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SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

The Draft EIR for the Trellis Residential Project was released for public comment from July 16, 2015 to August 14, 2015. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15088, the City of Walnut has evaluated the comments received on the Trellis Residential Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and provides responses to comments, corrections, and errata in this document, which together with the Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2014072044) comprise the Final EIR for the project.

This document is organized into four sections:

- **Section 1 – Introduction:** Introduces the content and purpose of the Final EIR, and summarizes the Project being evaluated.

- **Section 2 – Master Responses and Individual Responses to Written Comments:** Provides the Master Responses and a list of the agencies, organizations, and individuals that commented on the Draft EIR. Copies of all of the letters received regarding the Draft EIR and responses thereto are included in this section.

- **Section 3 – Errata and Changes to the Draft EIR:** Includes an addendum listing refinements and clarifications on the Draft EIR, which have been incorporated.

- **Section 4 – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:** A summary of the mitigation measures from the EIR and the steps toward implementing and monitoring them.

**Purpose**

This Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) has been prepared to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the Trellis Residential Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2014072044). This document is prepared in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines.

The purpose of this Final EIR is to disclose information to the public and decision makers about the potential environment effects of the proposed project. This Final EIR does not recommend either approval or denial of the proposed project; rather, it is intended to provide a source of independent and impartial analysis of the foreseeable environmental impacts of a proposed course of action. This Final EIR describes the proposed project, evaluates its environmental effects, and discusses reasonable alternatives that would attempt to avoid, reduce, or minimize environmental impacts. The City of Walnut Creek will consider the information presented in this document in making an informed decision regarding the proposed project.

**1.1 - Project Location**

The project site is located in the southern portion of the City of Walnut Creek, Contra Costa County, California (Exhibit 1-1). The City is located approximately 22 miles east of the City of San Francisco, 13 miles east of the City of Oakland, and 43 miles north of the City of San Jose. Regional access to the
project area is provided by Interstate 680 (I-680), State Route 24 (SR-24), and by the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) District.

The project site comprises 8.15 net acres of developed land. This site currently includes a vacant 35,635-square-foot community center, a parking lot, an outdoor pool, a children’s play area, various accessory structures, and a commercial landscape nursery in addition to a portion of the City’s Tice Valley Park and Gym. The project site consists of two parcels (Assessor’s Parcel Numbers [APNs] 189-130-047 and 189-130-048) and includes addresses 2071 Tice Valley Boulevard and 2055 Tice Valley Boulevard (Exhibit 1-2).

1.2 - Project Site Background

The western portion of the project site has been developed since 1958 with a number of different land uses, as described below. The eastern portion of the project site is currently developed as a commercial landscape nursery, which has operated at the location since at least 2002.

The western portion of the project site was first developed in 1958 as the public Tice Valley Elementary School. The school was later closed because of declining attendance, and the property was sold to the Jewish Community Federation of the Greater East Bay in 1984. The Jewish Community Federation received approval from the City to amend the General Plan and to rezone the property to a Planned Development (PD) zoning district (PD 1604) that allowed for the establishment of a community center (the Contra Costa Jewish Community Center, or JCC). In 1985, the JCC received approval from the City’s Design Review Commission to expand the existing facilities to include a gymnasium (which was never built) and an outdoor swimming pool. Design Review Commission approval was also granted to construct a parking lot and tennis courts, and an approximately 3,200-square-foot administrative office building on vacant land next to the existing facilities. However, these facilities were never constructed and this vacant land is now occupied by the commercial landscape nursery.

In 1996, the City and the JCC entered into an agreement whereby the City constructed the Tice Valley Community Gymnasium, partially on lands owned by the JCC, in exchange for granting the JCC some use of the gym.

The Jewish Community Federation decided to close the JCC in 2011, citing financial issues. In 2012, the Applicant entered into a joint option-to-buy agreement for a portion of the site with the Jewish Community Federation.

1.3 - Project Overview

1.3.1 - Project Setting

The project site comprises 8.15 net acres of land containing a vacant 35,635-square-foot community center, a parking lot, an outdoor pool, a children’s play area, various accessory structures, and a commercial landscape nursery. A portion of the project site is also occupied by the City’s Tice Valley Community Gymnasium and associated parking lot pursuant to a long-term land lease, which would remain and be amended to adjust the boundaries of the leasehold premises to accommodate the residential portion of the project. The community center includes classrooms, offices, library,
playgrounds, swimming pools, an auditorium, and ancillary outbuildings and parking areas. Some of these buildings date back to the 1950s, although the site has been improved throughout the years, most recently in the 1990s with the construction of the Tice Valley Community Gymnasium.

The Walnut Creek General Plan 2025’s Land Use Map currently designates the project site as Open Space/Recreation (OS/R), while the site is zoned Planned Development (PD) 1604. Table 1-1 provides a summary of the zoning district and land use designation associated with each of the parcels that comprise the project site.

Table 1-1: Onsite Zoning and General Plan Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel (APN)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning1</th>
<th>Existing General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Proposed General Plan Designation1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>189-130-047 (residential portion of the project site)</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1604</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD)</td>
<td>Open Space/Recreation (OS/R)</td>
<td>Multifamily Low (MFL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189-130-048 (gym and parking lot portion of the project site)</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1604</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD)</td>
<td>Open Space/Recreation (OS/R)</td>
<td>Open Space/Recreation (OS/R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 Pending consideration and potential recommendation by the Walnut Creek Planning Commission, and consideration and potential approval by the Walnut Creek City Council.
Source: City of Walnut Creek, Zoning Map, ND; City of Walnut Creek, General Plan Land Use Map, 2012.

1.3.2 - Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is located on the border between the City and the unincorporated County. To the west of Rossmoor Parkway, as it approaches the JCC property, Tice Valley Boulevard is a four-lane divided road surrounded primarily by one- and two-story retail and office uses. In front of the JCC property, Tice Valley Boulevard narrows to two lanes, but it is still a wide city street with sidewalks and on-street parking. Located across the street from the project site are the one-story Grace Presbyterian Church and the one- and two-story Tice Oaks Senior Apartments. Further behind these developments and atop a small hill sit several one-story nursing homes, all of which are accessed via Rossmoor Parkway. To the east of the JCC, and located within the unincorporated County, Tice Valley Boulevard narrows to a two-lane rural road surrounded by one and two story single-family dwellings on mostly half-acre lots.

In essence, the portion of the JCC site that is proposed for residential development sits in a transition area between the suburban city and the semi-rural county. Table 2-2 provides a summary of the land uses surrounding the project site along with the zoning districts and land use designations associated with each of these neighboring uses.
Table 1-2: Surrounding Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Roadway Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tice Valley Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1462</td>
<td>Multifamily Residential Very High (MF VH)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossmoor Garden Club’s Access Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1448</td>
<td>Multifamily Residential Very High (MF VH)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residences (Contra Costa County)</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential (R-20)¹</td>
<td>Single Family Residential-Low (SL)¹</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Rain Foundation’s Rossmoor Garden Club</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1483</td>
<td>Open Space/Recreation (OS/R)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1483</td>
<td>Open Space/ Recreation (OS/R) and Single Family Medium (SFM)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tice Valley Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1867</td>
<td>Open Space/Recreation (OS/R)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ¹ Contra Costa County Zoning District/General Plan Land Use Designation.
Source: City of Walnut Creek, Zoning Map, ND; City of Walnut Creek, General Plan Land Use Map, 2012; City of Walnut Creek, General Plan Transportation Element, 2006; Contra Costa County, General Plan Land Use Map, 2014.

1.3.3 - Project Description

The project includes the construction and operation of a single-family residential community comprised of up to 53 single-family homes, as well as associated improvements, on approximately 5.28 acres of the project site (Exhibit 1-3). Of the 53 homes to be constructed, 47 are detached residences, while the remaining six are attached products distributed within three duplexes. Each home consists of a two-story structure not to exceed 29 feet in height. Generally, each home contains three- or four-bedrooms and two-plus bathrooms, and range in size from approximately 1,600 to 2,200 square feet. Generally, the ground floor level of each home includes a two-car garage, living room, kitchen, and private yard, while additional bedrooms and bathrooms are found on the upper floor. Each home is designed with complementary architectural elements consistent with the historic precedence and aesthetic character of the existing homes in the project area and throughout the greater Northern California region, including Craftsman, Traditional, and French Country elevation styles (Exhibit 1-4). A series of paseos traverse the project site and connect residences to common landscape areas, as well as to offsite locations.
Exhibit 1-2
Local Vicinity Map
Aerial Base

Legend
- Project Site

Source: ESRI Imagery, 2013
Exhibit 1-4
Architectural Elevations

Source: Trellis Community Architecture, January 2015.
As part of the project, the existing community center and associated structures would be demolished. However, the Tice Valley Community Gymnasium would remain in place on roughly 2.87 acres of the project site. The project applicant is also proposing to consolidate parking spaces by enlarging the existing parking lot just north of the gym and providing new landscaping and lighting.

**Circulation, Access, and Parking**

The project site would be accessed by four driveways along Tice Valley Boulevard. Two of the driveways would access the parking lot for the Tice Valley Community Gymnasium, while the other two would access the residential portion of the project site. These driveways would be engineered and constructed in accordance with design standards set forth by the City of Walnut Creek. The City has established these design specifications in part to reduce the potential for conflict between vehicular traffic, pedestrians, and bicyclists crossing driveways. These driveways would include marked pedestrian crosswalks installed as part of the project. Additionally, a raised median would be installed to the east of the residential driveway. At both the residential and gymnasium driveways, curb extensions (also referred to as “bulb-outs”) would be installed on the south side of Tice Valley Boulevard. Both of these design elements result in visually narrowing the street, which in turn has traffic calming benefits and would reduce the distance that a pedestrian needs to cross the street.

Internal streets and drive aisles would allow for vehicle and bicycle circulation on the project site. Tice Valley Boulevard is identified for Class II bicycle facilities in both the Walnut Creek Bicycle Master Plan and the Contra Costa Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Additionally, several other Class I, II, and III bicycle facilities are located in the project vicinity. Public transit in the project area is provided by County Connection Route 1, which has an existing bus stop located on the existing parking lot of the project site; however, the bus stop will be relocated on-site or to an acceptable location along the Tice Valley Boulevard frontage as part of project improvements. Further, short-term bicycle parking via bike racks would be required on the new Tice Valley parking lot site in accordance with Walnut Creek Municipal Code Section 10-2.3.203-G.2, which mandates a minimum number of bicycle parking spaces equal to 10 percent of the requirement for automobile parking spaces for community use facilities, such as the gymnasium.

The project design includes a series of paseos to facilitate pedestrian circulation throughout the project. Every home contains a covered, two-car garage; 19 additional guest parking spaces are located throughout the project site. Additionally, the upgraded Tice Valley Community Gymnasium and Tice Valley Neighborhood Park parking lot would wrap around the northern and eastern sides of the existing gym, with consolidated access off Tice Valley Boulevard. Up to 241 parking spaces, including parking stalls that conform to the Americans with Disabilities Act, and bicycle parking, would be provided.
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SECTION 2: MASTER RESPONSES AND INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

Master responses address similar comments made by multiple public agencies, businesses, organizations, or individuals through written comments submitted to the City of Walnut Creek.

List of Master Responses

- Master Response 1 – General Opposition to the Project
- Master Response 2 – Traffic
- Master Response 3 – Schools
- Master Response 4 – General Plan Designation, Density and Zoning
- Master Response 5 – Character of Surrounding Area/Quality of Life
- Master Response 6 – Archaeological Resources and the Rossmoor Site

2.1 - Master Responses

Master Response 1 – General Opposition to the Project

Summary of Relevant Comments
Several commenters expressed general opposition to the project.

Response
CEQA requires that the Final EIR address comments on the adequacy of the DEIR. CEQA considerations are limited to environmental issues and the potential impacts of the project on the environment. Personal opinions expressing general support for or opposition to the project are noted and will be included within the overall administrative record for the project, but do not require a written response if they do not relate to an environmental issue or topical area that is addressed within the Draft EIR. Likewise, opinions about the general desirability, merits, or purely economic or political considerations of the project are not within the purview of CEQA and do not require a written response. Concerns about the project approval should be submitted to Jeremy Lochirco, Senior Planner, at the City of Walnut Creek Planning Department, 1666 N. Main Street, Walnut Creek, CA 94596, or at the public hearings to be conducted by the Planning Commission and City Council.

Master Response 2 – Traffic

Summary of Relevant Comments
Seven commenters expressed concerns about the traffic impacts of the project.

Response
People who live in the vicinity of the project have concerns about the amount of traffic that would be generated by the project and added to the current traffic on local streets. The DEIR concluded that there would be no significant impact to local streets or intersections. As presented in Section
3.13 of the DEIR on page 3.13-12, the pattern used to allocate new project trips to the street network was determined by reviewing existing turning movement counts at the study intersections, and through an understanding of the travel patterns in the City of Walnut Creek to reach employment, education, and retail centers. The project is estimated to generate a total of 41 AM peak-hour trips and 54 PM peak-hour trips, which will be distributed along the area streets.

Some commenters questioned the choice of study intersections, particularly why the intersection of Meadow Road and Tice Valley Boulevard was not studied in the DEIR. The study intersections were chosen in cooperation with City of Walnut Creek staff, based on the facilities most likely to be potentially impacted by the proposed project. The project is estimated to generate 41 AM peak-hour trips and 54 PM peak-hour trips. With respect to the project trip distribution to Tice Valley Boulevard southeast of the project (referred to as “east” in the DEIR), the percentage of trips would be 7 percent to/from Tice Valley Boulevard and Crest Avenue (just east of Meadow Road), or three AM peak-hour trips and four PM peak-hour trips passing through the Meadow Road intersection. This is not considered significant, and when all the trips are distributed across the network, the intersections in the study area will continue to operate acceptably, at the same levels of service currently. As discussed on page 3.13-22 of the Draft EIR, this is also true when the new traffic generated by background projects (approved projects and projects under construction in the local area) is added to the calculation, as well as under the future cumulative condition, which represents year 2030 conditions as projected for development consistent with the Walnut Creek General Plan.

If 100 percent of all project-generated trips travelled to/from the east and the Tice Valley Road/Crest Avenue intersection, the findings and conclusions of the traffic analysis would not change. This is because the proposed project would not generate enough peak hour trips to result in a significant impact to the intersection of Tice Valley Road/Crest Avenue. The traffic analysis concluded that there is ample capacity at this intersection today and in the future to accommodate additional trips.

The addition of three to four cars at any one time to the existing traffic on Tice Valley Boulevard eastbound does not require any mitigation in the form of roadway improvements or pedestrian safety requirements. That section of roadway is within Contra Costa County. The project’s pedestrian safety program (identified as Mitigation Measure TRANS-4b) will provide appropriate sidewalks and crosswalks at access points to the project, as well as along Tice Valley Boulevard to the northwest of the project. Gaps in the sidewalk network to the east of the project are acknowledged in the DEIR on page 3.13-1.

The City acknowledges that Tice Valley Boulevard experiences a high level of bicycle and pedestrian traffic, and that the roadway is in need of improvements to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. Proposed improvements are identified in three County planning documents:

1) 2009 Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan published by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA), which identifies Tice Valley Boulevard as a future class II bike lane;

2) Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP), which is a database of projects maintained by CCTA; and
3) Central County Area of Benefit (AOB) project list for the pending update for traffic mitigation fees.

The County is currently conducting an alternatives analysis to consider different levels of improvements (short- and long-term solutions) as funding becomes available.

**Master Response 3 – Schools**

**Summary of Relevant Comments**

Several commenters expressed concerns regarding the effect of the project on local schools.

**Response**

A number of commenters expressed concern about the effect of the project’s population on the enrollment or perceived overcrowding at local schools. In addition, the Walnut Creek School District noted in its comments on the Notice of Preparation (dated August 2014) that the current and proposed residential development in the area would result in the need for additional school facilities.

Section 3.12 of the EIR describes the existing school district’s enrollment and analyzed the effects of the additional students that would be generated by the project. The DEIR uses the California State Allocation Board’s (SAB’s) Office of Public School Construction methodology for determining the elementary, middle, and high school pupils that would be generated by new residential units. Based on the statewide average student yield factors provided by the SAB, the project’s 53 new single-family homes are expected to generate approximately 50 total new students: 27 elementary and middle school students (Walnut Creek School District), and 11 high school students (Acalanes Union High School District).

Based on correspondence with the Walnut Creek School District (Appendix J), while the project alone is unlikely to result in a need for new or expanded District facilities, when coupled with other residential development project and population growth in the project area, the project could incrementally contribute to the need for additional District resources. The text of the DEIR on page 3.12-9 in the fourth paragraph that discusses this potential impact has been corrected to read:

"Dorris Eaton School, adjacent to Parkmead, reverted back to the WCSD as an elementary school named Tice Creek beginning in 2015 for grades K-6, with phasing to become a K-8 in 2017. This would provide additional capacity for the project-generated elementary and intermediate students."

The Dorris Eaton School, which was formerly leased to a private school operator, re-opened in the fall of 2015 as a public K-6 elementary school. Nevertheless, to help offset the construction or expansion of facilities, the procurement of equipment, and the hiring and training of additional personnel, the Walnut Creek School District and the Acalanes Union High School District collect mandatory school facility fees on new development projects in accordance with Senate Bill 50 and related state laws. As part of the project entitlement process, the Applicant will be responsible for paying its fair share of these school facility fees. Therefore, with the payment of these mandatory fees, impacts associated with the construction or expansion of school district facilities would be less than significant.
Master Response 4 – General Plan Designation, Density, and Zoning

Summary of Relevant Comments

Five commenters expressed concern over the general plan designation, density, and zoning to the project.

Response

General Plan Designation and Density

A number of comments addressed the density of the project and questioned whether the construction of 53 single-family units on the 5.28 acres of the site that would be designated residential was consistent with the surrounding land uses and character of the neighborhood.

The site is currently designated Open Space/Recreation (OS/R) by the City’s General Plan; however, it is not used as public open space. The site operates as a privately owned, developed suburban land use, containing a vacant 35,635-square-foot community center building, a parking lot, an outdoor pool, a children’s play area, various accessory structures, and a commercial landscape nursery. These uses are not in conformance with the OS/R designation, which provides for public open space and recreation. These uses (part of the JCC complex that was vacated in 2012) would be demolished to prepare the site for construction of 53 new single-family units. The Tice Valley Community Gymnasium, a public recreational facility, would remain in place on roughly 2.87 acres of the project site, and the large surface parking lot serving the gym would be enlarged and reconfigured.

Section 3.9, Land Use and Planning, of the DEIR analyzes the consistency of the project with the City of Walnut Creek’s 2025 General Plan and Zoning (Municipal Code), as well as other applicable Regional Plans, Policies, and Regulations. The development of the project would require a change in the General Plan designation of the 5.28 acres of the site proposed for residential development to Multifamily Low (MFL) and a change in zoning to Planned Development (PD).

The MFL land use designation will allow the project to serve as a transition between the single-family neighborhoods located east of the project site in unincorporated Contra Costa County, the higher density senior housing directly northeast of the site, and the higher density residential, recreational, and commercial uses located west and north of the site (Exhibit 2-1). The project is consistent with the MFL land use designation as defined by the City’s General Plan 2025 and, at a density of 10 units per acre, falls within the MFL density range of 6.1 to 14 units per acre. The change in designation from OS/R to MFL will allow the site to comply with the General Plan with no significant land use or planning impact.

Zoning

The project site is not zoned for open space. The site currently operates under Planned Development PD-1604 zoning, which covers the operation of the Jewish Community Center and the commercial nursery. Neighboring zoning includes several other Planned Development districts, customized to address the various land uses in the vicinity including a church, senior apartments, single-family homes, a shopping center, and Rossmoor.
Exhibit 2-1
Onsite and Surrounding Land Uses and General Plan Designations
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The project will require rezoning from the current Planned Development PD-1604 district to a new Planned Development district that reflects the proposed residential use and recreational use with the existing gymnasium and reconfigured parking lot. If approved, the PD designation for this project will be assigned a new number in the zoning ordinance and have specific site development and architectural plans attached.

Planned Development (PD) zoning allows for more flexibility than typical residential zoning, both in the placement of buildings on the site and in the establishment of development standards to reflect the characteristics of the site and the development. As discussed in the Visual Character section of the Aesthetics analysis in the DEIR (page 3.1-9):

In general, the purpose of establishing zoning districts is to identify and group compatible land uses that share similar characteristics, including aesthetic and design characteristics, in order to provide for the orderly, planned use of land resources. Section 10-2.2.1701 of the City’s Municipal Code states:

The purpose of the Planned Development District is to allow diversification in the relationship of various buildings, land uses, structures, and open spaces in order to be relieved from the rigid standards of conventional zoning. A Planned Development district shall comply with regulation and provision of the General Plan and any applicable specific plan and shall provide adequate standards to promote the public, health, safety and general welfare without unduly inhibiting the advantages of modern building techniques and planning for residential or commercial purposes.

Master Response 5 – Character of the Surrounding Area/Quality of Life

Summary of Relevant Comments

Five commenters expressed concern about the project’s effect on the character of the surrounding area and quality of life.

Response

Although community character and quality of life are not issues analyzed directly under CEQA, they are considered community goals, and are therefore addressed by the analysis of compatibility with the City’s General Plan goals and policies for preserving and enhancing community character and quality of life. The City of Walnut Creek General Plan 2025 contains a Chapter entitled “Quality of Life” with these types of policies. Draft EIR Section 3.9-10, Land Use and Planning analyzes the consistency of the project with the General Plan, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Goal, Policy, or Action</th>
<th>Consistency Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 2: Quality of Life Chapter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Policy 1.1.</strong> Protect and enhance the distinctive characteristics of each neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Goal, Policy, or Action</td>
<td>Consistency Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.4. Require that new development is compatible with surrounding uses.</td>
<td>Consistent. The project will be designed to comply with the development, site, and design requirements for PD zoning districts set forth by City’s Zoning Code. The project will require Design Review Commission approval of the residential designs and landscaping plan to ensure compatibility with the surrounding land uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 8. Make Walnut Creek a community accessible to all.</td>
<td>Consistent. As with other development projects in the City of Walnut Creek, the project will be designed to comply with all applicable Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements related to accessibility. Furthermore, as discussed under Impact LUP-1 above, the project will not physically divide an established community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed in the Master Response 4 regarding the density of the site, the MFL General Plan Designation sought by the applicant will allow the construction of a type of multi-family units that are a transition between the single-family neighborhoods and the higher-density senior housing and commercial area in the vicinity of the site. As further explained in the Project Description section of the Draft EIR and in the introduction to this document, the project is designed to incorporate two-story residential designs in a neighborhood of landscaped paseos and common areas. See Master Response 4 for further discussion regarding zoning.

Master Response 6 – Archaeological Resources and the Rossmoor Site

Summary of Relevant Comments
Three commenters expressed concern regarding archaeological resources in the vicinity of the site, in particular the Rossmoor site.

Response
The known cultural resources in the vicinity of the site are documented in Section 3-4 of the DEIR, which has been revised as shown here and in Section 3, Errata, to discuss the known archaeological site located at the entrance to the Rossmoor development. There are no known cultural resources on the project site. There is a potential for discovery of prehistoric resources on the site during construction as discussed on Page 3.4-11 of the Draft EIR, Impact CR-2, which has been revised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact CR-2:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis
No archaeological resources have been previously recorded on the project site. A records search conducted at the NWIC revealed the existence of a single prehistoric resource within a 0.5-mile radius of the project boundary. The resource, known as the Rossmoor Site (P-07-000186), was an important Saklan village dating to approximately 1500–1700 CE. It was
discovered during construction of the main entrance road to Rossmoor Parkway, located approximately 1,500 feet southwest of the project area. No archaeological resources have been previously recorded on the project site or within a 0.5-mile radius beyond the project boundary, nor were any encountered during the pedestrian survey. A Prehistoric Sensitivity Map prepared for the City’s General Plan 2025 EIR indicates that the project site is located within an area considered to have a “High Sensitivity” for prehistoric resources. Typically, prehistoric archaeological resources and sites are located in areas near water. The project site is located relatively close to Tice Creek. While the project site has been disturbed since at least the late 1950s, the probability of encountering additional prehistoric resources within the project area remains high. However, the project site has been highly disturbed since at least the late 1950s, and thus, it is unlikely that intact prehistoric resources would be present within the project site.

While impacts to known prehistoric resources are unlikely to occur during development of the project, subsurface Construction activities may have the potential to damage or destroy previously undiscovered prehistoric resources. Prehistoric resources can include flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, and choppers) or obsidian, chert, or quartzite toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (such as midden soil containing heat-affected rock, ash, and charcoal, shellfish remains, and animal bones); and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones). Accordingly, implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 will be required to reduce potential impacts to prehistoric resources that may be discovered during project construction. With the incorporation of mitigation, impacts associated with prehistoric resources would be less than significant.

Furthermore, Mitigation Measure CR-1, on page 3.4-10 is revised as follows:

**MM CR-1**

A qualified archaeologist shall be retained by the developer and be available for consultation during all ground-disturbing activities. An on-site monitor shall monitor mass grading and utility trenching. If a potentially significant cultural resource is encountered during subsurface earthwork activities, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the find shall cease until the archaeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The Applicant shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement and shall conduct tailgate training with the on-call archaeologist to educate construction workers on the possible materials that could be found. Any archaeological previously undiscovered resources found during construction activities shall be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, glass, ceramics, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts, or features including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resource is determined significant under CEQA, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan that will capture those categories of data.
for which the site is significant. The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive report complete with methods, results, and recommendations, and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered resources. The report shall be submitted to the City of Walnut Creek, the Northwest Information Center, and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), if required. The Applicant shall be required to implement these recommendations.

With the incorporation of Mitigation Measure CR-1, as modified, impacts associated with prehistoric resources would be less than significant.

2.2 - List of Authors

A list of public agencies, organizations, and individuals that provided comments on the Draft EIR is presented below. Each comment has been assigned a code. Individual comments within each communication have been numbered so comments can be crossed-referenced with responses. Following this list, the text of the communication is reprinted and followed by the corresponding response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Author Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Municipal Utility District</td>
<td>EBMUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lafayette</td>
<td>LAFAYETTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa County Public Works Department</td>
<td>CCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Albert</td>
<td>ALBERT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Francis, letter one</td>
<td>FRANCIS-#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Francis, letter two</td>
<td>FRANCIS-#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith and Jarrod Gerhardt</td>
<td>GERHARDT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay Gray</td>
<td>GRAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Huddleston</td>
<td>HUDDLESTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Law</td>
<td>LAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabney Lawless</td>
<td>LAWLESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Ory</td>
<td>ORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Ove</td>
<td>OVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Reich</td>
<td>REICH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Straw</td>
<td>STRAW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 - Responses to Comments

2.3.1 - Introduction

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15088, the City of Walnut Creek, as the lead agency, evaluated the comments received on the Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2014072044) for the Trellis Residential Project, and has prepared the following responses to the comments received. This Response to Comments document becomes part of the Final EIR for the project in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15132.

2.3.2 - Comment Letters and Responses

The comment letters reproduced in the following pages follow the same organization as used in the List of Authors.
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September 10, 2015

Mr. Jeremy Lochirco
City of Walnut Creek
16666 North Main Street
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Dear Mr. Lochirco:

Trellis Residential Project - Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Thank you for continuing to include the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the project referenced above. Caltrans' new mission, vision, and goals signal a modernization of our approach to California's transportation system. Caltrans reviewed this local development for impacts to the State Highway System (SHS) in keeping with sustainability, livability, economy, safety and health. These comments are consistent with the State's smart mobility goals that support a vibrant economy, and build communities, not sprawl. The project would include 53 single family homes on 5.28 acres.

Traffic Operations
Please include in your traffic analysis the following interchanges:

- Olympic Boulevard / Interstate (I-) 680,
- South Main Street / I-680,
- Rudgear Road / I-680,
- Pleasant Hill Road / State Route 24.

Traffic Impact Fees
Given the project's contribution to area traffic and the location of the proposed project, traffic impact fees should be identified for project mitigation. Caltrans recommends the City of Antioch (City) participate in a contribution program and plan for the impact of future growth on the regional transportation system and regionally contribute such fees to a Regional Fee Program administered by TRANSPLAC. Contributions would be used to help fund regional transportation programs that improve the transportation system to lessen future traffic congestion, improve

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"
mobility by reducing time delays, and maintain reliability on major roadways throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. Please also consider a multimodal fee to improve transit.

**Vehicle Trip Reduction**

Caltrans encourages the City to locate any needed future related housing, jobs and employee related services near major mass transit centers, with connecting streets configured to facilitate walking and biking, as a means of promoting mass transit use and reducing regional vehicle miles traveled and traffic impacts on the State highways. Caltrans also encourages you to develop Travel Demand Management (TDM) policies to promote usage of nearby public transit reduce vehicle trips on the SHS to the Walnut Creek BART Station and increase service on the Contra Costa County Connection (e.g., better headway times on bus lines).

The TDM policies should include appropriate documentation for monitoring TDM measures, including annual reports to demonstrate the ongoing reduction of vehicle trips while continuing to survey the travel patterns of employees and visitors to the facility. Please see the following webpage for more information: www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/parking.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Keith Wayne at 510-286-5737 or keith_wayne@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[For] PATRICIA MAURICE
District Branch Chief
Local Development - Intergovernmental Review

c: State Clearinghouse

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"
State Agencies

California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS)

Response to CALTRANS-1

The commenter states:

“Please include in your traffic analysis the following interchanges:

- Olympic Boulevard/I-680; South Main Street/I-680; Rudgear Road/I-680; and Pleasant Hill Road/SR 24.”

The study intersections were chosen in cooperation with City of Walnut Creek staff, based on the facilities most likely to be potentially impacted by the proposed project. The project is estimated to generate 41 AM peak-hour trips and 54 PM peak-hour trips. With respect to the project trip distribution, the number of trips would be 40 percent to/from Olympic Boulevard and I-680, or 16 AM peak-hour trips and 22 PM peak-hour trips. The other interchanges listed by the commenter would receive fewer project trips than Olympic Boulevard. Formal analysis of these interchanges is not warranted, based on the volume of trips that would be generated by the project.

Response to CALTRANS-2

The commenter states that traffic impact fees should be identified for project mitigation. Caltrans recommends that the City participate in a contribution program.

The proposed project is not anticipated to result in any significant transportation impacts, and no mitigation measures have been identified that would be subject to a local or regional transportation impact fee program.

Response to CALTRANS-3

The commenter states that Caltrans encourages the City to locate housing, jobs and employee related services near major mass transit centers, and to develop Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policies.

The comment is noted. As discussed in Section 3.13 of the DEIR, the project would not result in any potentially significant impacts to local roadways or intersections and therefore there is no nexus to require the incorporation of TDM measures.

Response to CALTRANS-4

The commenter states that TDM policies should include appropriate documentation for monitoring TDM measures.

The comment is noted.
September 1, 2015

Jeremy Lochirco, Senior Planner
City of Walnut Creek Community and Economic Development Department
1666 North Main Street
Walnut Creek, CA  94596

Re:  Notice of Completion/Availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Trellis Residential Project at the Former Jewish Community Center and Tice Valley Gymnasium Site, Walnut Creek

Dear Mr. Lochirco:

East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Trellis Residential Project at the former Jewish Community Center and Tice Valley Gymnasium site located at 2055 and 2071 Tice Valley Boulevard in the City of Walnut Creek (City). EBMUD has the following comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

**WATER SERVICE**

EBMUD’s Colorado Pressure Zone, with a service elevation range between 250 and 450 feet, will serve the proposed development. A water main extension, at the project sponsor’s expense, will be required to serve the proposed development. When the development plans are finalized, the project sponsor should contact EBMUD’s New Business Office and request a water service estimate to determine costs and conditions for providing water service to the proposed development. Engineering and installation of water mains and services require substantial lead time, which should be provided for in the project sponsor’s development schedule. No water meters are allowed to be located in driveways.

**WATER CONSERVATION**

The proposed project presents an opportunity to incorporate water conservation measures. EBMUD requests that the City include in its conditions of approval a requirement that the project sponsor comply with Assembly Bill 325, "Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance," (Division 2, Title 23, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 2.7, Sections 490 through 495) and Contra Costa County’s “County Landscape Water Conservation Guidelines.” The project sponsor should be aware that Section 31 of EBMUD’s Water Service Regulations requires that water service shall not be furnished for new or expanded service unless all the applicable water-efficiency measures described in the regulation are installed at the project sponsor’s expense.
If you have any questions concerning this response, please contact Timothy R. McGowan, Senior Civil Engineer, Major Facilities Planning at (510) 287-1981.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David J. Rehnstrom
Manager of Water Distribution Planning

cc: Nick Kosla
Pulte Home Corporation
6210 Stoneridge Mall Road, Suite 500
Pleasanton, CA 94588

Contra Costa Jewish Community Center
2033 North Main Street, Suite 800
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
Local Agencies

East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD)

Response to EBMUD-1
This comment states that EBMUD will serve the project. No response is necessary.

Response to EBMUD-2
This comment provides the requirements for the development to receive water service under the District’s usual conditions, which is not a CEQA issue. The comment is noted and no response is necessary.

Response to EBMUD-3
This comment provides the information that the District’s Water Service Regulations require that water service shall not be furnished for new or expanded service unless all the applicable water-efficiency measures described in the regulation are installed at the project sponsor’s expense. EBMUD requests that the City include in its conditions of approval a requirement that the sponsor include water conservation measures referenced in the comment.

The DEIR determined that there is adequate supply of water for the project as served by EBMUD, as discussed in Impact USS-4 on page 3.14-17. This comment does not change that conclusion or provide information that would change the conclusion to find a significant. Therefore, this comment is not an added mitigation measure.

The City will require that the requested water conservation measures be included by specifying them as a condition of approval.
Jeremy:

I’m responding on behalf of the City of Lafayette to the attached CEQA notice regarding the Pulte Homes project. In general Lafayette does not have significant concerns about the permanent project impacts; however, we do have serious concerns about the temporary construction impacts. The Traffic Section of the EIR appears to be short on addressing impacts by construction traffic on the regional roadway network. Specifically, Lafayette believes that the PHR/Olympic corridors connecting the project to SR 24 may be a very appealing route for construction traffic such as hauling and delivery trucks. Depending on the volume this could have a significant impact on not only the traffic operation and safety of the corridors, but the degradation of pavement conditions on Lafayette streets. One very easy and obvious mitigation of such impacts would be a project condition of approval requiring the applicant to submit a construction access route plan for approval by the City of Walnut Creek. And in the spirit of regional cooperative planning, Lafayette would rely on Walnut Creek to ensure that said plan excludes the use of Lafayette streets.

I look forward to hearing your perspective on this issue. Thank you.

Regards,

Tony Coe
Lafayette City Engineer
City of Lafayette (LAFAYETTE)

Response to LAFAYETTE-1

The City of Lafayette has concerns about the temporary construction impacts.

The transportation chapter of the EIR did not analyze construction traffic impacts, as these are anticipated to be relatively short-term in duration for a project of this size. There are no identified thresholds of significance for this type of impact. The heaviest equipment would be delivered to the site and remain on-site for the duration of site preparation. Regular deliveries of construction materials and supplies would be ongoing for the duration of the construction activity, which could last two to three years. Typical truck trips would include concrete, lumber, interior and exterior finishes, landscape materials, and related materials. The trucks used would range from five- to 20-ton trucks. Employees would include up to 50 persons on-site at one time. Staging would occur on-site and in the gymnasium parking lot. The gym parking lot would be constructed concurrently with the last phase of residential construction.

Response to LAFAYETTE-2

The City of Lafayette believes that the Pleasant Hill Road/Olympic corridors connecting the project to SR-24 may be a very appealing route for construction traffic, which could impact traffic operation and safety as well as pavement conditions on Lafayette streets. The commenter states that one easy mitigation would be to prepare a construction access plan that excludes the use of Lafayette streets.

A construction traffic management agreement is typically prepared for City review and approval prior to issuing of building permits. This will be a condition of approval for the proposed project. The plan includes the truck haul routing plan as well as other elements such as roadway inspection, maintenance, and rehabilitation at the conclusion of construction, and a routing plan to avoid residential areas and to ensure smooth traffic flow during peak hours. An effort is made to keep trucks on major arterials as long as possible to avoid using local streets. Each haul plan is discussed internally with the City Traffic Engineer. During this review and consideration, the Engineer seeks to strike a balanced approach preserving the quality of life in sensitive areas while allowing a manageable window for performing critical construction activities. The City Traffic Engineer will communicate the final negotiated construction traffic management agreement to the City of Lafayette’s Traffic Engineer. After the first phase of the construction, which includes demolition and site grading, the City of Walnut Creek will review the construction management agreement in coordination with the City of Lafayette to respond to any concerns. This review of the agreement will be included in the final conditions of approval for the project.

Designated truck routes and arterial roadways such as Olympic Boulevard and Pleasant Hill Road are intended to provide access for all types of trips. The designation of Olympic Boulevard and Pleasant Hill Road as alternative freeway access for east-bound Olympic Boulevard to I-680 would prevent the trips from seeking alternate routes through residential areas during congested times. Trip distribution would depend on the source of the materials and chosen access routes. Restricting trucks to particular streets is only possible to the extent a master contractor is responsible for the individual haulers.
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Mr. Lochirco,

We have reviewed Section 3.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR for the Trellis Residential Project.

In August 12, 2014, we submitted comments on the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for this project. A copy of our letter is attached.

The Draft EIR did not address our comments related to drainage issues, which are listed in items 4 through 12 of our August 12, 2014 letter.

We request that the applicant be required to address those issues prior to the preparation of the Final EIR for the project.

We would appreciate receiving the responses of the applicant to our comments.

Thank you,

Mario Consolacion
Engineering Technician

255 Glacier Drive
Martinez, CA 94553

mcons@pw.cccounty.us
(925) 313-2283
(925) 313-2333
Contra Costa County Public Works Department (CCC)

Response to CCC-1
The commenter indicates that they submitted comments in 2014 on the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report.

This comment is noted and no response is necessary.

Response to CCC-2
The commenter states that the comments numbered 4 through 12 regarding drainage that were originally submitted in response to the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (August 12, 2014) were not addressed in the DEIR.

Responses to comments CCC-4 through CCC-12 are provided below and in the Draft EIR, as noted below. Please also note that the project was reduced in size from 74 units to 53 units following the release of the NOP.

Responses to comments 4 through 12 are provided below.

CONTRA COSTA-4: The commenter noted that an email from a downstream resident raised concerns about the effect of the project on the potential for flooding, on water quality of Tice Creek, on home values, on traffic, and on wildlife.

Response to CONTRA COSTA-4: The issues raised in the email were addressed in the EIR, with the exception of home values, which is a purely economic consideration and not within the purview of CEQA or the Draft EIR.

The effect of the project on traffic was fully analyzed in Section 3.13, Transportation and Traffic of the Draft EIR. All intersections were found to operate acceptably with the inclusion of project traffic and in the cumulative condition.

The effect of the project on zoning was fully analyzed in Section 3.9, Land Use and Planning of the Draft EIR. As discussed, the project would not result in any potentially significant impacts and no mitigation is required. The project was found to be consistent with relevant policies and goals of the General Plan.

The effect of the project on wildlife was fully analyzed in Section 3.3, Biological Resources of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR includes mitigation to protect nesting birds during construction. All other potential effects were found to be less than significant.

The effects of the project on Tice Creek are fully addressed in Section 3.8, Hydrology. Pursuant to City ordinance, applicants must submit a final drainage plan that demonstrates the ability of the planned on-site storm drain system to adequately collect on-site stormwater flows in accordance with all applicable requirements. (The preliminary stormwater control plan is included in Appendix G of the Draft EIR.) The final drainage plan shall demonstrate that the new on-site storm drain systems can satisfy the San Francisco Bay RWQCB’s Municipal Regional Permit (MRP) requirements by:
• Minimizing impervious surfaces, as feasible, and directing stormwater flows to bio-
filtration areas;
• Integrating pervious surfaces to ensure post-development flows do not exceed pre-
development flows; and
• Incorporating bio-filtration areas into the site plan, minimize impervious areas, and
incorporate dispersion of runoff to meet Low Impact Design requirements.

The project includes a reduction in impervious area of nearly 2,500 square feet and also
includes 28 bio-retention areas capable of treating stormwater in accordance with C.3
requirements. Submittal of the final drainage plan would ensure that long-term operational
impacts associated with water quality standards and wastewater discharge requirements
would be less than significant.

Accordingly, the project would not result in an increase of off-site flows that could
exacerbate any existing conditions in Tice Creek. The project would actually result in a
reduction in off-site flow from current conditions. Therefore, impacts related to flooding
and water quality in Tice Creek were found to be less than significant.

CONTRA COSTA-5: The commenter requests that maps and exhibits be included to clarify a
number of points related to Tice Creek watershed, Rossmoor detention basin, eastern and
western watersheds on the project site, stormwater collection points and volume of
stormwater runoff entering Tice Creek, location of bio-filtration areas, and information
related to flood zones.

Response to CONTRA COSTA-5: The Draft EIR includes a number of exhibits to support the
analysis of hydrology and water quality:

• Exhibit 3.8-1 shows the location of watersheds in the project vicinity.
• Exhibit 3.8-2 shows demarcates the eastern and western watersheds on the project site
and provides calculations for pervious/impervious surfaces in each areas.
• Exhibit 3.8-3 shows the location of flood zones in the project vicinity.
• Exhibits 3.8-4 and 3.8-5 shows the location of bio-retention areas throughout the site.

As noted previously, the project is designed to result in a reduction of stormwater runoff
from current conditions. Accordingly, the project would not result in an increase of off-site
flow that could exacerbate any existing conditions in Tice Creek. The project would actually
result in a reduction in off-site flow from current conditions. Therefore, impacts related to
flooding and water quality in Tice Creek were found to be less than significant.

CONTRA COSTA-6: The commenter requests that the Draft EIR include an analysis of the
capacity of Tice Creek and other water courses and man-made drainages in the vicinity, and
that the document identify any adverse impacts to these facilities and include mitigation
where required.
Response to CONTRA COSTA-6: As noted previously, the project is designed to result in a reduction of stormwater runoff from current conditions. Accordingly, the project would not result in an increase of off-site flow that could exacerbate any existing conditions in Tice Creek. The project would actually result in a reduction in off-site flow from current conditions. Therefore, impacts related to flooding and water quality in Tice Creek were found to be less than significant.

CONTRA COSTA-7: The commenter requests that the analysis required to demonstrate that the project would maintain pre-development peak flow rates be included in the Draft EIR.

Response to CONTRA COSTA-7: As noted previously, the project is designed to result in a reduction of stormwater runoff from current conditions. Accordingly, the project would not result in an increase of off-site flow that could exacerbate any existing conditions in Tice Creek. The project would actually result in a reduction in off-site flow from current conditions. Therefore, impacts related to flooding and water quality in Tice Creek were found to be less than significant.

CONTRA COSTA-8: The commenter raises questions related to volume of stormwater runoff, velocities of stormwater runoff, peak flows and duration of flows at Tice Creek, and requests that the Draft EIR analyze these issues.

Response to CONTRA COSTA-8: As noted previously, the project is designed to result in a reduction of stormwater runoff from current conditions. Accordingly, the project would not result in an increase of off-site flow that could exacerbate any existing conditions in Tice Creek. The project would actually result in a reduction in off-site flow from current conditions. Therefore, impacts related to flooding and water quality in Tice Creek were found to be less than significant.

CONTRA COSTA-9: The commenter raises questions related to flooding and the effect of stormwater runoff from the site on properties located in the flood zone.

Response to CONTRA COSTA-9: As noted previously, the project is designed to result in a reduction of stormwater runoff from current conditions. Accordingly, the project would not result in an increase in off-site flow that could exacerbate any existing conditions in Tice Creek. The project would actually result in a reduction in off-site flow from current conditions. Therefore, impacts related to flooding and water quality in Tice Creek were found to be less than significant.

CONTRA COSTA-10: The commenter raises questions related to Tice Creek erosion and instability in downstream reaches, and requests that the Draft EIR analyze the effect of the project on these issues.

Response to CONTRA COSTA-10: As noted previously, the project is designed to result in a reduction of stormwater runoff from current conditions. Accordingly, the project would not result in an increase of off-site flow that could exacerbate any existing conditions in Tice
Creek. The project would actually result in a reduction in off-site flow from current conditions. Therefore, impacts related to flooding and water quality in Tice Creek were found to be less than significant.

CONTRA COSTA-11: The commenter raises questions related to Rossmoor detention basin, and asks that the Draft EIR include analysis related to the downstream effect of project in conjunction with flows from Rossmoor detention basin.

Response to CONTRA COSTA-11: As noted previously, the project is designed to result in a reduction of stormwater runoff from current conditions. Accordingly, the project would not result in an increase of off-site flow that could exacerbate any existing conditions in Tice Creek, either from the project or in combination with flows from Rossmoor detention basin. The project would actually result in a reduction in off-site flow from current conditions. Therefore, impacts related to flooding and water quality in Tice Creek were found to be less than significant.

CONTRA COSTA-12: The commenter raises questions related to Rossmoor detention basin, and asks that the Draft EIR include analysis related to the downstream effects of peak flows from the project in conjunction with peak flows from Rossmoor detention basin.

Response to CONTRA COSTA-12: See response to comment 11 above.

Response to CCC -3
Contra Costa County states that it would appreciate receiving the responses of the applicant.

This comment is noted. The responses provided above are provided as part of the Final EIR.
Mr. Lochirco,

I am a Rossmoor resident who is very STRONGLY OPPOSED to the proposed Pulte development of Trellis planned for the five acres of land just outside Rossmoor for the following reasons: First, We selected Rossmoor as our retirement home because it is such a quiet and peaceful community away from dense population and traffic jams. The proposed Pulte development of Trellis would destroy the quiet character of our neighborhood. Second, I am amazed that so many living units (53) could even be crammed into such a small space as the five acres of this plot. Such development is appropriate to downtown or a much more heavily populated area, not our quiet neighborhood. Third, that use (53 units on five acres) is inconsistent with the surrounding land which has large populations of wild animals.

The only acceptable use for this land would be for recreational purposes or open space.

Please understand that I am very strongly against any such ill advised use of this land.

Thank you.

Elizabeth Albert
3316 Tice Creek Drive #3
Rossmoor
Walnut Creek, CA 94595
phone: (925) 954-8230
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Individuals

Elizabeth Albert (ALBERT)

Response to ALBERT-1

The commenter states that she is opposed to the project because the density of 53 units on five acres of land is not appropriate for the area. Master Response 1 addresses general comments in opposition to the project, while Master Response 4 discusses the density on the site and its compatibility with the General Plan and zoning for the area.

Response to ALBERT-2

The commenter states that the only acceptable use for this land would be for recreational purposes or open space.

The Draft EIR did include analysis of two project alternatives that focused on maintaining and expanding recreational/open space uses on the site. However, neither alternative was found to substantially reduce or avoid project impacts while meeting project objectives. As described in Section 6 of the Draft EIR, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, the following alternatives to the project were considered:

- No Project/Open Space Recreational Use (Alternative 1)
- No Project/Tice Valley Neighborhood Park Expansion (Alternative 2)
- Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 3)

Under Alternative 1, it is assumed that the City of Walnut Creek would purchase the property, remove the nursery and JCC facilities, and develop the open space recreational use area. However, the City of Walnut Creek has no plans to purchase the property at this time. Furthermore, none of the project objectives would be met under Alternative 1.

Under the No Project/Tice Valley Park Expansion Alternative (Alternative 2), development of the project would not occur. The project site would be developed for recreational use, consistent with its general land use designation of open space/recreation. Under Alternative 2, the City of Walnut Creek could hypothetically purchase the land to expand the existing Tice Valley Neighborhood Park. The main JCC building would be maintained as a community center and the interior space re-organized to add classrooms for recreational programs. A portion of the community center would be used as a rental facility for banquets and parties. The outdoor pool could be retained and reused, as would the children’s play area. The commercial nursery would be removed and replaced with a new dog park, outdoor bocce courts, and outdoor “workout stations.” The existing parking lot could be upgraded to accommodate recreational users at the existing Tice Valley Community Gymnasium and the Tice Valley Neighborhood Park, as well as the new recreational area replacing the commercial nursery, similar to the proposed project.

Alternative 2 would avoid or further reduce project impacts related to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, population and housing, public services and recreation, and utilities and service systems. Impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, and transportation and traffic would be increased compared with the proposed project.
None of these alternatives meet the project objectives as described in the DEIR. However, the City is not obligated to select or approve one or more of the alternatives; rather, the alternatives are presented for informational purposes in order to allow a meaningful comparison between various development scenarios, and allow for informed decision-making.

Response to ALBERT-3
The commenter again expresses opposition to the project.

The comment is noted. Please see Response to Master Comment 1, General Opposition to the Project.
Hi Jeremy,

Here is my first comment on the DEIR. I have browsed the document, but not looked in depth at too much yet.

During the construction of the main entrance road to Rossmoor (Rossmoor Parkway), construction equipment started digging up bones which were stored in boxes until somebody found out and reported it. This resulted in a proper archeological dig at the site (Blue Triangle below):

![Map of Rossmoor Parkway and Blue Triangle](image)

The resultant dig uncovered about 8 skeletal remains and evidence of a Saklan village thought to have been inhabited by about 75 Native Americans.

A plaque is in place that commemorates this and is located next to the Church parking lot – on the South side of Rossmoor Parkway between the Catholic Church and the Rossmoor gate. Also visible here are the grinding holes left in the rock near the plaque. This village was occupied from about 1500 to the early 1700’s when the missionaries forced the Native American villagers into the mission system.

This archeological dig is discussed in a book by one of the participants (including photos of artifacts and human remains):
Rossmoor, Walnut Creek, Tice Valley: 500 years of human history

by Frederickson, Vera-Mae

It is available from the vault at the Pleasant Hill Library.

I did a quick Google measurement for the distance between the Native American village and the Trellis site and came up with about ¼ mile.

Since the majority of the Trellis site area, the playground area, and the Church property parking lot have literally just had the surface scratched, I think that serious consideration of the potential for further Native American/early Spanish occupation finds must be realized and accounted for in the EIR.

The construction of Rossmoor Parkway destroyed most, if not all of the known village site.

With over 200 years of continuous habitation in this village, located so close to the project, I believe there is a high probability that further archeological finds will be uncovered within the Trellis project.

It is also interesting that there is an inscription on a rock outcropping above the Trellis site – “Tice 1855”, thought to have been scratched into the rock by Tice himself when he lived there. This site also has recently been commemorated with a plaque.

That these two documented archeological/historical sites were not identified in the DEIR is concerning to me. Hopefully, further review of the balance of the DEIR will prove to be more acceptable. I do find the traffic analysis to be good (although exhaustingly long).

Regards,

Steve Francis
Steve Francis (FRANCIS-#1)

Response to FRANCIS-#1-1
The commenter points out that a known cultural resource in the vicinity, the Rossmoor Site, is not properly described in the DEIR.

Section 3.4 of the DEIR has been revised to reflect this, including a revision to one of the mitigation measures for Cultural Resources, as described in Master Response 6 and in Section 3, Errata.

Response to FRANCIS-#1-2
The commenter suggests that the EIR should give serious consideration of the potential to uncover further evidence of Native American/early Spanish occupation, and that this must be accounted for in the EIR.

As discussed in Master Response 6, Mitigation Measure CR-1 has been revised to account for the possibility that archaeological resources could be encountered during site excavation.

Response to FRANCIS-#1-3
The commenter states that there is a high probability that further archaeological finds will be uncovered during construction of the Trellis project.

Please refer to Master Response 6.

Response to FRANCIS-#1-4
The commenter notes the presence of an inscription on a rock outcropping above the Trellis site “Tice 1855” that has been commemorated with a plaque.

The inscription and the plaque are accessible from a trail from the Rossmoor side of the hill, and the Rossmoor Historical Society recently installed the plaque. The inscription site is not listed in the City’s General Plan Built Environment Chapter as a either a “Historic Resource” or “Potentially Historic Resource.” The site, as the commenter noted, is uphill and approximately 1,065 feet from the southern boundary of the project. Section 3.4, page 3.4-8, third paragraph of the EIR has been revised to note this site, as shown in Section 3, Errata.

Response to FRANCIS-#1-5
The commenter reiterates his concern regarding the Rossmoor site and the Tice 1855 inscription.

Comment noted. Concerns about the Rossmoor archaeological site have been addressed in Master Response 6, and the DEIR text has been changed to reflect the existence of the Tice inscription, as described above in Response to FRANCIS-#1-4.
Hello Jeremy,

I only have one comment concerning the DEIR for the Pulte Trellis Project:

The DEIR does not list the abandoned Native American village that was located near the entrance to Rossmoor. It consisted of about 70 to 80 residents and was occupied from around 1500 to the 1700's when the Spanish forced the Native Americans to go to the missions. The site was examined when bones started to turn up during the construction of the main access road to Rossmoor in the early 1960's. A review of this dig and what was found can be found in the book:

**Rossmoor, Walnut Creek, Tice Valley: 500 Years of Human History**

By Vera-Mae Fredrickson

This book is available at the Contra Costa Library.

Since the Trellis site is so close to this ancient Native American village, there is a good possibility that further artifacts might be uncovered during the construction of the Trellis Project.

I would like to see some mention of this in the EIR and the necessary mitigation that will have to take place to avoid the desecration that occurred during the construction of the Rossmoor Parkway road works.

It should also be noted that there is a rock inscription up the hill behind the gymnasium. This inscription reads "TICE 1855" and is thought to have been scratched there by Tice himself.

Both of these sites have been landmarked by plaques placed by the Rossmoor Historical Society and are easily located.

Although I have some concerns about the Trellis Project, none relate to the EIR. I will relate these other concerns either in other emails or at public meeting comment time.

Regards,

Steve Francis
Steve Francis (FRANCIS-#2)

Response to FRANCIS-#2-1
The commenter points out that a known cultural resource in the vicinity, the Rossmoor Site, is not properly described in the DEIR.

Master Response 6 discusses the Archaeological/Native American sensitivity and Rossmoor Site.

Response to FRANCIS-#2-2
The commenter suggests that the EIR should note that there is a rock inscription up the hill behind the gymnasium, and that the inscription itself might have some cultural relevance.

As discussed in Response #1-4 above, Section 3.4, page 3.4-8, third paragraph of the EIR has been revised to note the presence of the rock inscription, as shown in Section 3, Errata.

Response to FRANCIS-#2-3
The commenter states that both of these sites (the rock inscription location and the Rossmoor Site) have been landmarked and they are easy to locate. As noted above, the Draft EIR has been revised to note the presence of these two resources (see Master Response 6 and Section 3, Errata).
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Hello Mr. Lochirco and Mayor Simmons,

My family lives about 1/3 mile from the proposed housing development and I am extremely concerned about a number of issues not addressed, or addressed inadequately in the DEIR.

There is a reason why this area is designated for open space/recreation. It is beautiful and most likely archaeologically significant.

We moved here because it is beautiful and quiet. We see raptors and migratory birds daily on our land which overlooks Tice Valley. The proposed development will remove trees from the site and possibly from the adjacent park. Regardless of what the DEIR finds, it is simply not possible that this will not adversely affect the ecology of our little valley.

I strongly support Alternatives 1 and 2 (No Project alternatives). These would mean that the city of Walnut Creek purchases the land from the JCC, but would make this beautiful space accessible to everyone. These alternatives are the only 2 described in the DEIR which are consistent with the site's intended use.

Where will the kids from these homes attend school? Parkmead and WCI are already impacted. We are a welcoming community and I strongly support the need for low-income housing options in Walnut Creek, but NOT when it comes at the expense of our shared natural resources and open space. This irrevocably changes the character of the area that drew us here in the first place.

Is high density housing really necessary in every underutilized area in Walnut Creek? Can't we prioritize open space and natural habitat once in a while? Once that land is developed it will forever change the habitat and nature of our lovely valley.

Thank you for the work you do,

Meredith and Jarrod Gerhardt
1920 Meadow Lane
Walnut Creek 94595
Meredith and Jarrod Gerhardt (GERHARDT)

Response to GERHARDT-1
The commenter expresses concern about issues that are not addressed in the DEIR.

The comment is noted.

Response to GERHARDT-2
The commenter states that the reason why this area is designated for open space/recreation is because it is beautiful and most likely archaeologically significant.

Master Response 6, Archaeological Resources and the Rossmoor Site discusses the archaeological significance of the site, and notes specific revisions to the DEIR to more fully disclose and respond to potential archeological resources.

Response to GERHARDT-3
This commenter expresses concerns regarding tree removal and the effect of the project on the local environment, noting the presence of raptors and migratory birds in the area.

The proposed project will remove or adversely affect approximately 54 of the 72 mature trees that are located on or immediately adjacent to the site. Fifteen of the existing trees designated as “Highly Protected Trees,” as defined by the City’s Tree Preservation Ordinance, would be preserved in place, as would three non-protected trees. Approximately 240 trees and larger shrubs would be planted throughout the site, as well as ground cover and other plants.

Mitigation Measure MM BIO-1 requires inspections of all trees on the site and within 250 feet outside of the boundary of the site to be conducted by a qualified biologist for active nests of raptors and migratory birds prior to any tree removal or construction on the site during the breeding/nesting season for local avian species. This mitigation measure would reduce impacts to nesting birds during construction activities to a less than significant level.

Response to GERHARDT-4
The commenter supports Alternatives 1 and 2 (No Project alternatives).

As described in Section 6, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, the following alternatives to the project were considered:

- No Project/Open Space Recreational Use (Alternative 1)
- No Project/Tice Valley Neighborhood Park Expansion (Alternative 2)
- Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 3)

None of the alternatives were found to substantially reduce or avoid project impacts while meeting project objectives. Under Alternative 1, it is assumed that the City of Walnut Creek would purchase the property, remove the nursery and JCC facilities, and develop the open space recreational use area. However, the City of Walnut Creek has no plans to purchase the property at this time. Furthermore, none of the project objectives would be met under Alternative 1.
Under the No Project/Tice Valley Park Expansion Alternative (Alternative 2), development of the project would not occur. The project site would be developed for recreational use, consistent with its general land use designation of open space/recreation. Under Alternative 2, the City of Walnut Creek could hypothetically purchase the land to expand the existing Tice Valley Neighborhood Park. The main JCC building would be maintained as a community center and the interior space re-organized to add classrooms for recreational programs. A portion of the community center would be used as a rental facility for banquets and parties. The outdoor pool could be retained and reused, as would the children’s play area. The commercial nursery would be removed and replaced with a new dog park, outdoor bocce courts, and outdoor “workout stations.” The existing parking lot could be upgraded to accommodate recreational users at the existing Tice Valley Community Gymnasium and the Tice Valley Neighborhood Park, as well as the new recreational area replacing the commercial nursery, similar to the proposed project.

Alternative 2 would avoid or further reduce project impacts related to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, population and housing, public services and recreation, and utilities and service systems. However, impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, and transportation and traffic would be increased compared with the proposed project.

None of these alternatives meet the project objectives as described in the DEIR. However, the City is not obligated to select or approve one or more of the alternatives; rather, the alternatives are presented for informational purposes in order to allow a meaningful comparison between various development scenarios, and allow for informed decision-making.

Response to GERHARDT-5
The commenter asks where the kids from these homes will attend school, noting that Parkmead and WCI [Walnut Creek Intermediate School] are already impacted.

Master Response 3 discusses the ability of local schools to accommodate new students to be generated by the project.

Response to GERHARDT-6
The commenter states support for low-income housing options, but not at the expense of natural resources and open space. The project will irrevocably change the character of the area.

Master Response 5 discusses the character of the area and quality of life. This is not a CEQA issue. The project is not restricted to low-income households and as such will be priced according to the larger marketplace for new single-family homes.

Response to GERHARDT-7
The commenter generally questions the need for the project. The comment asks if high-density housing is really necessary.

It is important to clarify that high-density housing is not proposed as part of the project. The project proponent proposes a change in General Plan designation to MFL. A mix of detached single-family
dwellings and duplexes would be constructed at a density of 10 units per acre, which meets the General Plan definition of MFL. See Master Response 4.

Master Response 1 responds to general comments opposed to the project.
Hello,

I am writing to provide feedback to the impact report recently released for the Trellis by Pulte project slated to be built in the Tice Valley neighborhood of Walnut Creek.

My main concern is the omission of a traffic study at the Meadow Road and Tice Valley Blvd. intersection. This is going to be one of the main intersections affected, yet it was part of the traffic study. This intersection should be studied and tested and the traffic effects released in the next report so that those of us who live in the area can review.

Also, in light of the increased car traffic that will be heading not only into downtown, but also to the Parkmead Elementary school, I think that the entrance to Newell Ave. from Olympic needs to be reopened to allow for some of the Trellis traffic to take that route to the school. Currently, the only route for all of the parents to take in the AM to the elementary school is down Tice, across Meadow, down Lancaster all the way to Newell. This will put 100% of the traffic burden on those of us who live on this route. I think it's only fair that the Olympic to Newell route take a fair share of school traffic in the mornings and afternoons.

Thank you for addressing the above concerns. I look forward to hearing from you.

Lindsay Gray
Meadow Road, Walnut Creek
Lindsay Gray (GRAY)

Response to GRAY-1
The comment suggests the DEIR should have included analysis of the traffic impacts of the project at the Meadow Road and Tice Valley Blvd.

Master Response 2 describes the approach and methodology of the traffic analysis, including why intersections were identified for further evaluation.

Response to GRAY-2
The comment suggests reopening the entrance to Newell Avenue from Olympic Boulevard to relieve the increase in traffic to Parkmead Elementary School.

The traffic generated by the project that would potentially use Newell Avenue would be somewhat less than the amount estimated to travel to Olympic Boulevard and I-680. With respect to the project trip distribution, the percentage of trips would be 40 percent to/from Olympic Boulevard and I-680, or 16 AM peak-hour trips and 22 PM peak-hour trips.

The other way to analyze the potential need for a right turn at Newell Avenue would be the additional elementary and middle school students generated by the project. According to DEIR Section 3.12.5 Schools, the project is expected to generate 27 elementary and middle school students. The DEIR has been revised to reflect that the Dorris Eaton school site, which previously operated as a private school, reverted to a public K-6 school in Fall 2015. Therefore, the trips that were made by students attending Dorris Eaton before its closure would be replaced by new students attending the new, public Tice Creek School in the same facility. Neither analysis results in a significant amount of new trips to that location that would warrant changing the existing traffic pattern.
From: Kelly Huddleston [mailto:kellyleerobbins@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2015 12:20 PM
To: candace.andersen@bos.cccounty.us
Cc: Jeremy Lochirco
Subject: Trellis Development - Pulte Homes

Dear Supervisor Anderson:

I’m writing to you to request your help for the residents in my neighborhood of Tice Valley. I live at the corner of Tice Valley Blvd. and Meadow Road. We are concerned about the traffic impacts from the proposed development Trellis by Pulte Homes at 2170 Tice Valley Blvd., Walnut Creek. The DEIR appendix J Transportation and Traffic report addresses five of the intersections on Tice Valley Boulevard: Olympic Boulevard/Tice Valley Boulevard; Rolling Hills Drive/Tice Valley Boulevard; Rossmoor Parkway/Tice Valley Boulevard; Montecillo Drive/Tice Valley Boulevard; Crest Avenue/Tice Valley Boulevard. Why is the three way stop at Meadow Road/Tice Valley Boulevard completely ignored? With the additional 100-200 cars per day that will travel past my house nothing is being done to make this area safer for residents of this unincorporated area of Walnut Creek. Many of us in this area walk and bike on Tice Valley Boulevard to reach the grocery and drug store at the Rossmoor Shopping Center. **We need a sidewalk** to connect the neighborhood to the Rossmoor Shopping Center that is currently being remodeled and expanded, again creating more traffic on this small country road called Tice Valley Boulevard. Development in greater Contra Costa County cannot be stopped but please help us make the streets safer by extending the sidewalk from the Trellis project to the intersection of Tice Valley Boulevard and Meadow Road. The addition of a sidewalk would give us and our children safe passage to neighborhood services and keep many cars off the already busy roads. Thank you for help.

Please let me know if meeting in person would be helpful.

Thank you,

Kelly Huddleston
925-324-0421
Kelly Huddleston (HUDDLESTON)

Response to HUDDLESTON-1
The comment concerns the lack of traffic analysis for the three way stop at Meadow Road/Tice Valley Boulevard in the EIR.

Master Response 2 – Traffic discusses the methodology and approach to the traffic analysis, including the selection of intersections for further study.

Response to HUDDLESTON-2
The comment concerns safety for residents, pedestrians, and bikers due to the increase in traffic in the project area.

As discussed in Section 2, Project Description, of the DEIR, the project includes various improvements within the public right-of-way for Tice Valley Boulevard. These improvements may include the construction of traffic calming elements, pedestrian enhancements, bike lanes, frontage sidewalk replacement, median construction, and other related street improvements as required by the City. All street and parking lot improvements would adhere to the specifications established by both the Walnut Creek General Plan 2025 Circulation Element and the City’s Municipal Code.

Response to HUDDLESTON-3
The commenter states a need for a sidewalk to connect the neighborhood to the Rossmoor Shopping Center for the safety of pedestrians and bikers.

There is a sidewalk on either side of Tice Valley Boulevard from Tice Valley Lane westward to Rossmoor Shopping Center. The proposed project does include pedestrian safety measures along its frontage and within the project site, but the commenter is correct in that there is no continuous sidewalk on either side of Tice Valley Boulevard east of Tice Valley Lane to Meadow Road. Furthermore, there is no basis to require the applicant for the Trellis Project to construct pedestrian improvements between Tice Valley Lane and Meadow Road based on the number of trips generated and the distribution of impacts. See also Master Response 2.
Hi Jeremy,

I am writing to voice my concerns about the proposed Pulte Home development on Tice Valley Road- where the old Jewish Community Center currently is.

Unlike many of the residents that have lived here a long time and for generations, my husband and I moved to the neighborhood (on Creekdale Road just off of Castle Glen/Tice Valley) late last year (2015). We, like so many before us, and surely so many to follow, moved here from SF seeking a respite from the city, a larger home, and some peace and quiet. We lovingly refer to our new life in Tice Valley as "life in the country". We love that we don't live in the city, and that we live in a place that doesn't feel like a generic suburb.

We purposely chose this community because it wasn't downtown. Because it wasn't infiltrated with new housing developments. Because there wasn't too much new build around us. Because there was actually space in between houses and we weren't on top of our neighbors. We cherish the fact that the houses in our neighborhood all look different- have their own unique look and feel. It's not cookie cutter not generic.

We live less than a mile from the site of the proposed housing development and pass it at least twice a day. I can not imagine the impact 53 new homes (especially on such a small amount of land) would have on this neighborhood. The increased traffic. The noise. The pollution. The overall environmental impact. Can our community and existing infrastructure even accommodate so many more residents?! Our roads, schools, public safety and law enforcement? This project, coupled with the other existing new housing developments in the works will bring more than 820 new apts, condos and single family homes to Walnut Creek in the next few years.

The most important thing of all -- this would change the entire neighborhood. We would no longer have the uniqueness that attracted so many of the people that live here. We'd no longer have a community center and garden- but an eye sore that would only result in a lower quality of life. It would be another planned community-- all homes squished together and all looking alike stripping us of the uniqueness and community feeling that Tice Valley is known for.

I know it's a time of growth. And that Walnut Creek is pushing hard to do so. And I realize that change is necessary. But I urge you to slow down the process. There's a reason this land was not zoned for this kind of development. Open space and community gathering spaces are valuable to the people of this community. Are there any other options?? Can the new developments be confined to the city center rather than barging into our neighborhoods?

If not, then I urge you to please revisit the proposal and make the greedy developers re-work their plan. There needs to be more of a set back from the housing development to the road, more
visitor parking built into the plan, and ultimately fewer houses on larger lots so that they aren't all crammed in like sardines. This can't be an eye sore in our community.

The developers are only thinking about the bottom line. They are only thinking about themselves. They don't care about our community or what's going to be best for the thousands of residents that live here. We're just another "get" for them, and then they will move onto develop in some other area once this project is completed. We'd be the ones left to pick up the pieces.

Please listen to the members of this community and show us that we didn't make a mistake when we chose to live in Walnut Creek.

Thank you for your consideration.
Jamie

--

Jamie Law
p: 415.517.4782
**Jamie Law (LAW)**

*Response to LAW-1*

The commenter raises general concerns about the proposed project. The comment does not provide specific commentary on the analysis or findings within the Draft EIR, nor does it specifically address any substantive environmental topic areas as identified by CEQA or the CEQA Guidelines. Master Response 1 addresses general opposition to the project.

*Response to LAW-2*

This comment suggests that the project would result in air quality, noise, and traffic impacts to the existing neighborhood.

Master Response 2 discusses the traffic analysis contained in the DEIR. The traffic analysis in the DEIR concluded that no significant traffic impacts would result from additional vehicle trips generated by the project. Short-term air quality and noise impacts associated with project construction can be mitigated to levels below significant as described in Sections 3-2 and 3-10, respectively of the Draft EIR.

*Response to LAW-3*

This comment questions how the community’s public services and infrastructure could accommodate this project.

Section 3-12 of the DEIR analyzed potential impacts from the project on schools, public safety, and law enforcement and concluded that less than significant impacts would result from the addition of 53 homes in a City of 65,000 residents. Cumulative effects of new developments in the area that are currently planned or under construction also were taken into account in the analysis. The potential impact to schools is discussed in more detail in Master Response 3, Schools.

*Response to LAW-4*

This comment concerns about the overall characteristics of the surrounding area and the quality of life.

Master Response 5 discusses the character of the area and quality of life concerns.

*Response to LAW-5*

This comment concerns open space and suggests the new development be confined to the city center rather than the neighborhood.

Master Response 4 discusses the General Plan Designation, Density, and Zoning of the project site.

*Response to LAW-6*

This comment suggests a revisit to the proposals, and to incorporate some sort of compromise for from the developers.

Master Response 5, Character of the Surrounding area/Quality of Life describes the zoning code requirements that will require Design Review Commission approval of the residential designs and landscaping plan to ensure compatibility with surrounding land uses.
Response to LAW-7
This comment makes general comments outside the purview of CEQA.

Please see Master Response 1, General Opposition to the Project.
Hi Jeremy and Mayor Simmons,

My name is Dabney Lawless and I live in Tice Valley. I moved here two years ago and selected our home based on the country-like feel and the uniqueness of the area. Not long ago I was made aware of the plans currently under review to put over 50 new homes on a less than 6 acre site. I thought it was a joke. Until I realized how truly serious this is.

I recognize this is a time of growth for Walnut Creek and I understand that the city is dealing with pressures from the state to create more affordable housing options near mass transit - however I can't understand how anyone on the city counsel, in the mayor's office or in the planning department can in good conscious approve this project. This is not affordable housing near bart, this is not housing that helps bring more business downtown - this is just overcrowded suburban blight in a neighborhood coveted for its community feel and charm.

Would Walnut Creek approve a development on my 2/3 acre property for six new homes? Should I greedily sell it to Pulte and make enough money to buy a much nicer home in Alamo and say screw my neighbors and the neighborhood - this is about me getting mine? That is what this feels like.

It is appalling to think of 50+ homes on that site. Please think about what this means - the impact this will have on our schools, our property values, the traffic on Tice Valley. This is not an acceptable project. Our schools are already over crowded by many standards and this will directly impact class room size. This housing development is specifically geared towards younger families - families with school aged children.

People in our neighborhood pay a premium for good schools and a quiet, country feeling neighborhood. This property is zoned for open space or recreation - not for 53 new homes piled up on top of one another. I went and looked at the homes in Orinda that Pulte built and they are an eye-sore and built so close together that is has a truly urban feel - not even suburban - no less country which Tice Valley is known for. This is a beautiful part of our city - one of the last country-like areas left.

The developers are not thinking about Walnut Creek or the community - they are thinking about how much money they can make by cramming in as many homes as humanly possible - much like a clown car - not a well thought out community that would align with the neighborhood. Not to mention the potential damage to the Saklan Indian artifacts and remains.

I urge you to stop and think about the environmental impact, how this will impact our creek? How will this impact the people that live here and care for our homes - the people that pay premium property taxes for good schools and a quiet, country neighborhood? Please do not let
this happen to Tice Valley. Please look at what Orinda's Pulte properties look like and if that makes sense in this neighborhood.

If you can't reserve this land for park or open space - please, please, please consider turning down the disaster notion that 53 homes can comfortably sit on a 6 acre property. Please have them look at a more reasonable plan such as 20 or 25 homes.

I truly appreciate you listening to the community on this and not just throwing us over to greedy developers who do NOT have Walnut Creek's best interest at heart.

Best,
Dabney Lawless
Meadow Lane
Dabney Lawless (LAWLESS)

Response to LAWLESS-1
The comment states that this project is not appropriate for the neighborhood.

Master Response 1, General Opposition to the Project responds to qualitative comments of this type. Master Response 4 General Plan Designation, Density and Zoning discusses concerns related to density and overcrowding. Master Response 5 – Character of Surrounding Area/Quality of Life discusses the project’s potential to change the character of the area.

Response to LAWLESS-2
The commenter expresses frustration about the change to the existing density and zoning, and asks whether the same would be allowed on his two-thirds-acre lot.

The comment does not raise specific issues related to the CEQA analysis contained within the DEIR. Please see Master Response 1, General Opposition.

Response to LAWLESS-3
The comment raises concern related to schools and traffic on Tice Valley Boulevard.

Master Response 2 discusses the traffic analysis of the project. Master Response 3 discusses the project’s impacts on schools.

Response to LAWLESS-4
The comment states that the project site is geared towards younger families, which have a large impact on schools.

See Master Response 3, Schools.

Response to LAWLESS-5
The comment raises concerns about the loss of country-like aesthetics.

Master Response 5 discusses the character of the surrounding area and the quality of life.

Response to LAWLESS-6
The comment states that the developers are not thinking about Walnut Creek or the community.

This comment is noted and no response is necessary.

Response to LAWLESS-7
The comment raises concerns about the Saklan Indian artifacts and remains.

Master Response 6 discusses the archaeological/native American sensitivity and Rossmoor site.

Response to LAWLESS-8
The comment concerns about the nearby creeks.

Section 3.8 of the DEIR, Hydrology, analyzed the potential for the project to impact Tice Creek through runoff of stormwater from the site. Walnut Creek requires all new developments to have an
approved Stormwater Management Plan. The DEIR includes the draft stormwater control plan in Appendix G, which demonstrates that the 28 proposed bio-filtration areas have sufficient capacity to accommodate stormwater such that the project would reduce the volume of offsite flow during storm events. As such, the project would have a positive effect on the potential for flooding and erosion along Tice Creek.

Response to LAWLESS-9
The comment states general opposition to the project.

This comment is noted. Please see Master Response 1, General Opposition.

Response to LAWLESS-10
The commenter requests that the site be developed with fewer homes.

The project was reduced in size from 71 to 53 residential units. As described in the Draft EIR, the project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts; all impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level. The DEIR did evaluate alternatives to the project and found that none of the alternatives would result in fewer impacts than the project, as designed, while meeting most of the project objectives.
From: Tim Ory [mailto:timory49@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2015 1:52 PM
To: Jeremy Lochirco
Subject: pulte develoment

Mr. Lochirco, my name is tim ory and I reside at 1697 castle hill rd.,w.c.and strongly oppose the pulte develoment proposal located at the old jcc site. I have no poltical connections, no fiancial interests, receive no money from developers or politicians. The proposal does not fit the semi rural area, it is too dense, zoning was not planned for high density develoment. There is no mitigation for increased traffic along such streets as Tice Valley Rd., Meadow Rd., Castle Hill Rd., Lancaster Rd., etc. The perception locally is that the city of Walnut Creek will rubber stamp all develoment requests; i can only ask you to be objective about this project and consider all aspects of this, i thought such density should be confined near transport hubs, i.e. Bart Stations, to avoid urban sprawl. Thankyou, tim ory
Tim Ory (ORY)

Response to ORY-1
This comment expresses general opposition to the project.

Master Response 1 addresses general opposition to the project.

Response to ORY-2
This comment raises concerns about the density of the project and the proposed zoning.

Master Response 4 discusses the density on the site and its compatibility with the General Plan and zoning for the area, and Master Response 5 describes the mitigation measures provided in the DEIR for addressing community character and quality of life.

Response to ORY-3
The commenter raises concerns related to increased traffic resulting from the project.

Master Response 2 – Traffic discusses the methodology and analysis of project traffic on local roadways. Master Response 4 discusses the density on the site and its compatibility with the General Plan and zoning for the area, and Master Response 5 discusses community character and quality of life.

Response to ORY-4
This comment raises general concerns about density and expresses opposition to the project.

Master Response 4 discusses the density on the site and its compatibility with the General Plan and zoning for the area. See also Master Response 1, General Opposition to the Project.
Dear Mr. Lochirco,

Thank you for the Notice of Completion of the draft EIR for the proposed Pulte project.

I have written letters in the past expressing my concern over this proposed project. I live on Coventry Court a short walk from the Project and am bewildered to think of 53 homes and the people and automobiles that will result should the current proposed project be approved.

The Gym next door, which is a great community asset, frequently generates traffic and parking needs that exceed current parking and roadside space. How will the Pulte project interface with this reality?

In the past, I have expressed my concern about the narrow roadway South of the project that is hazardous for pedestrians and cyclists alike. Not only does Rossmoor generate a fair amount of traffic, but when there is a problem on Highway #680, many have discovered this diversion to Highway #24.

I implore the City decision makers to think long and hard about the density of this project. In its current form, it will have a very negative impact on the quality of life of the existing community.

Pulte, like most developers, is out to optimize their land use. They came in with an outlandish development proposal to begin with, and now we are suppose to be grateful for this reduced, and equally outlandish, proposal!

One can only hope the Planning Dept., Commission, and City Council will have the courage to stand up for a project more suitable to this semi-rural community in terms of height, density, and parking. Pulte has everything to gain and can leave town; we on the other hand, must live with whatever it is you approve! Sincerely, Elaine Ove
**Elaine Ove (OVE)**

*Response to OVE-1*

The commenter is concerned about the project, particularly the number of automobiles that will result.

Draft EIR Section 3.13, Traffic and Transportation analyzed the effect of new vehicle trips on local roadways, finding that all local intersections would continue to operate acceptably following implementation of the project and in cumulative condition (Year 2030). Please also see Master Response 2 – Traffic, for further discussion of traffic resulting from the project.

*Response to OVE-2*

The commenter asks how the project will interface with the traffic and parking demand generated by the gym next door.

As described in the DEIR Section 2, Project Description, the project site would be accessed by four driveways along Tice Valley Boulevard. Two of the driveways would access the parking lot for the Tice Valley Community Gymnasium, while the other two would access the residential portion of the project site. There would be no driveway or street connection between the residential portion of the project and the gym parking lot. The gym parking lot will be enlarged and reconfigured to provide up to 241 parking spaces.

*Response to OVE-3*

This comment cites existing traffic from Rossmoor and traffic from outside the area that uses Tice Valley Boulevard as a cut through to Highway 680 when there is congestion on either 680 or Highway 24.

Master Response 2, Traffic Concerns, responds to traffic issues in the neighborhood.

The existing traffic in the area was assessed by conducting counts of the actual traffic in the area. Operating conditions during the AM and PM peak periods were evaluated to capture the highest potential impacts of the project, as well as the highest volumes on the local transportation network. The AM peak hour occurs between 7:00 and 9:00 a.m., and reflects conditions during the home to work or school commute, while the PM peak hour occurs between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m. and typically reflects the highest level of congestion during the homeward-bound commute. These counts would include any traffic that is using the area to cut through from 680 to 24 or vice versa due to rush hour congestion.

With the existing traffic volumes observed, all study area intersections are operating acceptably based on the applicable standards, and would continue to operate acceptably with the addition of project traffic.

*Response to OVE-4*

The comment concerns the effect of the project on quality of life in the community

Master Response 5 – Character of the Surrounding Community/Quality of Life provides further discussion regarding the effect of the project on the character of the area and quality of life.
Response to OVE-5

The commenter expresses general opposition to the project.

See Master Response 1 – General Opposition to the Project.
To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to you regarding the new development planned on Tice Valley Blvd. where the old Jewish Community Center is. My property backs up to the little road that takes people to the Rosmoor Gardens. My biggest fear is that there will be two - three story buildings close to the lot line looming over my back yard and my privacy will be lost. I will lose the feel of my back yard and the reason we bought in this area will be changed forever. When we bought this house there were horses grazing on the hill behind my house, We were not happy when the Rosmoor gardens took it over. We have adjusted, although we do contend with cars at all hours and head lights etc. But now to have this development of over 50 houses in my back yard. I think I will never see the sunset again. I will lose my privacy and it will change what is one of the nicest and best parts of Walnut Creek into everywhere else.

I do understand that to let the place sit empty is a problem. But at least build homes that are one story that have bigger yards like the houses of the neighborhood it will be in. I do not want to live downtown in any city. I love the feel of Tice Valley why I have not moved in over 30 years , and why most people that move here stay. We have the best of both worlds minutes away from downtown but large beautiful yards with space and the feel of the country at home.

I urge you, please, do not allow this project to go through as planned but ask that it be drastically reduced and have them include in a much smaller project some walking paths with lots of trees and plants for the surrounding area to use. Not another highrise high density building project. The city does NOT need this and mostly Tice Valley doesn’t. Im sure no matter how it gets spinned that there will be more traffic, and noise with the size of this project as planned. I also urge you to have a greater set back from the side of the property that is near any homes. IF there was a walking path around the outside of the project that might help mitigate noise and the loss of privacy that I fear will happen with the project as planned.

I respectfully ask that you revise this project to be more in keeping with the neighborhood it is in.

Thank you, Jill Reich
15 Ellery Ct
Walnut Creek, 94595
925-932 6061
THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
Jill Reich (REICH)

Response to REICH-1
This comment concerns the increased density that would lead to a loss of privacy in her home.

See Master Response 5 for a discussion of how the project will conform to community character through design review. See also Master Response 4 for a discussion of density.

Response to REICH-2
This comment concerns loss of the aesthetic appeal of Walnut Creek, and the ability to see the sunset over the site.

CEQA does not evaluate the effect of projects on private view corridors; CEQA focuses on scenic resources and publicly accessible vistas to these resources. Generally, while a project's interference with public scenic views from public vantage points will be considered to be an adverse aesthetic effect on the environment, the obstruction of individual landowners’ views from private property is not considered to be a significant environmental impact under CEQA. This is because the purpose of CEQA is to evaluate the impacts of a project on the environment in general, not the impacts of a project on particular individuals (see Mira Mar Mobile Community v. City of Oceanside (2004) 119 Cal.App.4th 477; Bowman v. City of Berkeley (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 572). As discussed in DEIR Section 3.1, Aesthetics, Tice Valley Boulevard is designated a Scenic Corridor by the General Plan. The analysis found that because of the height limitation of 29 feet for the dwelling units, the required minimum setbacks and the intervening existing and proposed landscaping, that the project would not impair views from the roadway.

Master Response 5 discusses the character of the surrounding area and the quality of life.

Response to REICH-3
This comment suggests building only one-story homes to keep the open space and the country-like characteristics of this neighborhood.

See Master Response 5 for a discussion of how the project will conform to community character. See also Master Response 4 for a discussion of density.

Response to REICH-4
This comment suggests the project be reduced in size and include some walking paths and greenery for the surrounding area to use, and requests that a high-rise, high-density project not be permitted.

The project includes landscaped paseos that will connect to the Tice Valley Neighborhood Park, as described in Section 2, Project Description, Recreational Space, and Amenities.

A high-rise project is not proposed. The maximum height of the units is 29 feet.

Response to REICH-5
This comment suggests that the project would result in air quality, noise, and traffic impacts to the existing neighborhood.
Master Response 2 discusses the traffic analysis of impacts to the surrounding area. The traffic analysis in the DEIR concluded that no significant traffic impacts would result from additional vehicle trips generated by the project. Short-term air quality and noise impacts due to construction can be mitigated to levels below significant through adherence to standard city regulations concerning construction hours and best management practices related to dust suppression and emission reductions, as described in Sections 3-2- and 3-10, respectively.

Response to REICH-6
This comment urges the City to require a greater set back from the side of the property that is near to any homes.

The proposed design will provide a 15-foot wide paseo along the eastern property line that will provide pedestrian access to six homes in the easternmost portion of the site. The comment is noted and will be taken into consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council when it considers approval of the project.

Response to REICH-7
This comment suggests requiring a walking path around the perimeter of the project as a mitigation measure for the loss of privacy and noise.

The proposed design will provide a 15-foot wide paseo along the eastern property line that will provide pedestrian access to six homes in the easternmost portion of the site. This paseo will connect to other internal circulation for pedestrians and vehicles, including common open space areas. The comment is noted and will be taken into consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council when it considers approval of the project.
Jeremy Lochirco  
Walnut Creek City Planner

My family and I are 33 year homeowners and residents of a tice valley home off of Tice Valley Blvd, less than half a mile from the project area. We purchased here for the rural setting of this valley and the large lots, ours is .66 acres. This area currently welcomes abundant wildlife to traverse and forage. The Trellis project is NOT in keeping with the existing homes with large frontages, large lots of mostly half acre or more and the visual aesthetics we already enjoy. We want to keep the country like peaceful valley that it is.  
As an option perhaps Pulte could consider large semi custom family residences with minimum half acre lots to complement the style of homes already here.  
Please document that we oppose this development on valid reasoning and the increase in traffic especially easterly on Tice Valley Blvd, where soft road shoulders with open ditches are already a safety hazard for adult and children pedestrians, cyclists, motorists and roaming wildlife.

Sincerely,
Mrs. J Straw  
Sent from my iPad


**Janice Straw (STRAW)**

*Response to STRAW-1*

This comment states the appeal of this neighborhood, which is a semi-rural setting with an abundance of wildlife.

The comment is noted. Master Response 5 addresses concerns with the character of the surrounding area and the quality of life. Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR also addresses biological issues.

*Response to STRAW-2*

This comment states that the Trellis project is not keeping with the existing homes with large frontage, large lots of mostly half acre or more and the visual aesthetics that is important to the community.

Master Response 5 addresses concerns with the character of the surrounding area and the quality of life. See also Master Response 4 for a discussion of density and zoning.

*Response to STRAW-3*

This comment suggests considering a large semi-custom family residences with minimum half-acre lots to complement the style of homes already existing.

The comment is noted and will be taken into consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council when it considers approval of the project.

*Response to STRAW-4*

This comment states opposition to the development due to the increase in traffic, especially to the east of the project site where pedestrian amenities are absent and the existing soft shoulder and open ditches along the roadway presents a hazard for motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians.

Master Response 2 discusses the analysis of traffic concerns. As discussed in Section 2, Project Description and Section 3.13, Traffic and Transportation of the Draft EIR, the project includes the development of enhanced pedestrian amenities along the project frontage, including sidewalks and enhanced cross walks to ensure pedestrian safety across Tice Valley Boulevard.

Although enhanced pedestrian amenities would be welcome in many locations in the City, including to the east along Tice Valley Boulevard, there is no basis to require the Applicant to improve this existing condition. The comment is noted and will be taken into consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council when it considers approval of the project.
SECTION 3: ERRATA

The following are revisions to the Draft EIR for the Trellis Residential Project. These revisions are minor modifications and clarifications to the document, and do not change the significance of any of the environmental issue conclusions within the Draft EIR. The revisions are listed by page number. All additions to the text are underlined (underlined) and all deletions from the text are stricken (stricken).

3.1 - Changes in Response to Specific Comments

3.1.1 - Section 3.4, Cultural Resources

Page 3.4-8, Section 3.4.3 – Methodology for Analysis

In response to comments on the DEIR, the following text is added following paragraph three on page 3.4-8:

An inscription on a stone on the hill south of the project site reads “JW Tice 1855” and is believed by the Rossmoor Historical Society to be scratched onto the stone by James W. Tice, the son of one of the historic landowners in what became Tice Valley, James M. Tice. This site is not listed in the City’s General Plan Built Environment Chapter as a either a “Historic Resource” or “Potentially Historic Resource.” The site is uphill and approximately 1,065 feet from the southern boundary of the project.

Page 3.4-11, Section 3.4.5 – Project Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measures

The text is changed to respond to comments on the DEIR as follows:

Archaeological Resource

| Impact CR-2: | The project could cause an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5. |

Impact Analysis

No archaeological resources have been previously recorded on the project site. A records search conducted at the NWIC revealed the existence of a single prehistoric resource within a 0.5-mile radius of the project boundary. The resource, known as the Rossmoor Site (P-07-000186), was an important Saklan village dating to approximately 1500–1700 CE. It was discovered during construction of the main entrance road to Rossmoor Parkway, located approximately 1,500 feet southwest of the project area. No archaeological resources have been previously recorded on the project site or within a 0.5-mile radius beyond the project boundary, nor were any encountered during the pedestrian survey. A Prehistoric Sensitivity Map prepared for the City’s General Plan 2025 EIR indicates that the project site is located within an area considered to have a “High Sensitivity” for prehistoric resources. Typically, prehistoric archaeological resources and sites are located in areas near water. The project site is located relatively close to Tice Creek. While the project site has been disturbed since at least the late 1950s, the probability of encountering additional prehistoric resources...
within the project area remains high. However, the project site has been highly disturbed since at least the late 1950s, and thus, it is unlikely that intact prehistoric resources would be present within the project site.

While impacts to known prehistoric resources are unlikely to occur during development of the project, subsurface construction activities may have the potential to damage or destroy previously undiscovered prehistoric resources. Prehistoric resources can include flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, and choppers) or obsidian, chert, or quartzite toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (such as midden soil containing heat-affected rock, ash, and charcoal, shellfish remains, and animal bones); and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones). Accordingly, implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 will be required to reduce potential impacts to prehistoric resources that may be discovered during project construction. With the incorporation of mitigation, impacts associated with prehistoric resources would be less than significant.

Furthermore, Mitigation Measure CR-1, on page 3.4-10 is revised as follows:

**MM CR-1**  
A qualified archaeologist shall be retained by the developer and be available for consultation during all ground-disturbing activities. An on-site monitor shall monitor mass grading and utility trenching. If a potentially significant cultural resource is encountered during subsurface earthwork activities, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the find shall cease until the archaeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The Applicant shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement and shall conduct tailgate training with the on-call archaeologist to educate construction workers on the possible materials that could be found. Any archaeological previously undiscovered resources found during construction activities shall be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, glass, ceramics, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts, or features including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resource is determined significant under CEQA, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant. The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive report complete with methods, results, and recommendations, and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered resources. The report shall be submitted to the City of Walnut Creek, the Northwest Information Center, and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), if required. The Applicant shall be required to implement these recommendations.
3.2 - Changes to Correct Typographical and Factual Errors

3.2.1 - Section 2-3 – Project Overview

Page 2-7, Table 2-2

Table 2-2, Surrounding Land Uses, has been corrected as shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Roadway Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tice Valley Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td>General Retail (GR)</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1462 and 1448</td>
<td>Multifamily Residential Very High (MFVH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossmoor Garden Club’s Access Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing (Contra Costa County)</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential (R-20)¹ Planned Development (PD) 1448</td>
<td>Single Family Residential-Low (SL)¹ Multifamily Residential Very High (MFVH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residences (Contra Costa County)</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential (R-20)¹ Planned Development (PD) 1448</td>
<td>Single Family Residential-Low (SL)¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Rain Foundation’s Rossmoor Garden Club</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1483</td>
<td>Open Space/Recreation (OS/R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1483</td>
<td>Open Space/Recreation (OS/R) and Single Family Medium (SFM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tice Valley Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1867</td>
<td>Open Space/Recreation (OS/R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
¹ Contra Costa County Zoning District/General Plan Land Use Designation.
Source: City of Walnut Creek, Zoning Map, ND; City of Walnut Creek, General Plan Land Use Map, 2012; City of Walnut Creek, General Plan Transportation Element, 2006; Contra Costa County, General Plan Land Use Map, 2014.
3.2.2 - Section 3-9, Land Use and Planning

Page 3.9-3, Table 3.9-2

Table 3.9-2, Surrounding Land Uses, has been corrected as shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Roadway Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tice Valley Boulevard</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1462 and 1448</td>
<td>General Retail (GR) Multifamily Residential Very High (MFVH)</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossmoor Garden Club’s Access Road</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing (Contra Costa County)</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential (R-20)² and Planned Development (PD) 1448</td>
<td>Single Family Residential-Low (SL)¹ and Multifamily Residential Very High (MFVH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residences (Contra Costa County)</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential (R-20)¹</td>
<td>Single Family Residential-Low (SL)¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Rain Foundation’s Rossmoor Garden Club</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1483</td>
<td>Open Space/Recreation (OS/R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1483</td>
<td>Open Space/Recreation (OS/R) and Singe Family Medium (SFM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tice Valley Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>Planned Development (PD) 1867</td>
<td>Open Space/Recreation (OS/R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
¹ Contra Costa County Zoning District/General Plan Land Use Designation.
² Source: City of Walnut Creek, Zoning Map, ND; City of Walnut Creek, General Plan Land Use Map, 2012; City of Walnut Creek, General Plan Transportation Element, 2006; Contra Costa County, General Plan Land Use Map, 2014.

3.2.3 - Section 3-12, Public Services

Page 3.12-9, Paragraph Two

A typographical error has been corrected as shown below:

The SAB Office of Public School Construction regulates enrollment projections for the State’s public school districts. The SAB defines a number of options to generate pupil enrollment
projections and provides an approved methodology for determining the elementary, middle and high school pupils that would be generated by new residential units. This methodology is based on historical student generation rates of new residential units constructed within the school district during the previous five years. Only new residential units of a similar type to those anticipated may be used as a basis for defining the student yield factor.

Page 3.12-9, Paragraph Four

A portion of this paragraph has been revised as shown:

Original text

Doris Eaton School, near Parkmead, will revert back to the WCSD as an elementary school beginning in 2016, and would provide additional capacity for the project, should it be constructed.

Replacement text

Dorris Eaton School, near Parkmead, will revert back to the WCSD as an elementary school beginning in 2015 and would provide additional capacity for the project, should it be constructed. For grades K-6, with phasing to become a K-8 in 2017. This would provide additional capacity for the project-generated elementary and intermediate students.

3.2.4 - Section 3-14, Utilities and Service Systems

Pages 3.14-16 and 3.14-22

Standard City conditions related to hydrology and water quality were mistakenly referred to as mitigation (Mitigation Measure HWQ-1) in the Draft EIR. Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 was removed from other portions of the Draft EIR before publication, because this measure only reflected standard conditions that will already be required by the City and are therefore not required to be included as mitigation. However, references to Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 erroneously remained in the Utilities and Service Systems section of the Draft EIR. Therefore, these references are stricken (consistent with the Hydrology and Water Quality section of the Draft EIR), and the significance conclusions are re-worded to reflect the fact that no mitigation is required. Impacts will remain less than significant.

Stormwater Drainage Facilities

Impact USS-3: The project could require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Impact Analysis

Under the existing condition, the natural drainage of the project site conveys stormwater to catch basins located within the hardscape areas, parking lot areas, and drive aisles. The existing storm drain system does not provide water quality treatment. The existing western storm system connects to the downstream Tice Creek box culvert approximately 250 feet northwest of the project site. The existing eastern storm system connects to the
downstream system at Tice Valley Lane, which outfalls to Tice Creek approximately 400 feet north of the project site.

Following operation of the project, the existing natural drainage patterns on the project site would be slightly altered with the project. However, as provided in Table 3.8-2, the project site has been designed to ensure that the minor adjustments to the subwatershed boundaries and redevelopment of the site do not increase peak flows. The new onsite storm drain system has been designed to comply with the requirements set forth in the MRP, as well as any other applicable regulations and standards, which helps ensure that stormwater runoff would be collected and contained to the project site before it can be discharged offsite. By keeping stormwater flows below pre-development levels, the new onsite storm drainage system would reduce the volume and rate of runoff entering the existing offsite municipal stormwater drainage system.

To ensure that the proposed storm drainage improvements are designed to satisfy the San Francisco Bay RWQCB’s MRP and all other applicable requirements, incorporation of Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 would be required. With the incorporation of mitigation, impacts associated with new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities will be less than significant.

**Level of Significance Before Mitigation**

Less than significant impact. Potentially significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required. Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 is required.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Less than significant impact.

**Cumulative**

| Impact USS-8: | The project could contribute to cumulative utilities and service systems impacts in the area. |

**Impact Analysis**

Implementation of the project could potentially result in cumulative impacts associated with utilities and service systems when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the broader project area. However, as addressed above, the project’s individual impacts related to utilities and service systems will be less than significant, and the project will be required to comply with all applicable policies and programs set forth by the San Francisco Bay RWQCB, EBMUD, CCCSD, and all other applicable federal, state, and local agencies and regulations.
Although the project’s individual impacts associated with utilities and service systems will be less than significant, the project’s water requirements, along with the water needs of related cumulative projects in EBMUD’s service area, could potentially combine to exceed the District’s projected future estimated supply during times of drought, such as the drought conditions that currently exist as of the date of this Draft EIR. However, EBMUD plans to meet this need by relying on short-term supplemental supply sources that include the Northern California Water Transfers (expected to provide up to 13 mgd [15,000 afy] of dry-year water) and the Bayside Groundwater Project Expansion (expected to provide up to 9 mgd [10,000 afy] of dry-year water). Beyond 2030 and outside the current required 20-year planning horizon of the UWMP, EBMUD’s supplemental supply needs will be met by implementing long-term conceptual supplemental supply sources. Additionally, the City’s General Plan 2025 EIR evaluated the adequacy of EBMUD’s water supply to accommodate projected growth through buildout of the General Plan. As addressed in Section 3.11 of this Draft EIR, the project’s population, as well as their projected demands on public services and municipal utilities such as water, represents a nominal percentage of what was previously evaluated within both the General Plan 2025 and ABAG’s 2009 Regional Projections.

The General Plan 2025 EIR determined that EBMUD, along with other water districts serving the City, would have adequate supplies through buildout of the General Plan. Thus, the water demands of the project, combined with the cumulative projects, has already been previously accounted for in the certified General Plan 2025 EIR.

Further, other related cumulative projects (see Section 3 of this Draft EIR for a list of cumulative projects) would similarly be required to comply with all applicable standards that are intended to address and reduce utilities and service systems impacts. These other related cumulative projects would also be required to comply with all applicable performance standards and requirements of the San Francisco Bay RWQCB, which includes participation with the NPDES Permit Program, preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program, and incorporation of both construction and operational Best Management Practices designed to collect and contain stormwater. Further, similar to other development projects in the City of Walnut Creek, the Applicant would be required to pay their fair share of development impact fees, which are assessed during the entitlement process. These mandatory impact fees help offset the increased service requirements due to new development within the City. Fees are used to maintain, improve, expand, and construct infrastructure, including water and wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities as well as stormwater drainage facilities, which serve new and existing land uses. Therefore, the project’s contribution to impacts associated with utilities and service systems are not considered cumulatively considerable, and cumulative utilities and service systems impacts as a whole will be less than significant.

**Level of Significance Before Mitigation**

Less than significant impact. Potentially significant impact
Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required. Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 is required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant impact.

3.2.5 - Section ES, Executive Summary

Pages ES-22 and ES-23

Based on the corrections made to Impacts USS-3 and USS-8 above, the corresponding changes are also included in the Executive Summary section, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact USS-3</strong>: The project could require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.</td>
<td>No mitigation measures are required. Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 is required.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact USS-8</strong>: The project could contribute to cumulative utilities and service systems impacts in the area.</td>
<td>No mitigation measures are required. Mitigation Measure HWQ-1 is required.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 4: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”) is the document that will be used by the enforcement and monitoring agencies responsible for the implementation of the project’s mitigation measures. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15097, the MMRP contains all mitigation measures identified in the EIR and provides City staff with a single source of reference to the full range of mitigation measures to be implemented. For each measure, the agency responsible for ensuring proper implementation is identified, along with the timing and method of verification.
### Table 4-1: Trellis Residential Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>Verification of Completion Date</th>
<th>Responsible for Verification</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 3.1 – Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM AES-3a:</strong> During non-construction hours, all construction equipment, vehicles, and materials shall be relegated to a designated staging area(s) on the project site. This staging area(s) shall be fenced and screened to clearly identify the boundary of the storage area and to limit views of stored construction items from adjacent land uses and roadways. Any onsite staging area shall be located within an appropriate, convenient portion of the project site away from adjacent land uses and roadways, as feasible. Storage containers shall also be used to store loose construction items and materials to prevent a haphazard visual appearance on the project site.</td>
<td>Relegate, create, fence, and screen the storage area.</td>
<td>During non-construction hours during the construction stage</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM AES-3b:</strong> Any demolition and construction debris not designated for reuse on the project site shall be promptly removed from the site, in accordance with the approved construction schedule. No long-term stockpiling of such debris shall occur on the project site, and no short-term stockpiles shall exceed the height of the temporary construction fencing that will bound the project site. Demolition and construction debris earmarked for reuse on the project site shall be a permitted activity, but shall still occur at a height that is not readily visible from adjacent land uses and roadways.</td>
<td>Remove construction/demolition debris.</td>
<td>During and after project construction</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Impact AES-5 requires implementation of Mitigation Measures AES-3a and AES-3b.*
Table 4-1 (cont.): Trellis Residential Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>Timing of Verification</th>
<th>Responsible for Verification</th>
<th>Verification of Completion Date</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.2 – Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact AIR-1 requires implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1.**

**MM AIR-1:** During construction, the following air pollution control measures shall be implemented:
- Exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day, or more as needed.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material onsite shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads and surfaces shall be limited to 15 mph.
- All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks shall be paved as soon as possible.
- A visibly visible sign shall be posted with the telephone number and person to contact at the City of Walnut Creek regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 2 business days of a complaint or issue notification. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Implement the air pollution control measures.

During project construction

City of Walnut Creek

**Impact AIR-4 requires implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1.**
### Table 4-1 (cont.): Trellis Residential Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>Timing of Verification</th>
<th>Responsible for Verification</th>
<th>Verification of Completion Date</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 3.3 – Biological Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM BIO-1:</strong> To prevent impacts to Migratory Bird Treaty Act-protected birds and their nests, the following measures related to raptors and nesting birds shall be required:</td>
<td>On-site inspection to confirm implementation of mitigation measures.</td>
<td>Before ground-disturbing (preparation and construction) activities</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The removal of trees shall be limited to only those necessary to construct the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. For trees that must be removed to construct the project, the Applicant shall target the removal of trees to occur outside the nesting season between September 1st and February 28th. If trees cannot be removed outside the nesting season, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted prior to tree removal to verify the absence of active raptor nests within 250 feet of any proposed construction activities. No further action is necessary if no active nests are found or if construction activities will occur during the non-breeding season (September 1st through February 28th).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. If construction or tree removal is proposed during the breeding/nesting season for local avian species (typically March 1st through August 31st), a focused survey for active nests of raptors and migratory birds (within a vicinity of no less than 250 feet outside the project boundaries, where possible) shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. Two surveys will be conducted, at least 1 week apart, with the second survey occurring no more than 2 days prior to tree removal activities. If no active nests are found, tree removal or construction activities may proceed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| d. If an active nest is located during pre-construction surveys, United States Fish and Wildlife Service and/or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (as}
Table 4-1 (cont.): Trellis Residential Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>Timing of Verification</th>
<th>Responsible for Verification</th>
<th>Verification of Completion Date</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>appropriate) shall be notified regarding the status of the nest. Further, construction activities shall be restricted to avoid disturbance of the nest until it is abandoned or the biologist deems disturbance potential to be minimal. Restrictions may include establishment of exclusion zones (no ingress of personnel or equipment at a minimum radius of 100 feet around an active raptor nest and a 50-foot radius around an active migratory bird nest) or alteration of the project construction schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact BIO-4 requires implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1a through BIO-1d.

Impact BIO-7 requires implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1a through BIO-1d.

Section 3.4 – Cultural Resources

**MM CR-1:** A qualified archaeologist shall be retained by the developer and be available for consultation during all ground-disturbing activities. An on-site monitor shall monitor mass grading and utility trenching. If a potentially significant cultural resource is encountered during subsurface earthwork activities, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the find shall cease until the archaeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The Applicant shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement and shall conduct tailgate training with the on-call archaeologist to educate construction workers on the possible materials that could be found. Any archaeological previously undiscovered resources found during construction activities shall be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources

<p>| Cease construction when there is a potentially significant archaeological resource and perform technical analyses. | During subsurface earthwork activities | City of Walnut Creek |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>Timing of Verification</th>
<th>Responsible for Verification</th>
<th>Verification of Completion Date</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, glass, ceramics, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts, or features including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resource is determined significant under CEQA, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant. The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive report complete with methods, results, and recommendations, and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered resources. The report shall be submitted to the City of Walnut Creek, the Northwest Information Center, and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), if required. The Applicant shall be required to implement these recommendations.

*Impact CR-2 requires implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1.*

**MM CR-3:** In the event that fossils or fossil-bearing deposits are discovered during construction activities, excavations within a 50-foot radius of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted. The Project contractor shall notify a qualified paleontologist to examine the discovery. The paleontologist shall document the discovery as needed (in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards [Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 1995]), evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the find under the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction activities are allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the Applicant determines that avoidance is not feasible, then the Applicant must cease construction when there is fossil evidence and perform technical analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>Timing of Verification</th>
<th>Responsible for Verification</th>
<th>Verification of Completion Date</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cease construction</td>
<td>During construction</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4-1 (cont.): Trellis Residential Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>Timing of Verification</th>
<th>Responsible for Verification</th>
<th>Verification of Completion Date</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of construction activities on the discovery. The plan shall be submitted to the City of Walnut Creek for review and approval prior to implementation, and the Applicant shall adhere to the recommendations in the plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact CR-5 requires implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-3.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 3.5 – Geology and Soils</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM GEO-1:</strong> During project construction, the project shall incorporate the engineering, construction, building, and safety specifications contained within the Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix E), specifically in Section 6 - Earthwork, Section 7 - Foundations, Section 8 - Retaining Walls, and Section 9 - Pavements. Implementation of these specifications shall be documented by the Applicant or its representative. Successful incorporation of these specifications shall be verified by the City of Walnut Creek prior to the issuance of final project approvals.</td>
<td>Review and approve specifications within the Geotechnical Investigation.</td>
<td>During project construction</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM GEO-2:</strong> Prior to construction of the project, the Applicant shall prepare and submit for review and approval by the City of Walnut Creek a final landscape plan that demonstrates that onsite landscape coverage complies with all applicable requirements set forth by the City. The project shall be designed and constructed in accordance with this approved plan.</td>
<td>Review and approve final landscape plan.</td>
<td>Prior to construction of the project</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact GEO-4 requires implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact GEO-6 requires implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1 and GEO-2.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4-1 (cont.): Trellis Residential Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>Timing of Verification</th>
<th>Responsible for Verification</th>
<th>Verification of Completion Date</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 3.7 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM HAZ-1a:</strong> Prior to construction of the project, known hazardous materials such as paints, solvents, chemicals, and batteries that are no longer in use shall be properly disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulatory requirements by a by a permitted and licensed contractor.</td>
<td>Dispose known hazardous material properly.</td>
<td>Prior to construction of the project</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM HAZ-1b:</strong> A health and safety plan shall be developed and implemented to protect the public and all workers in the construction area. The plan shall describe the practices and procedures to protect worker health in the event of an accidental release of hazardous materials (for example, fuels, or solvents during construction) or if previously undiscovered hazardous materials are encountered during construction. The plan shall include items such as spill prevention, cleanup, and evacuation procedures. The plan will help protect the public and workers by providing procedures and contingencies that will help reduce the exposure to hazardous materials.</td>
<td>Develop and implement Health and Safety Plan.</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a Site Development Permit</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM HAZ-1c:</strong> The existing onsite buildings shall be evaluated for the presence of asbestos-containing material (ACM), lead-based paints (LBP), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and mercury prior to their demolition. The evaluation shall be conducted by California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal-OSHA) certified ACM, LBP, and, as necessary, other contractors licensed to remove and handle PCBs and mercury. Any ACM, lead, PCBs, or mercury identified as a result of the evaluation shall be removed by a Cal-OSHA-certified ACM, LBP, and/or other qualified licensed contractor and shall be transported and disposed of offsite in</td>
<td>Evaluate onsite buildings for ACM, LBP, PCBs and mercury.</td>
<td>Prior to demolition of existing structures</td>
<td>California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal-OSHA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-1 (cont.): Trellis Residential Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>Timing of Verification</th>
<th>Responsible for Verification</th>
<th>Verification of Completion Date</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulatory requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MM HAZ-1d:** During earthwork and other subsurface activities on the project site, the Applicant or its representative shall regularly inspect the exposed soil for visual evidence of any contamination or volatilization of contaminants (odors). If visual or odor contamination indicators are identified during construction activities, all work shall stop in the vicinity of the contamination, and an investigation shall be designed and performed by a qualified environmental consultant to verify the presence and extent of contamination on the project site. Results of the investigation shall be reviewed and approved by the Contra Costa Health Services Hazardous Materials Programs (CCHS-Hazmat) prior to the resuming of construction activities in the vicinity of the contamination. The investigation shall include collecting samples for laboratory analysis and quantification of contaminant levels within the disturbance areas. Subsurface investigation shall determine appropriate worker protection and hazardous material and disposal procedures appropriate for the project site. Areas with contaminated soil and groundwater determined to be hazardous water shall be removed by personnel who have been trained through the OSHA-recommended 40-hour safety program (29 CFR 1910.120) with an approved plan for groundwater extractions, soil excavation, control of contaminant releases to the air, and offsite transport or onsite treatment. A health and safety plan, prepared by a qualified and approved industrial hygienist, shall be used to protect the public and all workers in the construction area.

Inspect exposed soil for contaminants.  
During earthwork and other subsurface activities on the project site  
City of Walnut Creek
### Table 4-1 (cont.): Trellis Residential Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>Timing of Verification</th>
<th>Responsible for Verification</th>
<th>Verification of Completion Date</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact HAZ-2 requires implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1d.</td>
<td>Review and confirm that applicant has prepared the CC&amp;R as specified.</td>
<td>Prior to sale of any residential lots within the project site.</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM HAZ-8: Prior to sale of any residential lots within the project site, the Applicant shall prepare and cause to be recorded a Declaration of Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&amp;Rs) that establishes and sets forth duties of a homeowner’s association, which shall include but not be limited to conducting regular clearing and maintenance on all common areas throughout the development in order to prevent the buildup of flammable debris, including excess brush, vegetation and trash. The CC&amp;Rs shall also contain rules for individual homeowners, including but not limited to the regular removal of excess brush and vegetation from private yards in order to minimize wildland fire risks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact HAZ-9 requires implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1a through HAZ-1d and HAZ-8.</td>
<td>Review Construction Management Plan.</td>
<td>Before the ground-disturbing (preparation and construction) activities</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.10 – Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM NOI-1a: To reduce potential construction noise impacts, the following multi-part mitigation measure shall be implemented for the project:  
• The construction contractor shall ensure that all internal combustion engine-driven equipment are equipped with mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.  
• The construction contractor shall locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction project area. In addition, the project contractor shall place such stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site. | | | | | |
### Table 4-1 (cont.): Trellis Residential Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>Timing of Verification</th>
<th>Responsible for Verification</th>
<th>Verification of Completion Date</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The construction contractor shall prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines. • The construction contractor shall, to the maximum extent practical, locate onsite equipment staging areas so as to maximize the distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction. • The construction contractor shall designate a noise disturbance coordinator who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaints (starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem. The construction contractor shall conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site.</td>
<td>Review plans. Inspect ventilation system at C.O. sign-off.</td>
<td>Building Permit plan review and Certificate of Occupancy.</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM NOI-1b:</strong> All proposed residences located within 84 feet of the centerline of Tice Valley Boulevard shall include an alternate form of ventilation, such as a central air conditioning system, in order to ensure that windows can remain closed for a prolonged period of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 3.13 – Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM TRANS-4a:</strong> Prior to issuance of a Site Development Permit, a detailed sight line analysis shall be completed by the Applicant and submitted to the City of Walnut Creek for review and approval. The sight distance analysis shall be completed for all project driveways, crosswalks, and bicycle crossings and shall be conducted in accordance with local standards, as directed by City of Walnut Creek staff.</td>
<td>Review and approval of detailed sight line analysis.</td>
<td>Prior to final project approvals</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-1 (cont.): Trellis Residential Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>Timing of Verification</th>
<th>Responsible for Verification</th>
<th>Verification of Completion Date</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM TRANS-4b:</strong> Prior to occupancy of the first phase, pedestrian crosswalks shall be installed along Tice Valley Boulevard at project driveways. Enhanced crosswalk designs shall be utilized for these locations. The enhancements shall include high-visibility pavement markings and advanced pedestrian crossing signs. The crossing, as well as adjacent sidewalks, including curb ramps, shall be updated to the most current Americans with Disabilities Act design standards. These crosswalks shall be consistent with City of Walnut Creek standards for uncontrolled crosswalks and shall be approved by the City.</td>
<td>Inspect pedestrian crosswalk.</td>
<td>Prior to final project approvals</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM TRANS-4c:</strong> Prior to occupancy of the first phase, center median striping shall be configured as a standard two-way left-turn lane striping adjacent to the raised median.</td>
<td>Inspect center median striping as a standard two-way left-turn lane.</td>
<td>Prior to final project approvals</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM TRANS-6a:</strong> Prior to occupancy of the first phase, bicycle parking spaces (i.e., bike racks) shall be provided on the gymnasium site to provide maximum flexibility for bicyclists to park near the gym and the park. Bicycle parking spaces shall be provided in well-lit, visible locations near building entrances. The applicant also proposes to construct new bike lanes along Tice Valley Boulevard, and these shall also be installed prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit.</td>
<td>Inspect bicycle parking spaces.</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM TRANS-6b:</strong> Prior to occupancy of the first phase, the applicant shall coordinate with the Central Contra Costa Transit Authority, as needed, to ensure that the bus stop is relocated to the Tice Valley Boulevard frontage or other suitable location.</td>
<td>Coordinate with the Central Contra Costa Transit Authority and the applicant to relocate the bus stop.</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit</td>
<td>City of Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>