					
a.	Power or natural gas?		X		37
b.	Communications systems?		X		3
c.	Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?		X		38,43
d.	Sewer or septic tanks?		X		3
e.	Storm water drainage?				see Section 4
f.	Solid waste disposal?		X		39
g.	Local or regional water supplies?		X		38

EXPLANATION:

12a. Power and natural gas are currently provided to the project site by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially change the existing infrastructure, which would be sufficient to serve the project site.[37]

12b. Telephone service is currently provided to the project site by SBC and cable television service is provided by Comcast. Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially change the existing infrastructure, which would be sufficient to serve the project site.

12c. The project site is currently provided with water service by the California Water Service Company (CWSC) via an eight-inch water main in Willow Road. The project would install a loop system on site with eight-inch water lines connecting to the existing eight-inch Willow Road system. The redevelopment of the site and occupancy of residential units would have a minimal impact on water demand and the water distribution system, and the CWSC has the capacity to accommodate the proposed project. According to the CWSC, its demand is currently under the water supply allotment guarantees from the San Francisco Water Department.[38]

12d. The project site is provided with sanitary sewer service by the West Bay Sanitary District (WBSD). Sanitary sewer flows are treated at the South Bayside Systems Authority (SBSA) treatment plant in Redwood Shores. To serve the homes, the proposed project would install new six-inch sanitary sewer lines within the entry road, looping internal street, and shared driveways One connection would be made from the project entry to Willow Road. In addition, due to the elevation of the existing sewer line in Willow Road and the elevation of the 75 Willow Road property, a new six-inch sewer line would be installed in Willow Road and Waverley Street to connect to the existing line. Ductile iron pipe would be used in the northern portion of the site in areas of shallow cover.

According to WBSD, there are no existing or projected capacity issues associated with the Willow Road sewer system or the South Bay Sanitary District plant. [43] The sewer line in Willow Road varies in size from six to eight inches and would adequately serve the project site.[3]

12e. Refer to **Section 4: Hydrology and Water Quality**.

12f. Solid Waste services would be provided by Allied Waste. According to Allied Waste, there is sufficient capacity to provide solid waste services to the project site. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the City's Construction and

Demolition Debris Recycling and Salvage Requirements Ordinance and would have to recycle approximately 65 percent of the debris.[39]

12g. Refer to 12c.

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
13. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:					
a. Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	X				1
b. Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	X				3
c. Create light or glare?			X		40

EXPLANATION:

13a. In the Menlo Park *General Plan*, only Sand Hill Road is considered part of a scenic vista. The proposed project site is not identified as part of a scenic vista or located in the vicinity of a scenic highway. The project site is developed with an office building and is located in a built-out urban area. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.[1]

13b. See **13a.** In general, the visual character of the existing site is of an office building surrounded by parking lots and associated landscaping. The visual character of the surrounding land uses includes a mix of office buildings with parking lots, and residential developments with yards and driveways. Buildings in the area vary in height (one- and two-story) and mass.[3]

The visual character of the project site would change from an office building to a residential development. The proposed project would include two-story residential units placed relatively close to one another, and would replace the relatively open space of the existing parking lots as well as the existing building. The vicinity of the site has a mix of commercial and residential development. The proposed residential units are similar to other residential developments in the vicinity and their design would be subject to approval from the Planning Department, Planning Commission and City Council. For those reasons, the project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings.

The impacts of tree removal will be considered in their context of their value as a scenic resource and their contribution to visual character in the EIR.

13c. The project site is currently developed with an office building that has exterior lighting (on the buildings and in the parking lots). In addition, street lighting contributes to existing light and glare in the project area. The proposed project would involve the development of two-story residential units that would also have exterior lighting and windows. Although the residential uses would introduce additional and exterior sources of light, the buildings directly adjacent to the site are either office buildings or are separated from the site by fences and vegetation.[40] For these reasons, the project would not create a new source of substantial light and glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views.

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
14. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:					
a. Disturb paleontological resources?		X			26,41
b. Disturb archaeological resources?		X			26,41
c. Affect historical resources?		X			26,41

d.	Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?		X			26,41
e.	Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?		X			26,41

EXPLANATION:

See next page.

14a-e. The project site is located in an area of Menlo Park that is generally underlain by alluvium. This alluvium is weathered, unconsolidated to moderately consolidated gravel, sand, and silt of the late Pleistocene age.[26] Typically, alluvium does not contain unique paleontological resources.

A records search conducted by the Northwest Information Center (NWIS), at Sonoma State University, indicated that there are no known archaeological resources on the project site, and no known historic properties are located within the project area.[41] The project site has already been developed, so the likelihood of finding buried resources is reduced. However, construction activities such as excavation and grading could result in the discovery of previously unidentified archaeological resources, a significant impact. **Mitigation Measure 14.1**, involving standard recovery procedures should resources be found, would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

The project site is completely developed and occupied by an office building. The proposed project would develop the site with single-family homes, similar to other residential development in the area. Therefore, the project would not cause a physical change that would affect unique ethnic cultural values. Furthermore, the project site is not known to have any religious or sacred uses. The possibility that human remains could be discovered during excavation would be addressed by **Mitigation Measure 14.1**.

Mitigation Measure 14.1

If archaeological resources such as chipped stone or groundstone, historic debris, building foundations, or human bone or any other indicators of cultural resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities will halt and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant, representatives of the City, construction contractor, and the archaeologist shall meet to determine the appropriate course of action. In the event that human remains are discovered, an appropriate representative of the Native American groups and the County Coroner shall be notified and consulted, as required by state law. All cultural materials recovered as part of the monitoring program would be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and a report prepared according to current professional standards.

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS	THAN	NO	SOURCES
			SIGNIFICANT IMPACT		IMPACT	

15. RECREATION. Would the proposal:

a.	Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?			X		36,42
b.	Affect existing recreational opportunities?			X		36,42

EXPLANATION:

15a. The proposed project is projected to generate an increase in population of 81 residents, based on the City's average of 2.45 residents per household. According to the Community Services Department, the City of Menlo Park has approximately 50 acres of parkland (not including Bay Front Park) to serve its residents. The closest park to the project site is Burgess Park; the amenities include picnic areas, baseball fields, soccer pitch, a playground, tennis courts, gymnasium and a swimming pool. Currently, the City is renovating Burgess Park. The renovations will expand the park facilities to include three pools.[42]

According to City staff, the City has no formal park standards for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review. According to the Community Services Department, the project applicant would be required to pay a "Recreation-in-lieu" fee to provide adequate parkland and recreational opportunities (programming including classes and public events) for the estimated 81 project residents. The formula for this development is 0.008 x # of units x current market value. The exact fee would be calculated by the City of Menlo

Park Public Works Department prior to building permit issuance (so that current market value can be determined).[36]

15b. Refer to 15a.

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	SOURCES
16. 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 important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X		3,15,20,21, 22,23,24,26, 41
b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?			X		3; see also sources for other checklist sections
c. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means the incremental effects of a project that are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	X				1,2,3,5,6,11, 15,18,29,30, 31,32,33,34, 36,37,38,39, 42
d. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X		1, 2, 3, 18, 8, 9, 10, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30,31, 32, 33

EXPLANATION:

16a. Refer to **Section 7: Biological Resources** and **Section 14: Cultural Resources**.

16b. The proposed project would replace an existing office building with housing. The project site is already developed and impacts to existing environmental resources would be minimal.

16c. Impacts that are individually limited but can be cumulatively considerable include impacts related to air pollutants, noise, population, public services, storm runoff/water, public utilities, impacts to parks and recreation, and traffic. For discussion of these issues, please refer to **Section 2: Population and Housing, Section 4: Water, Section 5: Air Quality, Section 6: Transportation/Circulation, Section 10: Noise, Section 11: Public Services, Section 12: Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 15: Recreation**. Cumulative traffic impacts will be addressed in the EIR; the other cumulative impacts would be less than significant, as discussed in each topical section.

16d. Environmental effects which could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly include impacts related to **Section 3: Geologic Problems, Section 5: Air Quality, Section 9: Hazards, and Section 10: Noise**. These

impacts of the project would be less than significant with mitigation proposed.

17. SOURCE REFERENCES

1	General Plan and General Plan Land Use Map
2	Menlo Park Zoning Map, November 1967, as amended
3	Project Plans (Wilsey Ham), January 27, 2006
4	San Mateo County Important Farmlands Map
5	Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), <i>Projections 2005</i> , June 2005
6	Table E-1. City/County Population Estimates for 2005, California Department of Finance, January 1, 2003 and January 1, 2004
7	Current List of Near-Term Development Projects, City of Menlo Park, June 28, 2005
8	Lowney Associates Geotechnical Feasibility Investigation For Willow Road Residential Development, September 8, 2004
9	USGS California Volcanoes and Volcanics Potential Area of Volcanic Hazards Map, 1989
10	Treadwell & Rollo, personal communication with John Gouchon, August 17, 2004
11	Questa Engineering, Drainage Review for 110 & 175 Linfield Drive, Menlo Park, California, March 3, 2005
12	Wilsey Ham, Preliminary Hydrology Calculations, 75 Willow Road, Menlo Park, California, January 25, 2006
13	FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM)
14	White, Kelly, Questa Engineering, personal communication regarding water quality issues
15	Clean Water Act (CWA)
16	City of Menlo Park, Grading and Drainage Plan Guidelines and Checklist, February 2005
17	Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines
18	Menlo Park Linfield Middlefield Willow Area-Wide Transportation Impact Analysis Draft Report, prepared by DKS Associates, March 2, 2006
19	Wilsey Ham, 75 Willow Road Sight Distance Diagram, January 27, 2006
20	Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act
21	California Fish & Game Code
22	Tree Report, Walter Bemis, Consulting Arborist, November 18, 2004, updated 2005 and 2006.
23	Menlo Park Heritage Tree Ordinance & Heritage Tree Replacement Guidelines
24	Consultation with Justin Murphy, Development Services Manager, Community Development Department, via e-mail, August 20, 2004
25	City of Menlo Park Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance
26	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Update Report, 75 Willow Road, Menlo Park, California prepared by LFR Levine Fricke, January 25, 2006
27	Limited Phase II Subsurface Summary Letter, prepared by LFR Levine Fricke, February 17, 2006
28	Letter regarding Removal of Two Underground Storage Tanks located at 75 Willow Road, Menlo Park, CA 94025 (Documentation also refers to this site as 85 Willow Road) from San Mateo County Environmental Health Department to EJC Partners, February 16, 2006.
29	Pimentel, Chris, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, personal communication with Impact Sciences, January 23, 2006
30	Noise Measurements taken by Impact Sciences staff, January 25, 2006
31	Environmental Protection Agency, typical noise level data
32	Menlo Park Noise Ordinance
33	Acker, Nicole, Menlo Park Police Department, personal communication with Impact Sciences, January 19, 2006
34	Menlo Park City School District website, http://www.mpcsd.k12.ca.us/ ; Sequoia Union High School District website, http://www.seq.org . Accessed January 19, 2006 and April 10, 2006
35	Residential Development Projects of 6 or More Dwelling Units in the City of Menlo Park, February 17, 2005
36	Stone, Pat, Menlo Park Public Works Department (DPW), personal communication (I) with Impact Sciences, January 25, 2006
37	Avanzato, Nora, Customer Service Representative, Pacific Gas and Electric, personal communication with Impact Sciences, January 19, 2006
38	Molder, Paul, California Water Service Company (CWSC), personal communication with Impact Sciences, January 19, 2006

39	Smith, Lisa, customer service agent, BFI Peninsula, personal communication with Impact Sciences, January 19, 2006
40	Visit to project area by Impact Sciences staff, January 25, 2006
41	Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University, July 8, 2004
42	Stone, Pat, Menlo Park Public Works Department (DPW), personal communication (II) with Impact Sciences, January 25, 2006
43	Daniels, Peggy, West Bay Sanitary District, personal communication with Impact Sciences, January 25, 2006

ATTACHMENTS

Figure 3.0-1, Project Location

Figure 3.0-2, Proposed Site Plan

Figure 3.0-3, Exterior Elevations for Typical Two-Story Home

Figure 3.0-4, Landscape Plan

APPENDIX

Air Emissions Calculations