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INTRODUCTION TO THE FINAL EIR

PURPOSE OF THE FINAL EIR

The California Environmental Quality Act and the Guidelines promulgated thereunder (together “CEQA”) require an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to be prepared for any project which may have a significant impact on the environment. An EIR is an informational document, the purposes of which, according to CEQA are “to provide public agencies and the public in general with detailed information about the effect which a proposed project is likely to have on the environment; to list ways in which the significant effects of such a project might be minimized; and to indicate alternatives to such a project.” The information contained in this EIR is intended to be objective and impartial, and to enable the reader to arrive at an independent judgment regarding the significance of the impacts resulting from the proposed project.

This Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) document, together with the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) published in April 2019, shall constitute the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as amended (commencing with Section 21000 of the California Public Resources Code) and the CEQA Guidelines for the proposed Cambria Hotel Project (“Project”) in the City of Pleasant Hill, California. The Project Applicant is Stratus Development Partners. The Lead Agency is the City of Pleasant Hill.

SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT

The full description of the Project is included in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR. A brief summary is included here for convenience.

The 2.5-acre Project site is located at 3195 and 3131 North Main Street and 1531 Oak Park Boulevard, at the southwest corner of the intersection of North Main Street and Oak Park Boulevard. The site is currently occupied by a 9,709 sq. ft. Black Angus restaurant and a 3,080 sq. ft. vacant commercial/retail building, both of which will be removed.

The proposed Project would involve the construction of a four-story 155-room Cambria Hotel and associated parking, landscaping, and amenities. The Project includes modifications within North Main Street, including modifications to the existing median and a new dedicated left turn pocket (northbound direction).

In conjunction with the hotel project, the City is also proposing to amend the General Plan to establish a new land use overlay designation for visitor-serving uses with accompanying goals, policies, programs and updated standards, including allowing a floor area ratio of up to 100% for specified uses within the proposed overlay. The overlay designation is currently proposed for only the hotel project site. The Project would also require rezoning to Planned Unit Development District, Development Plan Permit, Architectural Review Permit, Sign Permit, and a Tree Removal Permit.
EIR REVIEW PROCESS

Draft EIR
A Draft EIR was made available for public review in April 2019. During the public review period for the Draft EIR, the City received written comments.

Final EIR
This Final EIR contains all comments received by the City on the Draft EIR and also includes responses to these comments in Chapter 23. Changes to the Draft EIR are included in Chapter 22 of this Final EIR.

None of the revisions or responses to comments contained in this Final EIR would be considered “significant new information” under section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and therefore no recirculation of the Draft EIR is required.

The EIR will be presented to the City along with the Draft EIR at public hearings to consider recommendation for and certification of this document as a technically adequate, full disclosure document consistent with the requirements of CEQA. Assuming certification of this EIR as complete and adequate under CEQA, this document together with the Draft EIR will constitute the EIR for this Project.

An EIR does not control the agency’s ultimate discretion on the Project. In accordance with California law, the EIR must be certified before any action on the Project can be taken. However, EIR certification does not constitute Project approval.

REPORT ORGANIZATION
This Final EIR consists of the following chapters, commencing after Chapter 20 of the Draft EIR:

Chapter 21: Introduction to the Final EIR. This chapter outlines the purpose, organization and scope of the Final EIR document and important information regarding the public review and approval process.

Chapter 22: Revisions to the Draft EIR. This chapter includes corrections, clarifications or additions to text contained in the Draft EIR based on comments received during the public review period and regulatory agency coordination.

Chapter 23: Response to Comments. This chapter provides reproductions of letters received on the Draft EIR. The comments are numbered in the margin of the comment letters received. The responses to comments are also provided in this chapter immediately following each comment letter, and are keyed to the numbered comments.
REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

INTRODUCTION
The following are minor text changes, additions or modifications made to the Draft EIR for the Cambria Hotel Project. An explanation of the changes made in response to comments can be found in Chapter 23.

Comments, including the original location in the Draft EIR of the text to be changed, are in *italics*. Deletions are noted by *strikethrough*. Additions are *underlined*.

LACK OF “SIGNIFICANT NEW INFORMATION”
This Final EIR provides substantial evidence that the information and revisions contained in this document would not constitute “substantial new information” under CEQA and so would not require recirculation of the Draft EIR under section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. To that end, the following conclusions can be made from information in this document:

1. No new significant environmental impacts would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
2. No substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless new mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
3. There are no new feasible alternatives or mitigation measures required to lessen significant environmental impacts of the revised project that the applicant declines to adopt.
4. There is no information supporting a conclusion that the Draft EIR would be found to be fundamentally inadequate and conclusory such that meaningful review was precluded.

REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

CHANGES TO CHAPTER 2: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
- Page 2-4 through 2-22

Revisions are hereby made to Table 2.1: Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures to be consistent with specific revisions made to impacts or mitigation measures later in this chapter including: Impact and Mitigation Measure Noise-1 and Impact Noise-2.

CHANGES TO CHAPTER 14: NOISE
- Page 14-1

The following revisions are hereby made to the paragraphs under the Environmental Setting heading to clarify that the adjacent funeral home is considered a commercial noise sensitive use.

Residential uses are generally considered to be sensitive receptors for noise. Residential uses border the Project at the western boundary, which is also the boundary between Pleasant Hill (the Project site) and
Walnut Creek (the adjacent residential). While commercial uses are not generally as noise sensitive as residential, the Oak Park Hills Chapel (funeral home) adjacent to the site to the south would be considered a commercial noise sensitive use. The existing noise environment at the site and in the vicinity results primarily from I-680 traffic noise.

As measured near the western boundary of the project site, hourly average noise levels ranged from 61 to 66 dBA Leq during the day and from 57 to 68 dBA Leq at night. The measured day-night average noise level toward this western boundary was 70 dBA Ldn. Residences to the west of the project site are shielded by an existing 6-foot high sound wall and by the existing Black Angus building on a portion of the site and are currently exposed to an ambient noise level of about 62 dBA Ldn at ground level and 70 dBA Ldn at upper stories. Existing noise levels at other uses along North Main Street (such as the funeral home to the south) would have the same general noise sources (primarily I-680 traffic noise) and similar existing noise levels as on the Project site.

- Page 14-5 and 14-7

The following revisions are hereby made to Noise Impact-1 and the third and fifth through eight bullet points of Mitigation Measure Noise-1 to clarify that measures apply to both residential and commercial noise-sensitive uses.

**Impact Noise-1: Construction Noise and Vibration.** The construction of the Project would generate noise and vibration and would temporarily and intermittently increase noise and vibration levels at adjacent residential and commercial receivers. However, the construction period will not span more than one construction season and is considered to be *less than significant with mitigation*.

...  

- Locate stationary noise generating equipment as far as possible from residential and commercial sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction project area. Construct temporary noise barriers to screen stationary noise generating equipment when located near adjoining sensitive land uses. Temporary noise barriers could reduce construction levels by 5 dBA.

- Construction staging areas shall be established at locations that will create the greatest distance between the construction-related noise sources and residential and commercial noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction, as feasible.

- If conflicts occurred which were irresolvable by proper scheduling, temporary noise control blankets shall be erected along upper story building facades facing residential and/or commercial noise-sensitive areas. Noise control blankets can be rented and quickly erected.

- Locate material stockpiles, as well as maintenance/equipment staging and parking areas, as far as feasible from residential and commercial noise-sensitive receptors.

- The contractor shall prepare a detailed construction plan identifying the schedule for major noise-generating construction activities. The construction plan shall identify a procedure for coordination with the adjacent residents and noise sensitive commercial facilities so that construction activities can be scheduled to minimize noise disturbance.
The following revisions are hereby made to Noise Impact-2 and the second paragraph under the header “Summary Overall Project Noise Changes” to clarify that the analysis and impact apply to both residential and commercial noise-sensitive uses and is reduced through the identified mitigation.

**Impact Noise-2: Operational Noise.** On-site project operations would increase ambient noise levels at nearby residential and commercial noise-sensitive land uses. This is a potentially significant impact. However, with the identified mechanical equipment screening, noise levels would be within allowable levels and are considered to be less than significant with mitigation.

...With the development of the project, assuming the construction of the 42-inch parapet wall as specified in Mitigation Measure Noise-2 below, the project would generate a combined noise level of 50 dBA Leq at the closest residences to the west, and the same or lower noise levels at other noise-sensitive residential and commercial receptors. Assuming 24-hour operations of mechanical equipment, this would be equivalent to a day-night average noise level of 56 dBA Ldn. The resulting future ambient noise level at residences to the west, taking into account noise generating project operations and the shielding provided by the project building from traffic on I-680 and Main Street, would be 60 dBA Ldn. This noise level would be about 2 dBA lower than existing noise levels at ground levels of residences and about 10 dBA lower than existing noise levels at upper stories.
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RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains responses to the written comments on the Draft EIR. Where revisions to the Draft EIR are appropriate, such changes are noted below and the actual text changes are included in Chapter 22.

The City of Pleasant Hill received eight comment letters during the public review period of the Draft EIR for the Project. Specific comments are organized in chronological order by grouping, as follows:

LIST OF COMMENTS

LETTERS FROM AGENCIES
Letter A, California Department of Transportation (CalTrans), 5/30/2019

LETTERS FROM PERSONS AND GROUPS
Letter B, Donna Taylor, 4/29/19
Letter C, Lisa Goldin, 4/29/19
Letter D, Suzanne Cook, 5/1/19
Letter E, Doug Sibley, 5/2/19
Letter F, Doug Parker, 5/27/19
Letter G, Mark and Brad Magleby, Oak Park Hills Chapel, 5/29/19
Letter H, Matt Callahan, 5/31/19

RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS

The following pages contain comments on the Draft EIR for the Project. Each comment is numbered and responses to these comments are provided following each comment letter or set.

In some instances, responding to a comment received on the Draft EIR resulted in a revision to the text of the Draft EIR. In other cases, the information provided in the responses is deemed adequate in itself, and modification of the Draft EIR text was not necessary.

Letters referenced in this chapter were not always intended to be focused on environmental matters only and comments sometimes reference matters related to the Project but that are outside the realm of environmental review. Conversely, the responses to comments included here are intentionally focused on matters specific to the environmental review that is required under CEQA. A response
noting that a comment is not related to the environmental analysis is intended to signify the specific comment was not addressing a matter subject to review under CEQA and therefore that the EIR is not the appropriate forum for providing a response. Such a response is not intended to dismiss or diminish the validity of the comment outside the CEQA realm. All of the comments are a part of the record and will be considered by the City if and when Project approvals are presented for their consideration.
May 30, 2019

Troy Fujimoto, Project Planner
City of Pleasant Hill
100 Gregory Lane
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

SCH # 2019049104
GTS # 04-CC-2019-00335
GTS ID: 15311
PM: CC 680 16.86

Cambria Hotel Project – Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Dear Mr. Fujimoto:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Cambria Hotel Project. In tandem with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), Caltrans’ mission signals a modernization of our approach to evaluate and mitigate impacts to the State Transportation Network (STN). Caltrans’ Strategic Management Plan 2015-2020 aims to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in part, by tripling bicycle and doubling both pedestrian and transit travel by 2020. Our comments are based on the April 17, 2019 DEIR.

Project Understanding

The proposed Project involves the construction of a four-story 155-room Cambria Hotel and associated parking, landscaping, and amenities. The Project includes modifications within North Main Street, including modifications to the existing median and a new dedicated left-turn pocket (northbound direction). In conjunction with the hotel project, the City is also proposing to amend the General Plan to establish a new land use overlay designation for visitor-serving uses with accompanying goals, policies, programs and updated standards, including allowing a floor area ratio of up to 100% for specified uses within the proposed overlay. The overlay designation is currently proposed for only the hotel project site. The Project would also require rezoning to Planned Unit Development District, Development Plan Permit, Architectural Review Permit, Sign Permit, and a Tree Removal Permit.
Vehicular access for the site would be provided through one right-in/left-in driveway and one right-in/right-out driveway on North Main Street and one full access driveway on Oak Park Boulevard. Pedestrian access for the site would be provided along the North Main Street and Oak Park Boulevard frontages. The Project would include modifications within North Main Street to create a break in the median and left turn lane into the northerly entrance on North Main Street and to extend the median/landscaping toward Oak Park Boulevard to prevent left turns out of both North Main Street Project driveways.

**Multimodal Planning**

We strongly suggest this project evaluate the impacts of and barriers to bicycle and pedestrian access between the project site, and active transportation/transit hubs such as the Iron Horse Trail, the EBMUD trail, and the Pleasant Hill BART Station. If construction of or contribution to improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities, such as improvements to sidewalks, bike lanes, and crosswalks on Oak Park Boulevard are not feasible to shorten the required length of travel, or provide a lower-stress biking or walking environment, this project should be conditioned to provide a free shuttle (with bike racks) between the Hotel and the Pleasant Hill BART Station for employees and guests. Shower and locker/changing room facilities should be available for use by employees who commute by active modes. We encourage the development of a shared mobility hub and secure bike parking facilities.

For additional Transportation Demand Measures options, please refer to the Federal Highway Administration’s *Integrating Demand Management into the Transportation Planning Process: A Desk Reference* (Chapter 8). The reference is available online at:


**Lead Agency**

As the Lead Agency, the City of Pleasant Hill is responsible for all project mitigation, including any needed improvements to the STN. The project’s fair share contribution, financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures.

**Encroachment Permit**

Please be advised that any work or traffic control that encroaches onto the State right-of-way (ROW) requires an encroachment permit that is issued by Caltrans. To obtain an encroachment permit, a completed encroachment permit application, environmental documentation, and six (6) sets of plans clearly indicating the State ROW, and six (6) copies of signed and stamped traffic control plans must be submitted to: Office of Encroachment Permits, California DOT, District 4, P.O. Box 23660, Oakland, CA 94623-0660. To download the permit application and obtain more information, visit http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/permits/.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability.”
Mr. Fujimoto, City of Pleasant Hill
May 30, 2019
Page 3

Thank you again for including Caltrans in the environmental review process. Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Michelle Matranga at 510-286-5544 or michelle.matranga@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

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"
LETTER A, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (CALTRANS), 5/30/2019

Comment A-1

These are introductory statements and do not contain specific comments on the environmental analysis.

Comment A-2

This comment relates to barriers to bicycle and pedestrian access and recommendations for improvement. The transportation impact assessment prepared for the Project and included in full as Appendix J of the Draft EIR evaluated the bicycle and pedestrian conditions in the study area and acknowledged barriers to non-motorized travel between the project site and the Pleasant Hill BART Station. Recommendations to improve overall bicycle and pedestrian travel in the immediate study area were developed, including the provision of a shared mobility hub and secure bicycle parking facilities (page 48 of Appendix J).

The CCTA 2018 Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan identifies the provision of a low-use street bicycle facility on Oak Park Boulevard between the Contra Costa Canal Trail and the Iron Horse Trail. Construction of the project would not preclude the future provision of a low street bicycle facility or sidewalks on Oak Park Boulevard.

The Project proposes to provide a free shuttle between the hotel and the Pleasant Hill BART station.

Comment A-3

This comment notes the responsibilities of the Lead Agency (in this case Pleasant Hill) for identified mitigation measures and is not a specific comment on the environmental analysis. No improvements to the State Transportation Network (STN) have been identified as mitigation for this Project.

Comment A-4

This comment provides information related to the process for encroachment permits and does not contain specific comments on the environmental analysis.

Comment A-5

This is a closing statement and does not contain specific comments on the environmental analysis.
Hi Troy,

Please consider this my opposition to the proposed 155-Room hotel at the Black Angus site, and please share with the Planning Commission and City Council.

There are already at least 6 large hotels in the 7 square miles of Pleasant Hill. The last thing we need is a 7th one - what is the vacancy rate at these 6 hotels?

The Homewood Suites Hotel just opened last year, a 4-story 115-Room hotel. It’s now the largest building in the Ellinwood residential area.

I see the Original Pancake House closed on CC Blvd. Has the city contacted popular restaurant chains who might be interested in the Black Angus site? Just off the top of my head I can think of Cracker Barrel, Bonefish Grill, Carrabbas, Pappadeaux Seafood, IHOP, Famous Dave’s, Joe’s Crab Shack.

This site would work much better as a restaurant than another hotel. Please at least try.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Donna Taylor
Pleasant Hill
925-787-3145
LETTER B, DONNA TAYLOR, 4/29/19

Comment B-1

This letter expresses opposition to the Project and includes discussion of other development in the area but does not contain a specific comment on the environmental analysis. The comment will be provided to the City’s decision-makers.
From: Lisa Goldin [mailto:snackpack4000@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 10:22 AM
To: Troy Fujimoto <Tfujimoto@pleasanthillca.org>
Subject: Another hotel

ENOUGH ALREADY!!!!

Lisa
LETTER C, LISA GOLDIN, 4/29/19

Comment C-1

This letter expresses opposition to the Project but does not contain a specific comment on the environmental analysis. The comment will be provided to the City’s decision-makers.
Dear City Council Members,

As a 35 year resident of Pleasant Hill, it is with great disappointment and sadness that I read in the newspaper that the city is considering razing the Black Angus restaurant and allowing the building of a hotel. With approximately 25 hotels within 5 miles of downtown Pleasant Hill, I fail to see the need for another. Since this area is in need of affordable housing and the Black Angus is very popular, why not consider a multi use construction similar to the Two Worlds project. Being in the position of having to leave this area after living here for 50 years is heart breaking, but there is no affordable place for us seniors. Having visited my daughter in Barcelona for the past several years, I have come to appreciate the European concept of living space above a retail business, and would welcome consideration of this idea. As always, all building projects in this area seem to be based on how much money the city can garner from it rather than actual need. Please rethink the use of this valuable land.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Cook
LETTER D, SUZANNE COOK, 5/1/19

Comment D-1

This letter expresses opposition to the Project and includes discussion of affordable housing but does not contain a specific comment on the environmental analysis. The comment will be provided to the City’s decision-makers.
Dear Editor (and City Planning),

Earlier today I read in the East Bay times the article *Black Angus in Pleasant Hill could be replaced by 155-room hotel*. The proposed project would certainly generate a lot of jobs and revenue for the City of Pleasant Hill. However, I cannot visualize how the existing streets can handle the traffic such a project would generate. The majority of trips would be freeway oriented. Imagine the hotel traffic being added to the existing congestion at intersections of (1) Sunnyvale Ave/North Main St/I-680 on and off ramps, (2) North Main and Treat, and getting to and from the Oak Park Overcrossing!

Should the project ever get approved, I would want to see the project relocate the Black Angus restaurant to a convenient location. I frequent the Black Angus because of the quality and presentation of its meals and its intimate dining setting.

Doug Sibley

2175 Blackrock Place

Martinez, CA 94553-4957

925.788.8990
LETTER E, DOUG SIBLEY, 5/2/19

Comment E-1

This comment expresses concern regarding increases in traffic related to the Project. The addition of Project traffic was studied in the Draft EIR, including the locations mentioned in this comment and no significant impacts to these intersections were identified. Details of Project trips and intersection operation can be found in Chapter 16 (and Appendix J) of the Draft EIR.

Comment E-2

This comment expresses support for relocation of the Black Angus if removed from this site but does not contain a specific comment on the environmental analysis. The comment will be provided to the City’s decision-makers.
This Cambria Hotel Project Draft EIR concludes, to quote:

"No significant and unavoidable impacts were identified under the proposed Project. All Project impacts are either less than significant or can be reduced to those levels through Implementation of the mitigation contained in this Draft EIR."

I have no way to challenge the technical studies, and CEQA parameters they were based on, that resulted in the above conclusion. My concerns at this point may be addressed only by the project approval process before the Architectural Review Commission, the Planning Commission, and the City Council.

BUT, throughout this Draft EIR numerous non-binding staff recommendations were made that were expecting the Hotel developers to be proactive good citizens of Pleasant Hill.

For instance:
- **Noise issue:** Certain kinds of windows and air circulation systems were suggested.
- **Traffic and Circulation issue:**
  - Signage on site suggested
  - Oak Park Blvd. road restripping suggested
  - On site pedestrian and bicycle changes suggested
  - Site monitoring, maybe requiring a new parking strategy suggested

From input on this project at various community meetings I think there are issue areas of community concern that should be better reflected in the non-binding recommendations by staff. I fear the lack of these so far is because of conscious or unconscious bias, and generally inside the box institutionally formed habits.

For instance recommendations are needed such as the following on issues of:
- **Lighting:** Analysis seems to ignore that much new lighting, from my experience, will be for the neighbors like looking at arc welding. I don't think this is addressed by all of the light measurements depicted in the analysis, and needs to be prevented.
- **Noise:** The analysis mentions noise issue complexity, and then fails to make recommendations considering:
  - Absolute noise levels do not address constant low level, but annoying to neighbors, noise from the pool area by clientele or music, and the possible "2 in the morning" Gab fests in the parking lot, etc. Much could be done to prevent this.
  - Any so called sound wall should be just that, like the cinder block wall design along freeway's.
  - The size of the hotel means the building is going to reflect and amplify sound, even low level sound, like a megaphone. The project sort of reflects "white noise" back to the east and the freeway, and annoying noise back to the neighborhood on the west.
Traffic and Circulation:
   Side street, neighborhood street, circulation could helpfully be addressed by:
   On site, or even off site, signage that discourages such traffic.
   Employee employment requirements that "forbid" use of neighborhood streets, and
   Instructions to clientele and service providers that they are not to use neighborhood
   Streets.

That concludes my comments. Hopefully they are helpful. There intention only to help Pleasant
Hill stay the nice community it is, and to help Pleasant Hill’s excellent staff do its work.

Doug Parker

PS
   I had to do this on line, and I am not very good in this realm. I know it is probably not the
   normal procedure, but it would be greatly appreciated if you could let me know if you
   successfully received this email.   Thanks
LETTER F, DOUG PARKER, 5/27/19

Comment F-1

This is an introductory statement that suggests recommendations should be implemented outside of the environmental process and does not contain specific comments on the environmental analysis.

Comment F-2

This comment expresses concern that the new lighting will be unpleasant for the neighbors and has not been taken into account in the analysis. The proposed Project’s lighting was evaluated in the EIR. The Photometric Plan, which presents the increase in lighting levels within and at the boundaries of the site, was included as Figure 4.9 in the Draft EIR. It is based on the actual lights proposed (detailed information about the lights are included in a table on the lower right of that figure). As demonstrated in this figure, and as discussed on page 4-14 of the Draft EIR, the proposed lighting meets all applicable regulations and, as such, will not result in a significant impact related to lighting.

Comment F-3

This comment expresses concern that noise from the pool and parking lot could be annoying to neighbors. The noise assessment included in the Draft EIR analyzed the Project as proposed. No amplified sound (speakers) are proposed in outdoor areas. The pool is proposed to be open from 10 am to 10 pm. A cinder block sound wall is proposed per industry standards at the boundary of the site with sensitive uses where it does not already exist. As detailed on pages 14-8 and 14-9 of the Draft EIR, noise levels from the parking lot and outdoor activity such as pool use would not result in significant noise impacts.

Note that the Project would be required to comply with all applicable noise regulations. Incidents of noise disturbance related to noise in exceedance of applicable noise regulations can occur at any location and are considered a Code Enforcement issue and not a CEQA issue. Should they occur, noise disturbances can be addressed through complaints filed with the local police department with respect to exceedances of the noise ordinance limits.

Comment F-4

This comment expresses concern that the proposed hotel will reflect sound. Illingworth and Rodkin, the noise specialists who conducted the noise study for the Draft EIR, were asked to evaluate this comment and provided the following response: Like any large solid surface or structure, some reflections of sound may occur. In this case, the building is situated between the highway and residences to the west. There are no dominant noise sources that would be reflected to the west and reflection of on-site hotel noise toward the west would not raise these sounds to significant levels. Additionally, the building will provide shielding from highway noise to residences to the west, reducing highway noise levels in areas behind the building. To the east, some sound reflection of highway noise could occur in areas on the project site and directly adjacent to the proposed building. At the closest off-site receptors to the east, which are located across I-680 and greater than 500 feet from the project site, changes to the noise environment would not be noticeable or measurable as they would be less than 0.5 dBA Leq.

Comment F-5

This comment recommends measures to discourage use of neighborhood streets by hotel staff and guests. The traffic study considered levels of traffic and roadway use, including the likelihood of
some cut through traffic, and found no significant impacts based on use design capacities and established thresholds for analysis.

However, while not required under CEQA, the applicant has agreed to provide information to their employees that discourage parking in surrounding streets and using surrounding neighboring streets to commute to and from work. They have also agreed to request that mapping programs (specifically Waze and Google Maps) do not use routes through neighborhood streets to/from their site. These have been proposed as conditions of Project approval. While these programs sometimes grant such requests, the outcome cannot be controlled by the applicant or City.

Comment F-6

This is a closing statement and does not contain specific comments on the environmental analysis.
RE: Comments on Cambria Hotel

May 29, 2019

Dear Mr. Fujimoto,

First let us say your job must be one similar to a counselor with disturbed patients. Your patience for the patients is to be commended. As life-long area residents, graduates of Pleasant Hill High School and Pleasant Hill Intermediate School we are appreciative for the public representatives attentive stewardship efforts for the public's needs. We only want this project to give beauty and variety to this special spot of Pleasant Hill.

This letter is to make comment on the Cambria Hotel. Stratus Development Partners' EIR has certain impacts upon our business that we believe have not been considered.

Why is it that the report makes no specific designation that a business is located adjacent to the project area? Only references are "residences" or "residential." OAK PARK HILLS CHAPEL is a funeral home - a business and has existed on the adjacent site of the hotel project for 58 years. Coincidently Monday being Memorial Day, the OAK PARK HILLS CHAPEL being a funeral home offers a place of peaceful sanctuary to mourning families and has another history related to the U.S. Army veterans of World War II that served in the Pacific Theater and veterans that served in Korea.

The structure of OAK PARK HILLS CHAPEL is a re-purposed historical structure that existed originally on the site of Camp Stoneman in Pittsburg, CA as the base clinic. Camp Stoneman was named after George Stoneman, Jr. a US Army Cavalry officer during the Civil War and 15th Governor of California. The clinic at Camp Stoneman processed over two million GIs between 1942 and 1954. Through sacrifice and hard work by many members of our family, this structure was sectioned up and rolled over the Willow Pass, placed on its current site and remodeled into a funeral home. In the last 10 years at least six of those GIs that were honorably discharged at Camp Stoneman, had their funerals performed here, too.
The Executive Summary and Impact Overview, Page 2-1, we object to the finding "No" SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS THAT CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT. Because on the next page, 2-2 section IMPACTS REDUCED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT THROUGH MITIGATION, the last paragraph noted: "Noise: Construction and operation of the Project could increase noise levels at nearby noise sensitive land uses. Construction noise control measures (Mitigation Measure Noise-1)." The word "could" is our concern. Is the funeral home to be considered a "noise sensitive land use"? Here again is a part where the report does not allow for the adjacent business to be recognized. We appreciate that the BAAQMD efforts will be practiced, and in Table 2.1 Summary, Potential Environmental Impacts, Impact Noise 1: Construction Noise and Vibration, we would strongly request to be involved with the Contractor and the "Disturbance Coordinator" on a first name basis for all the demolition and major construction projects.

The DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, Chapter 14 CONSTRUCTION (TEMPORARY) NOISE AND VIBRATION page 14-5 has important significance to the type of business that is conducted at OAK PARK HILLS CHAPEL. We feel specific focus on this policy needs to be visited and discussed: "The City of Pleasant Hill does not establish a vibration limit for construction. For structural damage, the California Department of Transportation recommends a vibration limit of 0.5 in/sec PPV for buildings structurally sound and designed to modern engineering standards, which typically consist of buildings constructed since the 1990s. A conservative vibration limit of 0.3 in/sec PPV has been used for buildings that are found to be structurally sound but where structural damage is a major concern. For historic and old buildings, the limit is 0.08 in/sec PPV (see Table 3). There are no known historical or structurally weakened buildings within 300 feet of the proposed building. Therefore, the 0.3 in/sec PPV threshold would apply." As previously stated the OAK PARK HILLS CHAPEL structure was originally constructed in 1942 and the entire structure sectioned up and moved in 1960. Therefore, we believe the funeral home's structure, based on this paragraph would fall into the designation of "historic and old" or "structurally weakened" and require the lower vibration limit of 0.08 in/sec PPV. We feel Engineers need to revisit the vibration mitigation process as described in this paragraph: "The annoyance levels shown in Table 3 should be interpreted with care since vibration may be found to be annoying at much lower levels than those shown, depending on the level of activity or the sensitivity of the individual. To sensitive individuals, vibrations approaching the threshold of perception can be annoying. Low-level vibrations frequently cause irritating secondary vibration, such as a slight rattling of windows, doors, or stacked dishes. The rattling sound can give rise to exaggerated vibration complaints, even though there is very little risk of actual structural damage." (Appendix I: Environmental Noise and Vibration Assessment, page 3)

Groundborne Vibrations are something we experienced when the Pleasant Hill Inn/Motel was demolished due to the widening of North Main Street from Boyd
Road south to our location. Also, when the AAA Insurance office tower near the Pleasant Hill BART station was constructed, the pile driver vibrations cracked parts of the front of the white stucco surface of the OAK PARK HILLS CHAPEL and the pounding vibrations also created a disturbing feeling during some of the family services and visitations for their deceased loved ones preventing them the protected, undisturbed and peaceful sanctuary when mourning.

Table 2.1 Potential Impact, Impact Noise -2 Operational Noise, appears to only deal with Rooftop Equipment and the options for a sound wall to shield and mitigate the sound of the equipment. No mention of a sound wall for shielding the hotel customers from the adjacent business (Oak Park Hills Chapel). Seeing vehicles associated with funerals, caskets and mourning people. Vacationing customers may not want to view these scenes, possibly a deterrent to selecting the hotel.

Table 2.1 Potential Impact, Impact Hydro 2, Altered Runoff makes no mention of the changes that could result in flows over capacity off the system toward the southern property line. To mitigate flooding into the neighboring business (Oak Park Hills Chapel) there is an existing storm drain and grate for flows to move into, but this grate is completely blocked at this time. The storm drain's reliability is questionable and should be renovated.

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT Chapter 3, pages 3-2 & 3-3 there is mention of a "proposed concrete masonry wall". However, the only wall location specific to the southern property line with the adjacent business (Oak Park Hills Chapel) is designated on the Fig. 3.7 Landscaping Plan design page 3-17 and only in the southwest corner of the plan. Two Questions: Will this concrete masonry wall extend from the southwest corner of the project continuously along the property line at the same height as the eastern wall to the southeast corner at North Main Street? Will this wall be constructed before any demolition? Because Fig. 3.5 Demolition Plan, page 3-13 has a note with arrow on southern property line "WALL TO REMAIN". Currently there is no wall, only a chain link fence.

Thank you for your attention to our comments and concerns.

Best regards,
Mark and Brad Magleby
Owners
Oak Park Hills Chapel
3111 N. Main St. | Walnut Creek, CA | 94597
Phone: 925-934-6500 | Fax: 925-938-4808
www.oakparkhillschapel.com

cc: Pleasant Hill City Council
LETTER G, MARK AND BRAD MAGLEY, OAK PARK HILLS CHAPEL, 5/29/19

Comment G-1

This is an introductory statement and does not contain specific comments on the environmental analysis.

Comment G-2

This comment expresses concern that sensitivity of the adjacent funeral home has not been taken into account in the analysis. The environmental analysis uses the term “sensitive receptor” to indicate uses that are sensitive to particular impacts. Which uses are considered “sensitive receptors” is specific to the type of impact being discussed. The funeral home would be considered sensitive to daytime noise but for example, would not be considered sensitive to nighttime noise or lighting.

The detailed noise analysis included as Appendix I and used as the basis for conclusions in the noise chapter of the Draft EIR analyzed both residential and commercial noise sensitive uses and identified potential impacts and mitigation related to noise levels at sensitive commercial uses. See Impacts and Mitigation Measures Noise-1 and Noise-2 related to construction noise and mechanical equipment noise. As the residential threshold is more restrictive than that which applies to commercial uses, and the residences are located closer to the hotel building than the adjacent commercial use, meeting the noise limits at residences was the controlling factor and so it documented in multiple locations in the analysis. If the noise limits are met at the nearest residential use (which, as documented in the Draft EIR, they will be if the recommended mitigation is implemented), the noise limits will also be met at this commercial use.

Revisions have been added in the noise chapter (14) to the introduction of sensitive receptors, the construction-period noise mitigation, and the impact statement and summary of operational noise changes to make clear that this commercial noise sensitive use, as well as the residential noise sensitive uses, are included in the analysis and required mitigation. See Chapter 22 for the revisions.

Comment G-3

This comment references part of a summary statement that notes the Project “could” increase noise at nearby noise-sensitive uses. The next sentence continues the summary to explain that identified mitigation would ensure noise levels remain below significance levels. Under CEQA, the potential for impacts are identified (“could” language) along with mitigation that would reduce the potential impacts, as is the case here. While the referenced text was a summary statement, the complete noise analysis can be found in Chapter 14 (and Appendix I) of the Draft EIR, confirming conclusions that all potential noise impacts, including those at this noise-sensitive commercial use, would be reduced below significance levels with implementation of identified mitigation. See also response to Comment G-2 regarding commercial sensitive receptors.

Comment G-4

This comment requests specific construction noise coordination. Mitigation Measure Noise-2 requires in the eight bullet point that, “The contractor shall prepare a detailed construction plan identifying the schedule for major noise-generating construction activities. The construction plan shall identify a procedure for coordination with the adjacent residents and noise sensitive commercial facilities so
that construction activities can be scheduled to minimize noise disturbance.” The underlined text has been added for clarification (see revisions in Chapter 22).

Comment G-5

This comment expresses concern regarding construction-period vibration and questions the potential to damage their building. Pile driving, which can generate substantial vibration as noted in the comment, is not proposed for this Project. Illingworth and Rodkin, the noise specialists who conducted the noise study for the Draft EIR were asked to evaluate this comment. They responded that the ‘historic and old or structurally weakened’ criteria apply to structures identified by the City as such, which does not describe this building. That being said, at a distance of 150 feet, which is the distance from Oak Park Hills Chapel to heavy project construction; vibration levels from proposed construction equipment (which does not include pile driving) are calculated to be 0.03 in/sec PPV or less and would be well below any criteria for structural damage, including the historic and structurally weakened one even if that were applicable here.

Comment G-6

The noise analysis in the Draft EIR was performed assuming the existing fence would remain at the identified boundary and a sound wall in this location was not required to reduce impacts from an environmental perspective. While not related to an environmental impact, the applicant has agreed to extend the solid sound wall across this boundary consistent with City code requirements and this has been proposed as a condition of Project approval.

Comment G-7

This comment expresses concern regarding existing storm drainage and changes in runoff. While preliminary plans do not indicate any significant changes in run-off or drainage impacts as detailed on page 12-6 of the Draft EIR, per standard procedure, final hydraulic studies based on construction-level details must be submitted and will be reviewed by the City as part of the permitting process to assure that there are no significant impacts to the existing storm drain network or capacity. Furthermore the applicant is required to meet all regional and national storm water requirements.

Comment G-8

This comment questions whether there is a plan for a solid wall at the boundary between the Project and the Chapel. See response to comment G-6 above. While such a sound wall would not be required under CEQA, the applicants have agreed to voluntarily include such a wall as a condition of Project approval.
Troy,

1. Known concerns did not mention pedestrian safety and the lack of complete sidewalks on oak park blvd. I brought this up multiple times in meetings that the project will bring additional traffic to streets with inadequate sidewalks and bicycle infrastructure on Oak Park Blvd. I know it is on the recorded videos for the meeting and I'm concerned that this was not included in the draft EIR. I fear that this will increase risk for kids walking/biking to school and commuters walking/biking to BART. The Traffic section does mention the incomplete coverage of sidewalks and bicycle infrastructure. I might have missed it but I did not see any recommendations that these deficiency be mitigated. This seems like a major oversight especially when it was brought up in meetings as a known issue that should be looked into.

2. I believe the traffic assessment is flawed. It looks like they intentionally did not study the Oak Park Blvd and hook intersection. On that intersection is a highly trafficked gas station that cause significant traffic (Turns into the station and turns out of the station). There are significant wait times during wait times during peak hours. The additional traffic would further slow this intersection. Also the merge from two north bound oak blvd lanes to one lane (and associated speeding by drivers racing to pass each other) at that intersection makes it dangerous for cars on Hook avenue and the gas station to turn onto Oak Park Blvd. There is no justification as to why this intersection was excluded and less trafficked intersections were included.

Also a layman it is hard to decipher the methodology used to estimate traffic patterns. My concern is that drivers coming from Oakland on 24 during rush hour who use WAZE, google maps, and other related service will be directed to take the Pleasant Hill Road exit in Lafayette and then take Pleasant Hill Road to Oak Park Blvd. These Apps frequently show this is the quickest route because of the congestion on 24/680. I can't tell from the jargon used in the traffic study if this type of flow is factored into their analysis.

Thanks for your time. I hope these two concerns could be looked into.

Matt Callahan
1624 Oak Park Blvd
LETTER H, MATT CALLAHAN, 5/31/19

Comment H-1

This comment expresses concerns related to inadequate sidewalk connections and bicycle infrastructure. While there are inadequate sidewalk connections and bicycle infrastructure in the area, these are existing conditions and would not represent a significant impact of the Project itself. The transportation impact assessment prepared for the Project and included in full as Appendix J of the Draft EIR evaluated the bicycle and pedestrian conditions in the study area and acknowledged barriers to non-motorized travel between the Project site and the Pleasant Hill BART Station. The Project proposes to provide a free shuttle between the hotel and the Pleasant Hill BART station and recommendations to improve overall bicycle and pedestrian travel in the immediate study area were developed (page 48 of Appendix J).

The CCTA 2018 Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan identifies the provision of a low street bicycle facility on Oak Park Boulevard between the Contra Costa Canal Trail and the Iron Horse Trail. Construction of the Project would not preclude the future provision of a low street bicycle facility or sidewalks on Oak Park Boulevard. All Bike and Pedestrian improvements and circulation will be analyzed as part of the City's future Bike and Ped plan and General Plan Update.

Comment H-2

This comment questions whether the Project would have a significant impact on the Oak Park Boulevard and Hook Avenue intersection, which was not one of the study intersections in the Draft EIR. The CCTA guidelines for the preparation of traffic studies recommends that signalized intersections be evaluated where a project is expected to add more than 50 peak hour trips. The Project is expected to add less than 10 trips during either the morning or evening peak hour through this intersection, with no trips added to the southbound movement from Hook Avenue to Oak Park Boulevard. Based on the level of traffic that the Project would add through this intersection, its effect on overall intersection operations would be so small that it can be certain it will be less than significant and was therefore not further studied.

This comment also questions the potential for impacts where Oak Park Boulevard merges from two lanes to one lane. The Project traffic increase within the merge area is expected to be so small that it can be certain it will be less than significant, with less than 5 added vehicles in either peak hour. This level of added traffic would have, if any, an effect on overall operations of the merge area that would be so small it can be certain it will be less than significant and so was not further studied.

Comment H-3

This comment expresses concern that mapping programs will direct traffic through neighborhood streets during rush hour and that this may not have been taken into account in the Draft EIR analysis. The Project trip assignment considered that some drivers may deviate from the typical travel routes and cut-through on neighborhood streets, or exit SR 24 at Pleasant Hill Road and travel to Oak Park Boulevard. However, not all trips will deviate from the typical travel route, and over assigning Project trips to “cut-through” routes can serve to dilute the projects impacts to the primary travel routes to the Project and potentially result in impacts being understated along the primary travel routes to the Project site.
While not required under CEQA, the applicant has agreed to request that mapping programs (specifically Waze and Google Maps) do not use routes through neighborhood streets to/from their site. The requirement to make the request has been proposed as a condition of Project approval. While these programs sometimes grant such requests, the outcome cannot be controlled by the applicant or City.