

## CHAPTER 4: EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

### 4.1 - Introduction

This chapter is based on the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Notice of Preparation (NOP), dated November 15, 2018, and contained in Appendix A of this EIR. The NOP was prepared to identify the potentially significant effects of the Specific Plan (proposed plan) and was circulated for public review between November 15, 2018, and December 17, 2018. In the course of this evaluation, certain impacts were found to be less than significant, because construction and operation of the proposed plan would not result in such impacts. This chapter provides a brief description of effects found not to be significant or less than significant, based on the NOP, NOP public comments letters received, and more detailed analysis conducted as part of the EIR preparation process. Note that a number of impacts that are found to be less than significant are addressed in the various EIR topical sections (Sections 3.1 through 3.15) to provide more comprehensive discussion of why impacts are less than significant, in order to better inform decision makers and the general public.

### 4.2 - Effects Found Not To Be Significant

#### 4.2.1 - Agriculture and Forestry Resources

No agricultural land or forestland currently exists within the Specific Plan area (plan area). The plan area is currently designated for utility facilities, libraries, City offices, fire stations, churches, hospitals, residential, retail, commercial, office, and/or public uses in the City of Pleasant Hill 2003 General Plan and for medium density single-family residential land uses and Planned Unit Development uses in the Pleasant Hill Municipal Code.<sup>1,2</sup> The project site is mapped “Urban and Built-up Land,” a non-agricultural designation, by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.<sup>3</sup> As such, construction and operation of the proposed plan would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses, would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, would not conflict with existing zoning for forestland or timberland, and would not result in loss or conversion of forestland to non-forest uses.<sup>4,5</sup> Therefore, no impact related to agriculture or forestry resources would occur.

#### 4.2.2 - Mineral Resources

There are no mineral resource recovery sites on or in the vicinity of the plan area. A Mineral Resource Zones and Resources Sectors map prepared by the California Geological Survey indicates that the plan area is located in an area not containing any known mineral occurrences of

<sup>1</sup> City of Pleasant Hill. 2003. City of Pleasant Hill 2003 General Plan.

<sup>2</sup> City of Pleasant Hill. 2018. City of Pleasant Hill Municipal Code, Title 18 Planning and Land Use. Website: <https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/PleasantHill/>. Accessed February 20, 2019.

<sup>3</sup> California Department of Conservation. 2018. Contra Costa County Important Farmland 2016. Website: <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2016/con16.pdf>. Accessed February 20, 2019.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> California Department of Conservation. 2013. Contra Costa County Williamson Act FY 2012/2013. Website: <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2016/con16.pdf>. Accessed February 20, 2019.

undetermined mineral significance.<sup>6</sup> Thus, implementation of the proposed plan would not result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated by an applicable land use plan. The plan area is currently designated for utility facilities, libraries, City offices, fire stations, churches, hospitals, residential, retail, commercial, office, and/or public uses in the City of Pleasant Hill 2003 General Plan.<sup>7</sup> As such, construction and operation of the proposed plan would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of Statewide, regional, or local importance. Therefore, no impact related to mineral resources would occur.

---

<sup>6</sup> California Department of Conservation. 1987. Mineral Resource Zones and Resource Sectors Contra Costa County. Website: [file:///C:/Users/cdamle/Downloads/SR-146\\_Plate\\_2.2.pdf](file:///C:/Users/cdamle/Downloads/SR-146_Plate_2.2.pdf). Accessed February 20, 2019.

<sup>7</sup> City of Pleasant Hill. 2003. City of Pleasant Hill 2003 General Plan.

## CHAPTER 5: OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

### 5.1 - Significant Unavoidable Impacts

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.2(a)(b) requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the Specific Plan (proposed plan), including effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed plan were implemented.

The Civic Project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts.

The Residential Project would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

- Historic resources impact related to demolition of the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR)-eligible library currently located at 1750 Oak Park Boulevard; and
- Cumulative historic resources impact related to demolition of the existing CRHR-eligible library.

### 5.2 - Growth-Inducing Impacts

There are two types of growth-inducing impacts that a project may have: direct and indirect. To assess the potential for growth-inducing impacts, the proposed plan's characteristics that may encourage and facilitate activities that individually or cumulatively may affect the environment must be evaluated (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2(d)). CEQA Guidelines, as interpreted by the City, state that a significant growth-inducing impact may result if the proposed plan would:

- Induce substantial population growth in an area (for example, by proposing new homes and commercial or industrial businesses beyond the land use density/intensity envisioned in the general plan);
- Substantially alter the planned location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the population of an area; or
- Include extensions of roads or other infrastructure not assumed in the general plan or adopted capital improvements project list, when such infrastructure exceeds the needs of a project and could accommodate future developments.

Direct growth-inducing impacts occur when the development of a project imposes new burdens on a community by directly inducing population growth, or by leading to the construction of additional developments in the same area. Also included in this category are projects that remove physical obstacles to population growth (such as a new road into an undeveloped area or a wastewater treatment plant with excess capacity that could allow additional development in the service area). Construction of these types of infrastructure projects cannot be considered isolated from the development they facilitate and serve. Projects that physically remove obstacles to growth, or projects

that indirectly induce growth may provide a catalyst for future unrelated development in an area such as a new residential community that requires additional commercial uses to support residents.

The plan area is located in the southeastern portion of the City of Pleasant Hill in an urbanized area. The Civic Project involves the construction and operation of a replacement library, a new park, roadway improvements, and upgrading three existing outfalls to Grayson Creek. The Residential Project involves the construction and operation of new residences.

Implementing the proposed plan would directly induce growth in the City, but not in a manner that is beyond the Citywide land use densities/intensities envisioned in the Pleasant Hill 2003 General Plan for this area of Pleasant Hill. According to the California Department of Finance (CDF), as of 2018, the City's population was 35,068 people.<sup>1</sup> According to the CDF and the Pleasant Hill 2015 Housing Element, the population of the City is expected to increase by 2,632 people by 2040, resulting in a total anticipated population of 35,900 by 2030.<sup>2</sup> The Residential Project would develop 34 single-family homes with seven accessory dwelling units and would be expected to result in an additional population of approximately 103 persons.<sup>3</sup> The proposed library would continue to provide space for the City's existing library personnel, and the positions at the existing library would be relocated to the new library; there would be no increase in the number of employees related to the library portion of the Civic Project; the new library is expected to employ 20 persons. The other plan components are not anticipated to require new employees during operation. Conservatively assuming that all of the approximately 103 people would be new to the City, the population growth associated with the Residential Project would represent 0.29 percent of the total 35,068 population of the City of Pleasant Hill as reported by the CDF in 2018. Therefore, direct population growth as a result of the proposed plan is considered negligible. In addition, this direct population growth associated with the proposed plan would be consistent with growth projections for the City as projected by the Association of Bay Area Governments.

The proposed plan would also not significantly and adversely affect the permanent jobs/housing balance, because the proposed plan would create residential development without significantly increasing the number of permanent jobs. Therefore, it would not create a housing demand above what would otherwise occur in the City. Housing included as part of the Residential Project would help the City achieve a more balanced job/housing balance by providing much-needed housing.

The plan area currently consists of vacant, undeveloped land as well as an existing library and vacant administrative offices with surface parking lot. Implementing the Civic and Residential Project would require the extension of electrical, natural gas, flood control, and water utility infrastructure and connections to existing utilities infrastructure on and adjacent to the plan area. However, this extension of infrastructure would not remove physical obstacles to population growth and, thus, would not induce growth in other areas, because the plan area is already within an urbanized area and the adjacent areas are already developed and zoned residential, commercial, public institutional, and

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Finance (CDF). 2018. Table 2: E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 1/1/2018. Website: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-5/>. Accessed January 2, 2019.

<sup>2</sup> California Department of Finance (CDF). 2018. Table E-4. Historical Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State. Website: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/>; City of Pleasant Hill Housing Element, 2015-Table H2. Population Estimates and Projections, 2010-2040.

<sup>3</sup> The California Department of Finance (CDF). Persons per household ratio for the City of Pleasant Hill is 2.50.

recreational. Furthermore, the Civic Project and Residential Project would be compatible with the surrounding residential uses and not pressure adjacent properties to redevelop with new or different land uses. As a result, it is not anticipated that nearby residents would relocate. Therefore, the proposed plan would not remove a barrier to growth nor create an indirect population increase.

Because the proposed plan would not result in indirect growth, negatively alter the existing jobs/housing balance, or be inconsistent with the Pleasant Hill 2003 General Plan, or Pleasant Hill 2015 Housing Element's direct growth projections for the City, the growth-inducing impact would be less than significant.

### 5.3 - Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

As mandated by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c), the EIR must address significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from implementation of the proposed plan. Specifically, such an irreversible environmental change would occur if:

- The proposed plan would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources;
- Irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the proposed plan; and
- The proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the proposed plan results in the wasteful use of energy). (Refer to Section 3.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions/Energy, which addresses this topic in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix G)

The Civic Project involves the construction and operation of a replacement library, a new park, roadway improvements, and upgrading three existing outfalls to Grayson Creek. The Residential Project involves the construction and operation of new residences. The proposed plan would result in 47.36 percent of the site being left as open space or landscaped area. Of the 302 trees on-site, 154 are "protected trees" under Pleasant Hill's Tree Preservation Ordinance. Pursuant to the Pleasant Hill's Tree Preservation ordinance, non-protected trees would be replaced at a 1:1 ratio and protected trees are replaced by two trees for each protected tree removed.

Construction debris recycling practices would be expected to allow for the recovery and reuse of building materials such as concrete, lumber, and steel and would limit disposal of these materials, some of which are non-renewable. Construction would include the use of building materials, such as petroleum-based products and metals that cannot reasonably be recreated. Construction also would involve significant consumption of energy, usually petroleum-based fuels that deplete supplies of nonrenewable resources. Construction of structures and infrastructure would consume energy and water; however, because of its temporary and one-time nature, construction associated with the proposed plan would not represent a significant irreversible use of resources.

Once construction is complete, the land uses associated with the Civic Project and Residential Project would use some nonrenewable fuels to heat and light structures and consume water. The new residential, semi-public and institutional, and recreational uses would be required to be built to and adhere to the latest adopted edition of the California Green Building Standards Code, which

includes a number of standards that would reduce energy demand, water consumption, wastewater generation, and solid waste generation that would collectively reduce the demand for resources. This compliance would result in the emission and generation of less pollution and effluent and lessen the severity of corresponding environmental effects. Thus, although the proposed plan would result in an irretrievable commitment of non-renewable resources, energy for heat and light and water for irrigation and plumbing would not be consumed inefficiently, unnecessarily, or wastefully.

Furthermore, the Civic Project and Residential Project do not have the potential to cause significant environmental accidents through releases into the environment, as they would not involve large quantities of hazardous materials (see Section 3.7, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire, for additional information). In addition, the plan area is located within an urbanized area that is not within a State responsibility area or land classified as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Given that the southeast area of the City of Pleasant Hill is not located in steep terrain surrounded by natural vegetation nor does it consistently experience high winds, the plan area would be not be substantially prone to wildfires (see Section 3.7, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire, for additional information). As discussed in Section 3.12, Public Services, the existing fire protection facilities would be adequate to serve the Civic Project and Residential Project, and the proposed plan would not result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to the need for new or altered fire protection facilities. Thus, implementation of the proposed plan would not have the potential to result in significant environmental accidents related to wildfire hazards and would not result in significant irreversible environmental changes.

## CHAPTER 6: ALTERNATIVES

### 6.1 - Introduction

In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.6, this chapter contains a comparative impact assessment of alternatives to the Oak Park Properties Specific Plan (proposed plan). The primary purpose of an alternatives analysis under CEQA is to provide decision-makers and the public with a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the proposed plan that could attain most of the basic plan objectives, while avoiding or reducing any of the plan's significant adverse environmental effects.

Analysis of three alternatives to the proposed plan is provided for informational purposes and to allow decision-makers to consider the Civic Project and Residential Project in light of hypothetical alternative development scenarios, thereby promoting CEQA's purpose as an information disclosure statute. This analysis is guided by the following considerations set forth under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6:

- An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project;
- An EIR should identify alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but rejected as infeasible during the scoping process;
- Reasons for rejecting an alternative include:
  - Failure to meet most of the basic project objectives;
  - Infeasibility; or
  - Inability to avoid significant environmental effects.

### 6.2 - Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

The implementation of the proposed plan was analyzed for potentially significant impacts related to each of the environmental issues discussed in Sections 3.1 through 3.15.

The results of the analysis indicate that the Civic Project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts. The Residential Project would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

- Historic resources impact related to demolition of the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR)-eligible library currently located at 1700 Oak Park Boulevard; and
- Cumulative historic resources impact related to demolition of the existing CRHR-eligible library.

Mitigation measures were identified for these aforementioned historic resources impacts but would not reduce the impacts to less than significant. Thus, even though the Residential Project attempts to mitigate its impacts to the greatest extent feasible as required by CEQA, the mitigation is not technically feasible or sufficient or available to reduce impacts from significant and unavoidable.

## 6.3 - Alternatives to the Proposed Plan

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, this EIR presents a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed plan for analysis and evaluation of their comparative merits. These alternatives are considered to cover the range of development alternatives that would meet the basic objectives of the plan while lessening one or more of its significant impacts. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) states that an EIR need not evaluate every conceivable alternative. Information has been provided for each alternative that would allow meaningful comparison with the proposed plan.

CEQA requires that an EIR analyze a “no project” alternative (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(e)). Where, as here, this alternative means a proposed project would not proceed, the discussion “[sh]ould compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state against environmental effects which would occur if the project is approved” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(e)(3)(B)). Another type of alternative to be considered includes consideration of what could reasonably be expected in the foreseeable future if the project is not approved, based on current land use plans/designations/zoning and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. In addition, given the significant and unavoidable historic resources alternative under the Residential Project, a type of historic preservation alternative is to be considered.

The three alternatives to the proposed plan analyzed in this chapter are as follows:

- **No Project, No Development Alternative:** The proposed plan would not be implemented. Neither the Civic Project nor the Residential project would proceed. The existing library on the Residential Project site would remain operational and the administrative offices would remain vacant. The library would remain operational as long as County funding remained available to address ongoing and deferred maintenance issues. The Civic Project site would also remain vacant. No roadway improvements or creek improvements would occur. The pedestrian trail and potential future bridge proposed along the eastern portion of the Civic Project to connect the to the off-site East Bay Municipal Utilities District (EBMUD) trail would not be constructed.
- **Code Compliant Alternative:** The proposed plan would not be developed. The existing library would remain operational as long as County funding remains available and the administrative offices would remain vacant on the 1750 Oak Park property. No new library or new park would be constructed or operated as part of the Civic Project.

The Pleasant Hill 2015 Housing Element designates the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property as a potential housing site;<sup>1</sup> therefore, for this alternative, the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property would be developed with a total of 96 single-family, small-lot, detached units as set forth in the Housing Element. This would result in a density of approximately 10 to 12 units per acre on the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property. No new library or new ballfields would be constructed or operated as part of this alternative.

<sup>1</sup> City of Pleasant Hill. 2015. Pleasant Hill 2015 General Plan Housing Element-Table D1. Potential Housing Sites (page 92). Website: <https://www.ci.pleasant-hill.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/5328/2009-ADOPTED-and-CERTIFIED-Housing-Element-August?bidId=>. Accessed January 3, 2019.



The stormwater infrastructure improvements and construction of the pedestrian trail, as described under the Civic Project, would occur. Similar to the Civic Project, the proposed pedestrian trail along the eastern portion of the Civic Project would be constructed. In addition, the potential future pre-cast pedestrian bridge across Grayson Creek, connecting the EBMUD trail to the proposed pedestrian trail on the Civic Project site, may be constructed once funding is secured. The roadway improvements as described under the Civic Project would also occur.

- **Partial Historic Preservation Alternative:** The proposed park and library as detailed under the Civic Project would be constructed and operated on the 1700 Oak Park property. All Creek, floodplain, and roadway improvements, as well as construction of the pedestrian trail as described under the Civic Project, would also occur. However, with respect to the Residential Project, on the 1750 Oak Park property, architecturally significant elements of the existing library complex including the library rotunda and connected southern annex building (Sections A and B in original building drawings totaling 30,000 to 32,985 gross square feet) would be preserved in keeping with the Secretary of Interior’s standards for the rehabilitation of historic properties and subject to the 2016 California Historical Building Code (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 24, Part 8). The goal in rehabilitating these two connected sections would be to preserve the relationship between the circular library rotunda (Section A) and the angular, zigzag roofed office annex (Section B). The sharp contrasts in form and style between the two connected sections are representative of the architecturally significant “International Style” in which the library complex was designed. Other significant elements to be retained include these sections’ vitrolite paneling, aluminum framing, and windows. Once retrofitted, the buildings could be re-utilized as a residential-serving community center. This residential-serving community center would be available to the tenants on the site only, and would not be a resource for the community. Under this alternative, 21,840 to 24,736 gross square feet of the existing library building complex would be demolished. Up to 10 single-family residential units and two accessory dwelling units would be constructed and operated around the rehabilitated section of the existing library structure throughout the 1750 Oak Park property. Similar to the Residential Project, 1750 Oak Park property access would be from off of Monticello Avenue.

## 6.4 - Project Objectives

As stated in Chapter 2, Project Descriptions, the proposed plan has the following objectives for implementation of the Civic Project and Residential Project:

### Specific Plan

- Adopt a comprehensive planning document to establish specific guiding principles for redevelopment of 16.60 acres of land across various properties within the plan area that includes a Civic Project (Library, Roadway, Trail, Stormwater Infrastructure and Park Improvements) and a Residential (infill development) Project.

## Civic Project

### Library Component

- To develop a new, state-of-the-art community library with interior and exterior community gathering spaces that serves the citizens of the City of Pleasant Hill and the vicinity well into the future;
- To support multi-generational learning and a variety of learning styles as well as overall literacy within the community.

### Roadway, Trail, Creek, and Floodplain Improvements Component

- To provide the needed pavement surface, bike/pedestrian facilities, and other public roadway infrastructure to facilitate a logical and safe roadway facility that balances the overall needs of vehicles, bicycle, and pedestrians in the area and address key traffic circulation issues within the limits of the Civic Project;
- To create a new pedestrian trail parallel to and providing visual access to Grayson Creek; and
- To enhance stormwater capacity, conveyance, and detention within the existing floodplain and protect the proposed new library building from flooding by increasing its site elevation.

### Park Component

- To enhance recreation and park facilities for City of Pleasant Hill residents;
- To create new high-quality athletic fields to support local youth leagues and provide positive out-of-school time youth activities;
- To increase field time available for sports leagues by extending useable playing time;
- To provide opportunities for adults to improve their health and wellness through active sports opportunities;
- To offer a community-gathering place via a park that provides active and passive spaces;
- To reduce impact on other parks in the City of Pleasant Hill by adding popular amenities such as bocce ball courts;
- To improve drop-off/pick-up access to Pleasant Hill Middle School through the modification of the parking area north of the Civic Project site; and
- To meet the recreation service demand established in the Contra Costa Local Agency Formation Commission *Municipal Service Review: Parks and Recreation and Cemetery Services*.<sup>2</sup>

## Residential Project

- To maximize infill development on underutilized properties in an area served by public transit;
- To develop residential land uses in an area served by adequate infrastructure and services;

---

<sup>2</sup> Contra Costa County Local Agency Formation Commission. 2010. *Municipal Service Review: Parks and Recreation and Cemetery Services*. April.

- To provide housing opportunities within the City of Pleasant Hill that will help address an overall housing shortage throughout the Bay Area region; and
- To create new housing proximate to public services such as schools, parks, and other community facilities in order to reduce vehicle trips that would otherwise be necessary.

## 6.5 - Alternative 1—No Project, No Development Alternative

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) to evaluate a “No Project Alternative,” which is defined as the “circumstance under which the project does not proceed.” Under the No Project/No Action Alternative, new residential units, a new park, and a new library would not be constructed and operated within the plan area. In addition, the various floodplain management and street improvements as part of the proposed plan’s Civic Project would not occur. The existing library would remain operational and the administrative offices would remain vacant. The library would remain operational as long as County funding remained available to address ongoing and deferred maintenance issues. .

### 6.5.1 - Impact Analysis

#### Aesthetics

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, the proposed plan would not be implemented, the on-site library would remain operational, the administrative offices would remain vacant, and landscaping/trees would remain the same. The new residential units (as part of the alternative to the Residential Project) would not be constructed. Also, the new park and new library proposed as part of the Civic Project would not be constructed and operated, nor would the various floodplain management, creek, and street improvements occur. There would be no change in visual character, views, nighttime lighting, daytime glare, or shadow, as there would be no change to the existing on-site buildings, parking area, streets, utility lines, topography, or vegetation/landscaping. Thus, there would be no aesthetics impacts under this alternative.

The proposed plan’s impacts related to aesthetics would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.1, Aesthetics). The No Project, No Development Alternative would have a lower level of aesthetic impacts compared to the proposed plan; however, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to the Civic Project or Residential Project in terms of visual character, as this alternative would not contribute to enhanced recreation and park facilities for City of Pleasant Hill residents nor would it provide the City with a new, state-of-the-art community library with interior and exterior community gathering spaces.

#### Air Quality

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, the plan area would not be redeveloped, and the on-site library and administrative offices would not be removed. There would be no change related to criteria pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions, as there would be no change to the existing on-site buildings and associated library operations or daily vehicle trips. Thus, there would be no air quality impacts under this alternative.

The proposed plan impacts related to air quality would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.2, Air Quality). The No Project, No Development Alternative would result in lower levels of criteria pollutant and toxic air contaminant emission generation impacts compared to the proposed plan. However, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to residential, park, or library facilities in terms of air quality, as this alternative would not provide modernized municipal facilities and, thus, would not promote greater energy efficiency nor maximize infill development on underutilized properties in an area served by adequate infrastructure and services in proximity to neighborhood shopping and public transit.

### **Biological Resources**

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, the plan area would not be redeveloped, the on-site library and administrative offices would not be removed, and landscaping/trees would remain the same. Under the Residential Project, the new residential units would not be constructed. Also, the new park and new library proposed as part of the Civic Project would not be constructed and operated, nor would the various floodplain management, creek, and street improvements occur. There would be no change related to wildlife, habitat, and waters of the United States, as there would be no improvements to Grayson Creek including enhanced capacity of the underground storm drain system, no new bioretention basins to provide pretreatment of stormwater, and upgrades to outfalls to improve creek water conveyance and reduce potential for erosion. Thus, there would be no biological resources impacted or enhanced under this alternative.

The proposed plan impacts related to biological resources would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.2, Biological Resources). The No Project, No Development Alternative would have a lower level of biological resources impact compared to the proposed plan; however, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to residential, park, or library facilities.

### **Cultural and Tribal Resources**

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, the administrative offices would remain vacant, and the existing library would remain operational as long as County funding remains available to address ongoing and deferred maintenance issues. The property at 1700 Oak Park would also remain vacant. As such, there would be no change in historic, archeological, or tribal cultural resources, as there would be no change to the existing on-site buildings and no ground disturbance would occur. Thus, there would be no cultural resources impacts under this alternative.

The proposed plan impacts related to cultural resources would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation (see Section 3.4, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources). The No Project, No Development Alternative would have a lower level of cultural resources impact compared to the proposed plan. However, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to park or library facilities as this alternative would not contribute to enhanced recreation and park facilities for City of Pleasant Hill residents nor provide the community with a new, state-of-the-art community library with interior and exterior community gathering spaces. Furthermore, there are no plan objectives for cultural or tribal cultural resources.

## **Geology and Soils**

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, the plan area would not be redeveloped, and the on-site library and administrative offices would not be removed. Existing buildings would continue not to meet current building codes related to current energy, seismic safety, and fire provisions and, thus, during a seismic event could result in adverse impacts related to groundshaking, liquefaction, unstable soils, and expansive soils. Thus, there would be a significant and unavoidable impact related to potential exposure of persons and property to seismic- and soil-related hazards under this alternative.

The proposed plan impacts related to geology and soils would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.5, Geology and Soils). The No Project, No Development Alternative would have a higher level of geology and soils impact compared to the proposed plan, as it would leave in place a structure that does not meet current seismic safety code; however, this alternative would not meet either the Civic Project or Residential Project objectives related to residential, park, or library facilities in terms of geology and soils, as this alternative would not provide new, state-of-the-art community library facilities. The existing library would continue to operate for as long as funding continues, and would continue to not meet current building codes related to energy, seismic safety, and fire provisions.

## **Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy**

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, the plan area would not be redeveloped, and the on-site library and administrative offices would not be removed. There would be no change related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emission generation or energy consumption, as there would be no change to the existing on-site buildings or associated library operations or daily vehicle trips. Thus, there would be no impact related to GHG emissions and energy under this alternative.

The proposed plan impacts to GHG emissions and energy would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy). The No Project, No Development Alternative would result in a lower level of GHG emissions impact compared to the proposed plan; however, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to residential, park, or library facilities in terms of related to GHG emissions and energy, as this alternative would not provide modernized municipal facilities, nor would it maximize infill development on underutilized properties in an area served by adequate infrastructure and services in proximity to neighborhood shopping and public transit.

## **Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire**

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, the plan area would not be redeveloped, and the on-site library and administrative offices would not be removed. Since there would be no demolition of the existing on-site buildings, no impacts related to potential exposure to lead-based paint or asbestos-containing materials would occur from demolition activities. Therefore, this alternative would not include mitigation requiring abatement or removal of asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint. Thus, there would be a significant and unavoidable impact related to potential exposure of persons to hazardous materials under this alternative due to the existing structures remaining on-site.

The proposed plan impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.7, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire). The No Project, No Development Alternative would have a higher level of hazards and hazardous materials impact compared to the proposed plan. In addition, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to residential, park, or library facilities in terms of hazardous materials exposure, as this alternative would not provide modernized municipal facilities that comply with building safety codes and regulations.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, the plan area would not be redeveloped, and the on-site library and administrative offices would not be removed. The new residential units would not be constructed as part of this alternative to the Residential Project. Also, the new park and new library proposed as part of the Civic Project would not be constructed and operated, nor would the various floodplain management, creek, and street improvements occur. Improvements to the floodplain on the Civic Project site would not be implemented, including enhancing the capacity of the underground storm drain system, the addition of new bioretention basins to provide pretreatment of stormwater, and the upgrades to outfalls in Grayson Creek to improve conveyance and reduce potential for erosion. There would be no change related to hydrology, stormwater runoff and drainage, water quality, or groundwater recharge, depletion, or flooding, as there would be no change to the existing on-site buildings, surface parking lots, or landscaping. Thus, there would be no hydrology and water quality impacts or improvements under this alternative.

The proposed plan impacts to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.8, Hydrology and Water Quality). The No Project, No Development Alternative would have a lower level of hydrology and water quality impact compared to the proposed plan; however, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to improvements to stormwater infrastructure, as this alternative would not provide increased stormwater capacity to accommodate storm flows and address existing overflow and flooding from Murderers Creek, including new bioretention basins to provide pretreatment of stormwater, and upgrades to outfalls to improve conveyance and reduce potential for erosion within the Grayson Creek Corridor.

### **Land Use and Planning**

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, the plan area would not be redeveloped, and the on-site library and administrative offices would not be removed. The No Project, No Development Alternative would leave municipal buildings located on an underutilized parcel adjacent to public transport. This alternative would not be consistent with the objectives of the Pleasant Hill 2003 General Plan, Community and Development Element and Economic Strategy Element that focus on enhancing the public facilities and services, recreation, parks, neighborhoods, and conservation and energy. Specifically, this alternative would not allow for access to a state-of-the-art library, would not promote a wide range of recreational programs, would not provide for the reclamation of degraded streams, give priority to development that incorporates energy-efficient and resource conserving design and construction, or facilitate the reuse of underutilized parcels.

The proposed plan impacts to land use and planning would be less than significant, and the proposed plan would meet many of the objectives of the Pleasant Hill 2003 General Plan, particularly the Community and Development Element and Economic Strategy Element (see Section 3.9, Land Use and Planning). The No Project, No Development Alternative would have a higher level of land use and planning impact compared to the proposed plan. In addition, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to residential, park, or library facilities in terms of land use and planning. This alternative would not concentrate a library, housing, and recreational amenities where people can gather, consolidate municipal and police administrative services into a central location to improve efficiency and access, or utilize a currently underutilized parcel.

### **Noise**

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, the plan area would not be redeveloped, and the on-site library and administrative offices would not be removed. There would be no change in groundborne vibration and noise sources (including from traffic noise), as there would be no change to the existing on-site buildings, parking lots, generators, and mechanical ventilation equipment operation. Thus, there would be no noise impacts under this alternative.

The proposed plan's noise impacts with regard to increase in ambient noise would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.10, Noise). The No Project, No Development Alternative would have a lower level of noise impact compared to the proposed plan; however, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to residential, park, or library facilities in terms of noise, as this alternative would not provide a new, state-of-the-art community library with interior and exterior community gathering spaces and with well-insulated wall assemblies and tight seals around openings thereby providing low indoor noise.

### **Population and Housing**

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, the plan area would not be redeveloped, and the on-site library and administrative offices would not be removed. The new residential units would not be constructed as part of this alternative to the Residential Project. Also, the new park and new library proposed as part of the Civic Project would not be constructed and operated, nor would the various floodplain management, creek, and street improvements occur. There would be no change related to housing and jobs and no conflict with regional population growth projections, as there would be no change to the existing on-site buildings. Thus, there would be a no impact related to population under this alternative. However, this alternative would not be consistent with the objectives of the Pleasant Hill 2003 General Plan that focuses on the reuse of underutilized parcels with mixed-use development, when appropriate (Economic Strategy Element Policy 2D, Housing Element Policy 2D).

The proposed plan impacts on population and housing would be less than significant and would provide housing for approximately 103 persons, in support of the Pleasant Hill 2015 Housing Element (see Section 3.11, Population and Housing). The No Project, No Development Alternative would not provide any housing, and would therefore have a higher level of population and housing impact compared to the proposed plan. In addition, this alternative does not meet the plan objectives related to residential, park, or library facilities in terms of population and housing, as this

alternative would not maximize infill development on underutilized properties in an area served by adequate infrastructure and services, provide housing opportunities to the City of Pleasant Hill, or provide housing within proximity of transit uses, schools, parks and community facilities.

### **Public Services**

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, the plan area would not be redeveloped, and the on-site library and administrative offices would not be removed. The new residential units would not be constructed as part of this alternative to the Residential Project. Also, the new park and new library proposed as part of the Civic Project would not be constructed and operated, nor would the various floodplain management, creek, and street improvements occur. There would be no change related to fire, police, school, or library services, as there would be no change to the existing buildings or facilities. Thus, there would be no impact related to school and library services under this alternative. However, this alternative would result in continued operation, for as long as funding is provided, of the existing library that does not meet current building codes related to current energy, seismic safety, and fire provisions. Thus, there would be a less than significant impact related to libraries under this alternative.

The mitigation associated with public services under the proposed plan is related to the potential environmental impacts with respect to construction of the new library. Because the No Project Alternative would not construct a new library, this mitigation would not be necessary. The proposed plan impacts to public services would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.12, Public Services). The No Project, No Development Alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to residential, park, or library facilities in terms of public services, as this alternative would not provide a new, state-of-the-art community library with interior and exterior community gathering spaces or enhance recreation and park facilities that would serve the citizens of the City of Pleasant Hill. The No Project, No Development Alternative would therefore have a higher level of impact compared to the proposed plan.

### **Recreation**

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, the plan area would not be redeveloped, and the on-site library and administrative offices would not be removed. The new residential units would not be constructed as part of this alternative to the Residential Project. Also, the new park and new library proposed as part of the Civic Project would not be constructed and operated, nor would the various floodplain management, creek, and street improvements occur. . The proposed park at 1700 Oak Park Boulevard, including two 40,000-square-foot baseball fields, a 54,000-square-foot soccer field overlay on the athletic field grass between the two diamonds, three 720-square-foot bocce ball courts and associated amenities, would also not be developed under this alternative. In addition, the pedestrian pathway along the Grayson Creek Corridor would not be developed. There would be no change related to recreation and park services, as there would be no change related to existing land uses. Further, the daytime employment population and associated demand for parks and recreational facilities would remain the same as currently exists. Thus, there would be a no impact related to recreation and parks under this alternative.



The proposed plan recreation and parks impact would be less than significant with mitigation for construction-period air quality and transportation impacts (see Section 3.13, Recreation). The No Project Alternative would have a lower level of recreation and parks impact compared to the proposed plan; however, this alternative would not meet the key plan objectives related to residential, park, or library facilities in terms of recreation and parks, as this alternative would not enhance recreation and park facilities for City of Pleasant Hill residents; provide high-quality athletic fields to support local youth leagues and provide positive after school and out-of-school youth activities; increase field time available for sports leagues by extending useable playing time; provide opportunities for adults to improve their health and wellness through active sports opportunities; or create a community-gathering place by offering a park that provides active and passive spaces.

**Transportation**

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, the plan area would not be redeveloped, and the on-site library and administrative offices would not be removed. The No Project, No Development Alternative would not result in additional vehicle trips, and the transportation system would be the same as identified under the No Project conditions, for both the existing and cumulative scenarios. None of the impacts would occur and none of the mitigation measures that apply to the proposed plan would be implemented. The existing conditions would remain as they are now, and, as shown in Table 6-1, the No Project, No Development Alternative would not generate any additional vehicle traffic over the current level generated by the existing library trips. Study intersections under existing conditions generally operate at overall acceptable service levels in accordance with benchmarks set by the City during both the weekday morning, weekday afternoon, weekday evening, and Saturday afternoon peak-hours. Thus, there would be a less than significant impact related to transportation and traffic under the No Project, No Development Alternative.

**Table 6-1: No Project, No Development Alternative Trip Generation**

Scenario	Daily Trips	AM Peak-hour	PM Peak-hour
No Project, No Development Alternative <sup>1</sup>	0	0	0
Proposed Plan	950	37	125

Notes:  
<sup>1</sup> The existing library currently generates approximately 1,500 weekday daily trips, including 45 AM peak-hour, 321 afternoon peak-hour, and 170 PM peak-hour trips. On a Saturday, the daily trip generation is approximately 1,270 trips including 144 peak-hour trips. These trips are already on the roadway system and under the No Project, No Development Alternative; no net-new traffic would be generated.  
 Source: Fehr & Peers 2019.

The proposed plan impacts to transportation and traffic would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.14, Transportation). The proposed plan would generate more daily vehicle trips, but would provide roadway and utility improvements to Oak Park Boulevard and Monticello Avenue that would not occur under the No Project, No Development Alternative. These improvements would generally include undergrounding of utility lines, on-street vehicle lane restriping, existing traffic signal modification, widening sidewalks, adding bicycle lanes on Monticello Avenue, and adding a new

sidewalk on the north side of Oak Park Boulevard. Transportation impacts from the No Project, No Development Alternative would be less than those of the proposed plan; however, the No Project, No Development Alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to residential, park, or library facilities in terms of transportation and traffic, as this alternative would not provide housing within proximity of transit uses, schools, parks and community facilities that would reduce vehicle trips that would otherwise be necessary.

### **Utilities and Service Systems**

Under the No Project, No Development Alternative, the plan area would not be redeveloped, and the on-site library and administrative offices would not be removed. The new residential units would not be constructed as part of this alternative to the Residential Project. Also, the new park and new library proposed as part of the Civic Project would not be constructed and operated, nor would the various floodplain management, creek, and street improvements occur. Furthermore, the utility improvements to Oak Park Boulevard and Monticello Avenue, including the upsizing and undergrounding of utility lines would not occur. There would be no change related to water supply utility and wastewater, stormwater, and solid waste collection service systems, as there would be no change to the existing on-site civic buildings or associated utilities demand and infrastructure facilities. Thus, there would be no impact related to utility and service systems under this alternative.

The proposed plan impacts to utility and service systems would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.15, Utilities and Service Systems). The No Project, No Development Alternative would have a lower level of utility and service systems impact compared to the proposed plan; however, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to residential, park, or library facilities in terms of utility and service systems, as this alternative would not provide modernized municipal facilities that reduce maintenance costs and promote greater efficiency in delivery of utility services.

### **6.5.2 - Conclusion**

The No Project, No Development Alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable cultural resources impacts of the Residential Project under the proposed plan by avoiding demolition or removal of the architecturally significant elements of the existing library complex, including the library rotunda and connected southern annex building. This alternative would, in general, not exacerbate many of the identified impacts; however, by leaving the existing library facility on-site in its dilapidated state, the No Project, No Development Alternative would result in significant and unavoidable geology/soils and hazards/hazardous materials due to lack of upgrade to seismic codes, as well as leaving asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint in place. Additionally, this alternative would have a greater impact to public services by not adding a new library. This alternative would not advance any of the overall, residential, parks, library, street improvements, or floodplain improvement plan objectives.

## **6.6 - Alternative 2—Code Compliant Alternative**

Under this Code Compliant Alternative, the proposed plan, as currently proposed, would not be implemented. The existing library would remain operational and the administrative offices would

remain vacant on the 1750 Oak Park property. No new library or new park would be constructed or operated. The library would remain operational as long as County funding remained available to address ongoing and deferred maintenance issues. The Pleasant Hill 2015 Housing Element designates the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property as a potential housing site; therefore, the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property would be developed with a total of 96 single-family, small-lot, detached units as set forth in the Housing Element. This would result in a density of approximately 10 to 12 units per acre on the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property. No new library or ballfields would be constructed or operated. The creek and floodplain improvements and construction of the pedestrian trail, as described under the proposed plan's Civic Project, would occur. In addition, similar to the proposed plan's Civic Project, the future pedestrian trail and potential future bridge connecting the proposed on-site pedestrian trail to the off-site EBMUD trail would also be constructed. The roadway improvements as described under the proposed plan would also occur.

### 6.6.1 - Impact Analysis

#### Aesthetics

Under the Code Compliant Alternative, the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property would be developed with a total of 96 single-family, small-lot, detached units. The existing library would remain operational and the administrative offices would remain vacant on the 1750 Oak Park property. The various floodplain management and street improvements would occur with some variation from the proposed plan. There would be changes in visual character, views, nighttime lighting, and shadow, as there would be an addition of residential uses on-site that do not currently exist. Thus, there would be a less than significant aesthetics impact with the incorporation of mitigation for light or glare impacts by adhering to the City's Design Review Process and Standards (Mitigation Measure [MM] AES-4) under this alternative.

The proposed plan impacts related to aesthetics would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.1, Aesthetics). The Code Compliant Alternative would have a similar level of aesthetics and light and glare impact compared to the proposed plan due to the inclusion of housing on site. Additionally, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to park or library facilities in terms of aesthetics, as this alternative would not contribute to enhanced recreation and park facilities for City of Pleasant Hill residents nor provide the community with a new, state of the art community library with interior and exterior community gathering spaces.

#### Air Quality

Under the Code Compliant Alternative, the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property would be developed with a total of 96 single-family, small-lot, detached units. The existing library would remain operational and the administrative offices would remain vacant on the 1750 Oak Park property. The various floodplain management and street improvements would occur with some variation from the proposed plan. As part of this alternative, no new library or new park would be constructed or operated. There would be changes related to criteria pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions, as there would be new on-site residential buildings as well as new daily vehicle trips. The Code Compliant alternative would have higher weekday morning peak-hour trip generation as compared to the proposed plan and have higher levels of inbound traffic during the weekday evening peak-hour,

although it is expected to result in similar levels of overall traffic-related emissions. No demolition would occur with this alternative and overall square footage of construction and operation would be less; therefore, construction and operational air quality impacts under this alternative would be less than under the proposed plan. However, the same mitigation applied to the proposed plan would be applied to this alternative. Thus, the impact related to criteria pollutant emissions under this alternative would be less than significant with mitigation.

The proposed plan impacts related to air quality would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.2, Air Quality). The Code Compliant Alternative would have a similar level of air quality impact compared to the proposed plan, and would meet some of the identified plan objectives related to park or library facilities in terms of air quality, as this alternative would promote greater energy efficiency in new residential uses and would maximize infill development on underutilized properties in an area served by adequate infrastructure and services in proximity to neighborhood shopping and public transit. This alternative would generate greater pedestrian activity versus vehicle use, but would not provide modernized municipal facilities.

### **Biological Resources**

Under the Code Compliant Alternative, the Grayson Creek Outfalls Project and floodplain improvements as well as construction of the pedestrian trail as described under the proposed plan's Civic Project would occur. In addition, similar to the proposed plan's Civic Project, the future pedestrian trail and potential future bridge connecting to the future on-site pedestrian trail to the off-site EBMUD trail would also be constructed. The Creek and floodplain improvements generally include enhanced capacity of the underground storm drain system, new bioretention basins to provide pretreatment of stormwater, and upgraded outfalls in Grayson Creek to improve conveyance and reduce potential for erosion. Because the Code Compliant Alternative would include the same improvements within the Grayson Creek Corridor, it would result in the same potential impacts to nesting birds, bats, turtles, riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities, and trees in the vicinity of the plan area and Creek corridor. The same mitigation applied to the proposed plan would be applied to this alternative. Thus, impacts related to biological resources would be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation to avoid active migratory bird nests, bat roosts, and turtle dens (MM BIO-1), obtaining Clean Water Act 401 and 404 permits and a streambed alteration agreement and planting additional trees along Grayson Creek Corridor and obtaining tree removal permits (MM BIO-2), and the implementation of tree protection treatment and guidelines during construction (MM BIO-5) under this alternative.

The proposed plan impacts related to biological resources would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.2, Biological Resources). The Code Compliant Alternative would have a similar level of biological resources impact compared to the proposed plan. In addition, the Code Compliant Alternative would also achieve the plan objectives related to Creek improvements in terms of biological resources, as this alternative would include the same activities within the Grayson Creek Corridor. Additionally, this impact would achieve the plan alternatives related to the residential component and street improvements, while not meeting the park, library, or overall objectives of the proposed plan as it would not provide modernized municipal facilities or a park on-site.

## **Cultural and Tribal Resources**

Under the Code Compliant alternative, the existing library would remain operational and the administrative offices would remain vacant on the 1750 Oak Park property. The Pleasant Hill 2015 Housing Element designates the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property as a potential housing site; therefore, the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property would be developed with a total of 96 single-family, small-lot, detached units as set forth in the Housing Element. The creek and floodplain improvements and construction of the pedestrian trail, as described under the proposed plan's Civic Project, would occur. In addition, and similar to the proposed plan, the future pedestrian trail and potential future bridge connecting the future on-site pedestrian trail to the off-site EBMUD trail would also be constructed. No new library or ballfields would be constructed or operated.

Under this alternative, there would be no direct change in historic resources, as there would be no change and no impact to the existing on-site historic library complex. This alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts that would be incurred under the Residential Project by not removing historic resources from the site. Under this alternative, construction of the new residential buildings, including earth-moving activities, could result in direct impacts to currently unknown archeological and tribal cultural resources impacts, and such impacts would be mitigatable by conducting construction archeological resources monitoring (MM CUL-2) and stopping construction in the event that human remains or other cultural or tribal cultural resources are encountered (MM CUL-3). Thus, overall, there would be a less than significant with mitigation cultural resources impact under this alternative.

Cultural resource impacts of the Residential Project (as part of the proposed plan) would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation (see Section 3.4, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources). The Code Compliant Alternative would have a lower level of cultural resources impact compared to the proposed plan; however, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to park or library facilities, as this alternative would not provide new, state-of-the-art community library facilities that serve the citizens of the City. Furthermore, there are no plan objectives for cultural or tribal cultural resources.

## **Geology and Soils**

The Code Compliant Alternative would develop the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property with a total of 96 single-family, small-lot, detached units, resulting in a density of approximately 10 to 12 units per acres. The existing library would remain operational and the administrative offices would remain vacant on the 1750 Oak Park property. The new development on-site would develop roughly the same amount of square footage as under the proposed plan. However, because there would be no change to the existing on-site library and administrative buildings, these buildings would continue to not meet current building codes related to current energy, safety, fire provisions and, thus, during a seismic event could result in adverse impacts related to groundshaking. Thus, there would be a significant and unavoidable impact related to potential exposure of persons and property to seismic-related hazards under this alternative.

The proposed plan impacts with regard to geology and soil resources would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.5, Geology and Soils). The Code Compliant Alternative would have a higher level of geology and soils impact compared to the proposed plan, as the existing library would

remain and would not meet current code requirements for seismic stability. In addition, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to park or library facilities in terms of seismic- and soil-related hazards, as this alternative would not contribute to enhanced recreation and park facilities for City of Pleasant Hill residents nor provide modernized, state-of-the-art municipal facilities that comply with seismic and other building safety codes and regulations.

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy**

Under the Code Compliant Alternative, the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property would be developed with a total of 96 single-family, small-lot, detached units. The existing library would remain operational and the administrative offices would remain vacant on the 1750 Oak Park property. The various floodplain management and street improvements would occur with some variation from the proposed plan. As part of this alternative, no new library or new park would be constructed or operated. There would be a slightly lesser impact related to GHG emission generation or energy consumption, as there would not be a new library or park on-site; however, there would still be new daily vehicle trips that differ from the existing condition on-site. The Code Compliant alternative would have lower levels of overall traffic-related emissions than the proposed plan. No demolition would occur with this alternative and overall square footage of construction would be less, therefore, GHG and energy impacts from construction would be even less than what was analyzed for the proposed plan. However, the same mitigation applied to the proposed plan could be applied to this alternative, which would require the plan to implement feasible mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions to a less-than-significant level via the selection of a variety of GHG reduction measures. Thus, the impact related to GHG emissions and energy would be less than significant with mitigation under this alternative.

The proposed plan GHG emissions and energy impact would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy). The Code Compliant Alternative would have a similar level of GHG emissions and energy impact compared to the proposed plan. In addition, this alternative would meet the identified plan objectives of GHG emissions and energy for the proposed residential uses but would not meet such objectives for library operations.

### **Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire**

Under the Code Compliant Alternative, the on-site library and administrative offices would not be renovated or removed, and the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property would be developed with a total of 96 single-family, small-lot, detached residential units. Since there would be no demolition of the existing on-site buildings, no construction impacts related to potential exposure to lead-based paint or asbestos-containing materials would occur from demolition activities. However, these materials would not be abated and would continue to pose a potential hazard. In addition, hazard impacts related to wildfire and emergency access would be less than significant. Thus, the impact related to hazards, hazardous materials, and wildfire under this alternative would be less than significant.

The proposed plan impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.7, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire). The Code Compliant Alternative would have a higher level of hazards, hazardous materials, and wildfire impact compared to the proposed plan. However, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to library

facilities in terms of hazards, hazardous materials, as this alternative would not provide modernized municipal facilities that comply with building seismic, safety codes, and regulations, such as those related to abatement of asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

Under the Code Compliant Alternative, the Creek and floodplain improvements (including enhanced capacity of the underground storm drain system, new bioretention basins to provide pretreatment of stormwater, and upgraded outfalls in Grayson Creek to improve conveyance and reduce potential for erosion) would occur. The Code Compliant Alternative would also develop 96 single-family, small-lot, detached residential units, adding a similar amount of square footage to the site as under the proposed plan. However, because the Code Compliant Alternative would result in a high density of development, and not develop the new park, as is proposed under the proposed plan, there would be a greater amount of impervious surfaces on-site. The same mitigation applied to the proposed plan would be applied to this alternative, and the associated C.3 requirements would ensure that stormwater runoff would be retained to ensure no net increase in off-site stormwater flow. Thus, the impact related to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation requiring that a drainage plan be provided to City Public Services staff prior to grading (MM HYD-3) under this alternative.

Impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.8, Hydrology and Water Quality). The Code Compliant Alternative would have a similar level of hydrology and water quality impact compared to the proposed plan. This alternative would meet the plan objectives related to the Civic Project in terms of stormwater runoff and drainage, as it would implement the new bioretention basins to provide pretreatment of stormwater, and upgraded outfalls to improve conveyance and reduce potential for erosion within the Grayson Creek Corridor.

### **Land Use and Planning**

Under this Code Compliant Alternative, the plan would develop the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property with a total of 96 single-family, small-lot, detached units as set forth in the Housing Element. This would result in a density of approximately 10 to 12 units per acre on the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property. The Pleasant Hill 2015 Housing Element designates the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property as a potential housing site.

Under this alternative, the plan would be compliant with the existing Zoning Code, and would be consistent with the Pleasant Hill 2003 General Plan, as well as the Regional Housing Need Allocation in that it would provide a greater number of housing units on an underutilized parcel. (According to the Regional Housing Need Allocation, the City's projected housing needs from 2015 to 2023 is 448 residential units.) However, because this alternative would not develop a new library within the plan area, the Code Compliant Alternative would not be consistent with the objectives of the Pleasant Hill 2003 General Plan, Community and Development Element and Economic Strategy Element that focuses on enhancing the public facilities and services, recreation, parks, neighborhoods, and conservation and energy. Specifically, this alternative would not allow for access to a state-of-the-art library.

The proposed plan impacts related to land use and planning would be less than significant (see Section 3.9, Land Use and Planning). The Code Compliant Alternative would have a similar level of land use and planning impact compared to the proposed plan.; however, this alternative would not meet many of the objectives of the Pleasant Hill 2003 General Plan, particularly the Community and Development Element and Economic Strategy Element, related to library facilities in terms of land use and planning, as this alternative would not provide a new, state-of-the-art community library to serve the citizens of the City.

## Noise

Under the Code Compliant Alternative, the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property would be developed with a total of 96 single-family, small-lot, detached units. The existing library would remain operational and the administrative offices would remain vacant on the 1750 Oak Park property. The various floodplain management and street improvements would occur with some variation from the proposed plan. As part of this alternative, no new library or new park would be constructed or operated. Therefore, there would be fewer new stationary noise sources than what was analyzed for the proposed plan. In addition, the Code Compliant Alternative would attract slightly fewer overall daily vehicle trips to the plan area, which would result in slightly lower traffic noise levels under this alternative compared to the proposed plan. However, temporary or periodic impacts of groundborne vibration and noise sources from construction activities under this alternative would occur, and the library and administrative building would remain on-site under this alternative, which would represent a noise-sensitive receptor subjected to construction-related groundborne vibration and noise sources. Such potential noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of MM NOI-1 that requires the implementation of noise-reduction measures during construction under this alternative. The same mitigation applied to the proposed plan would be applied to this alternative. Thus, noise and vibration impacts would be less than significant with mitigation under this alternative.

The proposed plan impacts related to noise would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.10, Noise). The Code Compliant Alternative would have a similar level of noise impact compared to the proposed plan; however, while this alternative meets the residential and street improvement objectives of the proposed plan, it would not meet the park and library objectives, as it would not develop a park or new library on the site.

## Population and Housing

Under this Code Compliant Alternative, the plan would develop the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property with a total of 96 single-family, small-lot, detached units as set forth in the Housing Element. This would result in a permanent population increase of 240 people on the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property. The Pleasant Hill 2015 Housing Element designates the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property as a potential housing site. As part of this alternative, no new library or new park would be constructed or operated. There would be no change related to employment under this alternative compared to the proposed plan; however, there would be greater amount of housing supplied under this alternative compared to the proposed plan.



The proposed plan impacts related to population and housing would be less than significant, (see Section 3.11, Population and Housing). The Code Compliant Alternative would have a lower level of impact related to housing provision compared to the proposed plan, as it would provide a greater number of housing units in compliance with goals of the 2015 Housing Element. This alternative would meet the plan objectives identified for the residential, street improvement, and floodplain improvements; however, it would not meet the plan objectives related to libraries and parks.

### **Public Services**

Under the Code Compliant Alternative, the plan area would be developed with a total of 96 single-family, small-lot, detached housing units, the on-site library and administrative offices would not be removed, and the proposed plan's recreational amenities would not be developed. There would be a similar, but slightly increased change related to fire, police, school, and library services, as under the proposed plan there would be more residents living on the site. In addition, this alternative would leave the current library on-site that does not meet current building codes related to current energy, safety, and fire provisions.

The proposed plan impacts to public services would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.12, Public Services). The Code Compliant Alternative would have a similar, although slightly higher level of public services impact compared to the proposed plan. In addition, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to library facilities in terms of public services, as this alternative would not provide a new, state-of-the-art community library with interior and exterior community gathering spaces or enhance recreation and park facilities that serves the citizens of the City of Pleasant Hill.

### **Recreation**

Under the Code Compliant Alternative, the plan area would be redeveloped predominantly with housing, and the on-site library and administrative offices would not be removed. The proposed park at 1700 Oak Park Boulevard, including two 40,000-square-foot baseball fields, a 54,000-square-foot soccer field overlay on the athletic field grass between the two diamonds, three 720-square-foot bocce ball courts, and associated amenities would also not be developed under this alternative to the Civic Project. However, the pedestrian pathway along the Grayson Creek Corridor would be developed. In addition, the residential population and associated demand for parks and recreational facilities would be greater than the proposed plan due to a higher density (and number) of housing units on-site. The proposed plan would implement MM AIR-2, MM AIR-3, MM GHG-1, MM NOI-1, and MM TRANS-1a as mitigation for constructing recreational facilities. This mitigation would not be necessary under this alternative, as it would not include construction of a recreational facility.

The proposed plan recreation and parks impact would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.13, Recreation). The Code Compliant Alternative would have a higher level of recreation and parks impact compared to the proposed plan because the housing units would generate a greater need for recreational facilities, which would not be provided under this alternative. This alternative would not meet the key plan objectives related to recreation and parks, as this alternative would not enhance recreation and park facilities for City of Pleasant Hill residents; provide high-quality athletic fields to support local youth leagues and provide positive after school and out-of-school youth activities;

increase field time available for sports leagues by extending useable playing time; provide opportunities for adults to improve their health and wellness through active sports opportunities; or create a community-gathering place by offering a park that provides active and passive spaces.

**Transportation**

Under the Code Compliant Alternative, the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property would be developed with a total of 96 single-family, small-lot, detached units. The existing library would remain operational and the administrative offices would remain vacant on the 1750 Oak Park property. The various floodplain management and street improvements would occur with some variation from the proposed plan. As part of this alternative, no new library or new park would be constructed or operated.

The Code Compliant alternative would generate more peak-hour trips during the morning peak-hour than the proposed plan, potentially worsening intersection operations slightly more than the proposed plan; however, the slight increase in vehicle traffic is not expected to result in deficient operations at the study intersections. As shown in Table 6-2, the Code Compliant Alternative would generate 1,010 daily trips, 73 AM peak-hour, and 68 PM peak-hour. The improvements proposed for Monticello Avenue at Oak Park Boulevard would not occur as they would under the proposed plan; the intersection is projected to continue operating at overall acceptable service levels, although the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile westbound vehicle queue could spillback to the trail crossing on Oak Park Boulevard. As the Code Compliant Alternative would generate fewer vehicle trips during the other time periods evaluated, the impacts of this alternative would be less severe than the proposed plan, but it is not expected to eliminate any of the significant impacts identified to occur with the proposed plan; specifically, impacts to the transit, bicycle, pedestrian system, and emergency access are expected to be similar. Construction-period impacts would be less as the existing library would not close, and therefore a temporary facility would not be required. Potential periodic closure of Monticello Avenue could still occur, and MM TRANS-1, identified for the proposed plan, would apply. MM TRANS-1 includes the preparation and implementation of a construction traffic management plan, the reconstruction of a bus route with a pedestrian clear-way, mid-block pedestrian crosswalks, and the preparation of a bicycle to roadway plan prior to construction. Because this alternative would construct habitable structures, this alternative would also implement MM TRANS-4 that requires the preparation of the design for fire access road as well as a sprinkler system. Thus, the impact related to transportation would be less than significant with mitigation impact under this alternative.

**Table 6-2: Code Compliant Alternative Trip Generation**

Scenario	Daily Trips	AM Peak-hour	PM Peak-hour
Code Compliant Alternative	1,010	73	68
Proposed Plan	950	37	125
<b>Difference</b>	<b>(60)</b>	<b>(36)</b>	<b>57</b>

Source: Fehr & Peers 2019.

The proposed plan impacts to transportation would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.14, Transportation). The Code Compliant Alternative would have a similar level of traffic impacts compared to the proposed plan. This alternative would also meet the identified plan

objectives related to proposed residential uses in terms of transportation but would not meet plan objectives related to proposed library and park uses in terms of transportation, as this alternative would provide needed housing and maximize infill development but not provide high-quality athletic fields and modernized library facilities.

### **Utilities and Service Systems**

Under the Code Compliant Alternative, the 1700 Oak Park Boulevard property would be developed with a total of 96 single-family, small-lot, detached units. The existing library would remain operational and the administrative offices would remain vacant on the 1750 Oak Park property. The various floodplain management and street improvements would occur with some variation from the proposed plan, but the proposed recreational amenities would not be developed. Furthermore, the utility improvements to Oak Park Boulevard and Monticello Avenue, including the undergrounding of utility lines would occur. The addition of housing on-site would result in a change related to water supply demand and distribution services as well as wastewater, stormwater, and solid waste generation and collection services, while there would be no change to the existing on-site civic buildings or associated City department operations. The same mitigation related to construction of the proposed plan would be applied to this alternative. Under this alternative, the utility and service impacts related to construction of waste, wastewater, stormwater, and telecommunication facilities would be less than significant with the implementation MM AIR-2, MM AIR-3, MM GHG-1, MM NOI-1, and MM TRANS-1a.

The proposed plan impacts related to utility and service systems would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.15, Utilities and Service Systems). The Code Compliant Alternative would have a higher level of utility and service systems impact compared to the proposed plan, but potential impacts would also be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation. In addition, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to proposed park and library facilities in terms of utility and service systems, as this alternative would not provide modern municipal facilities that provide efficient delivery of services.

### **6.6.2 - Conclusion**

The Code Compliant Alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable cultural resources impacts of the Residential Project in the proposed plan by avoiding demolition of the architecturally significant elements of the existing library complex, including the library rotunda and connected southern annex building. This alternative would, in general, exacerbate many of the identified impacts due to an increased density of development. Additionally, this alternative would result in significant and unavoidable geology and soils, as well as hazards/hazardous materials impacts by leaving the existing library facility on-site in its current state with asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, and noncompliance with current seismic safety codes. This alternative would advance the overall, residential, street improvement, and floodplain improvement proposed plan objectives. However, the Code Compliant Alternative would develop housing where the proposed plan would establish a new park, and would not develop a modern, state-of-the-art library, thus not advancing the library and park component objectives of the proposed plan. This alternative would realize the full potential of the property site, but would fail to achieve some key plan objectives.

## 6.7 - Alternative 3—Partial Historic Preservation Alternative

Under the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative, the proposed new park and new library as detailed under the proposed plan would be constructed and operated on the 1700 Oak Park property. All creek, floodplain, and roadway improvements, as well as construction of the pedestrian trail as described under the proposed plan's Civic Project, would also occur. However, on the 1750 Oak Park property, architecturally significant elements of the existing library complex, including the library rotunda and connected southern annex building (Sections A and B in original building drawings totaling 30,000 to 32,985 gross square feet), would be preserved. The goal in rehabilitating these two connected sections would be to preserve the relationship between the circular library rotunda (Section A) and the angular, zigzag roofed office annex (Section B). The sharp contrasts in form and style between the two connected sections are representative of the architecturally significant "International Style" in which the library complex was designed. Other significant elements to be retained include these sections' vitrolite paneling, aluminum framing, and windows. Once retrofitted, the buildings could be re-utilized for a residential-serving community center, available to the tenants on the site only, and would not be a resource for the community. Under this alternative, 21,840 to 24,736 gross square feet of the existing library building complex would be demolished. A total of 10 single-family residential units with two accessory dwelling units would be constructed and operated around the rehabilitated section of the existing library structure throughout the 1750 Oak Park property. Similar to the Residential Project, 1750 Oak Park property access would be from off of Monticello Avenue.

### 6.7.1 - Impact Analysis

#### Aesthetics

As part of the library building's rehabilitation, the architecturally significant elements of the existing library complex on the 1750 Oak Park property, including the rotunda and connected southern annex building, would be preserved as a community center for the residents. There would be other changes to the plan area in terms of visual character, views, and nighttime lighting, as there would be an addition of housing and park facilities on-site that do not currently exist. Impacts would be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation for light or glare impacts to adhere to the City's Review Process and Standards (MM AES-4) under this alternative.

The proposed plan impacts related to aesthetics would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.1, Aesthetics). The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would have a similar level of aesthetics impact compared to the proposed plan, as it would be subject to the same design review guidelines.

#### Air Quality

Less demolition would occur with this alternative and overall square footage of new construction would be less; therefore, air quality impacts from construction would be less than what was analyzed for the proposed plan. In addition, there would be less operational vehicle trips associated with this alternative, as there would be fewer dwelling units on-site. However, the same mitigation for the

reduction of criteria pollutant emissions (MM AIR-2) applied to the proposed plan could be applied to this alternative and would be expected to reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

The proposed plan impacts related to air quality would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.2, Air Quality). The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would have a similar level of air quality impact compared to the proposed plan, and would be subject to the same mitigation for the reduction of criteria pollutant emissions (MM AIR-2) as the proposed plan.

### **Biological Resources**

Under the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative, the creek and floodplain improvements and construction of the pedestrian trail, as described under the proposed plan's Civic Project, would occur; in addition, similar to the proposed plan's Civic Project, the future pedestrian trail and potential future bridge connecting the future on-site pedestrian trail to the off-site EBMUD trail would also be constructed. The Creek and floodplain improvements generally include enhanced capacity of the underground storm drain system, new bioretention basins to provide pretreatment of stormwater, and upgraded outfalls to Grayson Creek to improve conveyance and reduce potential for erosion. Because the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would include the same improvements within the Grayson Creek Corridor, it would result in the same potential impacts to nesting birds, bats, and turtles. Thus, impacts related to biological resources would be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation to avoid active migratory bird nests, bat roosts, and turtle dens (MM BIO-1), obtaining Clean Water Act 401 and 404 permits and a streambed alteration agreement and planting additional trees along Grayson Creek Corridor and obtaining tree removal permits (MM BIO-2), and the implementation of tree protection treatment and guidelines during construction (MM BIO-5) under this alternative.

The proposed plan impacts to biological resources would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.2, Biological Resources). The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would have a similar level of biological resources impact compared to the proposed plan. Additionally, the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would also achieve all of the plan objectives, including those related to creek and floodplain improvements by making improvements to the Grayson Creek corridor.

### **Cultural and Tribal Resources**

Under the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative, all creek, floodplain, and roadway improvements, as well as construction of the pedestrian trail as described under the proposed plan's Civic Project, would occur. In addition, the new library would be constructed on the 1700 Oak Park property, and the proposed park would be constructed and operated on the 1700 Oak Park property. With respect to this alternative to the Residential Project, on the 1750 Oak Park property, architecturally significant elements of the existing library complex including the library rotunda and connected southern annex building (Sections A and B in original building drawings totaling 30,000 to 32,985 gross square feet) would be preserved in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's standards for the rehabilitation of historic properties and subject to the 2016 California Historical Building Code. A total of 10 single-family residential units and two accessory dwelling units would be constructed and operated around the rehabilitated section of the existing library structure throughout the 1750 Oak Park property.

Under this alternative, development of the new residential and library buildings could result in direct archeological and tribal cultural resources impacts from construction activities including earth-moving activities, which could result in direct impacts to currently unknown archeological and tribal cultural resources impacts, but such impacts would be mitigatable by conducting construction archeological resources monitoring (MM CUL-2), and stopping construction in the event that human remains or other cultural or tribal cultural resources are encountered (MM CUL-3), similar to the proposed plan. Partial preservation and adaptive reuse of architecturally significant sections of the historic library would reduce significant and unavoidable historic impacts under the proposed plan to a less-than-significant-level. Thus, overall, the impact related to cultural resources would be less than significant with mitigation under this alternative.

The impacts to cultural resources from the Residential Project in the proposed plan would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation (see Section 3.4, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources). The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would result in a less than significant impact to cultural resources impact compared to the proposed plan; however, this alternative would not meet the plan objectives related to residential use in terms of cultural resources to the same degree as the proposed plan as this alternative would provide fewer housing units in a time of critical housing need in the City of Pleasant Hill and the greater Bay Area.

### **Geology and Soils**

Under the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative, the new development on-site would develop less square footage than the proposed plan. A portion of the existing on-site library that would be preserved and developed into a new residential community center. As part of the rehabilitation, certain seismic safety upgrades would be implemented, but it is assumed that the upgrades would not fully comply with current building codes related to energy, seismic safety, and fire provisions (as allowed by the Secretary of the Interior's standards).

The proposed plan impacts with regard to geology and soil resources would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.5, Geology and Soils). The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would have a similar level of geology and soils impact as the proposed plan, assuming rehabilitation is completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's standards.

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy**

Less demolition would occur with this alternative and overall square footage of new construction would be less, therefore, GHG and energy impacts from construction would be less than under the proposed plan. However, there would be a change related to GHG emission generation or energy consumption, as there would be less on-site residential buildings associated operations as well as less new daily vehicle trips. The same mitigation applied to the proposed plan could be applied to this alternative and would be expected to reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

The proposed plan impacts to GHG emissions and energy would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy). The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would result in fewer daily vehicle trips and therefore a lower level of GHG emissions and energy impact compared to the proposed plan. In addition, this alternative would meet the plan

objectives related to park and library uses in terms of GHG emissions and energy, as this alternative would create a community-gathering place by offering a park that provides active and passive spaces and provide a new, state-of-the-art community library with interior and exterior community gathering spaces that serves the citizens of the City of Pleasant Hill and the vicinity.

### **Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire**

Less demolition would occur with this alternative and overall square footage of construction would be less. However, the partial rehabilitation of the library would include remediation of asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint; therefore, impacts related to potential exposure to lead-based paint or asbestos-containing materials from demolition activities would be the same as the proposed plan, and the same mitigation requiring appropriate abatement would be applied.

The proposed plan impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.7, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire). The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would have a similar level of hazards and hazardous materials impact compared to the proposed plan. This alternative would meet the plan objectives related to park and library uses in terms of hazards, hazardous materials, and wildfire, as this alternative would develop a new, state-of-the-art community library that meets current building codes related to current energy, safety, and fire provisions.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

The creek and floodplain improvements including enhanced capacity of the underground storm drain system, new bioretention basins to provide pretreatment of stormwater, and upgraded outfalls in Grayson Creek to improve conveyance and reduce potential for erosion would occur. The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would develop ten single-family residential units and two accessory dwelling units on-site that would be constructed and operated around the rehabilitated section of the existing library structure on the 1750 Oak Park property. Overall, the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would result in a lower density of development on the site, and would hence have a decreased level of impervious surfaces on-site than is proposed under the proposed plan.

The proposed plan impacts to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.8, Hydrology and Water Quality) for the Civic Project and less than significant for the Residential Project. The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would have a slightly lower level of hydrology and water quality impacts compared to the proposed plan due to less impervious surfaces on-site; however, the same MM HYD-3 would be applied for the Civic Project (requiring a drainage plan) and would reduce potential impacts to less than significant. This alternative would meet the plan objectives related to the Civic Project in terms of stormwater runoff and drainage, as it would implement the new bioretention basins to provide pretreatment of stormwater, and upgraded outfalls to improve conveyance and reduce potential for flooding in the plan area.

### **Land Use and Planning**

Under the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative, ten single-family residential units and two accessory dwelling units would be constructed and operated around the rehabilitated section of the existing library structure on the 1750 Oak Park property. This alternative would also develop a new

library and a new park in the plan area. For this reason, the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would be consistent with the objectives of the Pleasant Hill 2003 General Plan, Community and Development Element and Economic Strategy Element that focuses on enhancing the public facilities and services, recreation, parks, neighborhoods, and conservation and energy in a similar way as to the proposed plan.

The proposed plan impacts to land use and planning would be less than significant and would meet many of the objectives of the Pleasant Hill 2003 General Plan, particularly the Community and Development Element and Economic Strategy Element (see Section 3.9, Land Use and Planning). The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would have a similar level of land use and planning impact compared to the proposed plan.

### **Noise**

Under the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative, the proposed new park and new library as well as Creek, floodplain, roadway improvements, and construction of the pedestrian trail, as detailed under the proposed plan, would be constructed and operated. Additionally, ten single-family residential units and two accessory dwelling units would be constructed and a residential-serving community center would be added to the preserved portion of the existing library structure on the 1750 Oak Park property.

Less demolition would occur under this alternative and overall square footage of new construction would be less. There would be a similar level of new stationary noise sources as there would be for the proposed plan, which is expected to result in similar less than significant impacts. However, new temporary or periodic impacts of groundborne vibration and noise sources from construction activities under this alternative would occur, as a portion of the library building would be preserved under this alternative, which would represent a sensitive structure subjected to construction-related groundborne vibration impacts. Mitigation would be required to reduce potential impacts to this sensitive structure during demolition of the adjoining portions of the building. It is expected that construction noise impacts to off-site receptors would remain the same as the proposed plan and would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of mitigation. In addition, the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative is expected to have a lower level of external vehicle trip generation as compared to the proposed plan for all time periods analyzed. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation.

The proposed plan impacts on noise would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.10, Noise). The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would have a similar level of noise impact compared to the proposed plan. In addition, with mitigation, vibration impacts associated with partial demolition of the library structure could be reduced to less than significant. This alternative also meets all of the identified plan objectives as this alternative would provide housing, a new park, new library, street improvements, and floodplain improvements on-site.



## Population and Housing

Under the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative, ten single-family residential units and two accessory dwelling units would be constructed and operated around the rehabilitated section of the existing library structure on the 1750 Oak Park property.

The proposed plan impacts on population and housing would be less than significant (see Section 3.11, Population and Housing). The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would provide fewer housing units and would also have a less than significant impact in terms of population and housing. Compared to the proposed plan, this alternative would have a lesser effect on addressing the critical housing shortage in the bay area, as it would result in the construction of 24 fewer housing units. This alternative meets the identified overall residential, park, library, street, and floodplain improvements identified for the proposed plan, and would enhance multi-modal access to the new library, athletic fields, residential development, as well as to Pleasant Hill Middle School. Additionally, this alternative would add housing to the site, provide high-quality athletic fields, and provide a new state-of-the-art community library that meets current building codes.

## Public Services

Under the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative, the proposed new park and new library as well as creek, floodplain, roadway improvements, and construction of the pedestrian trail as detailed under the proposed plan, would be constructed and operated. Additionally, a total of ten single-family residential units and two accessory dwelling units would be constructed and a residential-serving community center would be added to the preserved portion of the existing library structure on the 1750 Oak Park property. Compared to the proposed plan, there would be a slightly lower impact related to fire, police, school, or library services, as there would be fewer housing units constructed.

The proposed plan impacts to public services would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.12, Public Services). The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would have a slightly lower impact on public services compared to the proposed plan, because it would provide fewer housing units requiring public services. In addition, this alternative meets the plan objectives related to park and library uses in terms of public services, as this alternative would provide a new, state-of-the-art community library with interior and exterior community gathering spaces and enhance recreation and park facilities that serve the citizens of the City of Pleasant Hill.

## Recreation

Under the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative, the Civic Project site would be partially developed with a new library and a new park. Additionally, the proposed park at 1700 Oak Park Boulevard, including two 40,000-square-foot baseball fields, a 54,000-square-foot soccer field overlay on the athletic field grass between the two diamonds, three 720-square-foot bocce ball courts, and associated amenities would be developed under this alternative as it is proposed under the proposed plan, as well as the pedestrian pathway along the Grayson Creek Corridor. The residential population and associated demand for parks and recreational facilities would be less than the proposed plan due to a lower density (and number) of housing units on the Residential Project site. Thus, under this alternative, there would be a less than significant impact with the

incorporation of mitigation measures MM AIR-2, MM AIR-3, MM GHG-1, MM NOI-1, and MM TRANS-1a related to the construction of a recreational facility.

The proposed plan recreation and parks impact would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.13, Recreation). The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would have a lesser level of recreation and parks impacts when compared to the proposed plan, due to the reduced number of housing units, but would be subject to the same mitigation as the proposed plan. In addition, this alternative meets the key plan objectives related to recreation and parks, as this alternative would enhance recreation and park facilities for City of Pleasant Hill residents; provide high-quality athletic fields to support local youth leagues and provide positive after school and out-of-school youth activities; increase field time available for sports leagues by extending useable playing time; provide opportunities for adults to improve their health and wellness through active sports opportunities; and create a community-gathering place by offering a park that provides active and passive spaces.

### **Transportation**

Under the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative, the proposed new park and new library as detailed under the proposed plan would be constructed and operated, as well as ten single-family residential units and two accessory dwelling units would be constructed and operated around the rehabilitated section of the existing library structure on the 1750 Oak Park property. All Creek, floodplain, roadway improvements, and construction of the pedestrian trail would also occur. Additionally, the architecturally significant elements of the existing library complex on the 1750 Oak Park property, including the rotunda and connected southern annex building, would be preserved. The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative is expected to generate less traffic than the proposed plan during all time periods of analysis. As shown in Table 6-3, the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would generate 460 daily trips, 13 AM peak-hour, and 48 PM peak-hour.

The level of traffic is not expected to result in deficient operations at the study intersections based on the level service results determined for the proposed plan. For intersections where deficiencies are projected, this alternative would not exacerbate those deficiencies and is not expected to result in a significant impact based on level of service. The traffic associated with this alternative is not expected to increase vehicle queues for some movements where queue spillback already occurs, potentially resulting in additional vehicle queue impacts. Based on the configuration of the site, and the location of the existing library building that would be renovated, the access location to the potential new homes may be constrained, and the ultimate roadway configuration within a portion of the site may not meet City roadway standards, resulting in a potentially significant impact. A similar impact as compared to the proposed plan during the construction period is expected to occur with the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative. MM TRANS-1 includes the preparation and implementation of a construction traffic management plan, the reconstruction of a bus route with a pedestrian clear-way, mid-block pedestrian crosswalks, and the preparation of a bicycle to roadway plan prior to construction. Because this alternative would construct habitable structures, this alternative would also implement MM TRANS-4 that requires the preparation of the design for fire access road as well as a sprinkler system. Thus, under this alternative, the impact related to transportation would be less than significant with mitigation.

**Table 6-3: Partial Historic Preservation Alternative Trip Generation**

Scenario	Daily Trips	AM Peak-hour	PM Peak-hour
Partial Historic Preservation Alternative	460	13	48
Proposed Plan	950	37	125
<b>Difference</b>	<b>(490)</b>	<b>(24)</b>	<b>(77)</b>
Source: Fehr & Peers 2019.			

The proposed plan impacts related to transportation would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.14, Transportation). The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would have a lower level of traffic impacts compared to the proposed plan, due to the construction of fewer housing units. In addition, this alternative meets the identified plan objectives related to proposed residential uses in terms of transportation, as this alternative would provide needed housing and maximize infill development as well as provide high-quality athletic fields and modernized library facilities close to public transit. This alternative would achieve all of the objectives of the proposed plan, but, as described above, would meet the objectives of the Residential Project to a lesser degree.

### Utilities and Service Systems

Under the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative, the proposed new park and new library as detailed under the proposed plan would be constructed and operated. All creek, floodplain, roadway improvements, and construction of the pedestrian trail would also occur. Furthermore, the utility improvements to Oak Park Boulevard and Monticello Avenue, including the undergrounding of utility lines would occur. Ten single-family residential units and two accessory dwelling units would be constructed and operated around the preserved portion of the existing library structure on the 1750 Oak Park property. The addition of housing on-site would result in a change related to water supply utility and wastewater, stormwater, and solid waste collection generation service systems, while the renovation of existing on-site civic buildings or associated City department operations would remain approximately the same, but with greater efficiency than the existing condition. The same mitigation related to construction of the proposed plan would be applied to this alternative. Under this alternative, the utility and service impacts related to construction of waste, wastewater, stormwater, and telecommunication facilities would be less than significant with the implementation MM AIR-2, MM AIR-3, MM GHG-1, MM NOI-1, and MM TRANS-1a.

The proposed plan impacts related to utility and service systems would be less than significant with mitigation (see Section 3.15, Utilities and Service Systems). The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would have a slightly lower level of utility and service systems impact compared to the proposed plan because there would be fewer housing units developed. In addition, this alternative meets the plan objectives related to library and park uses in terms of utilities and service systems, as this alternative would provide modern municipal facilities that provide efficient delivery of utility services.

### 6.7.2 - Conclusion

The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable impact to cultural resources associated with implementation of the Residential Project. The reduction in potential impact would be achieved by avoiding demolition or removal of the architecturally significant elements of the existing library complex on the 1750 Oak Park property ( including the library rotunda and the connected southern annex building, and described in Sections A and B in the original building drawings, which total 30,000 to 32,985 gross square feet). In preserving a portion of the existing library complex, the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative would also be in keeping with the Secretary of Interior’s standards for the rehabilitation of historic properties and subject to the California Historic Building Code. This alternative would, in general, not exacerbate the majority of the identified impacts nor would it create additional significant impacts. This alternative would achieve all of the proposed plan objectives, but it would achieve the residential objectives to a lesser degree as it would not maximize housing on the 1750 Oak Park property.

### 6.8 - Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(e)(2) requires identification of an environmentally superior alternative. If the No Project, No Development Alternative is environmentally superior, CEQA requires selection of the “environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project, No Development Alternative” from among the proposed plan and the alternatives evaluated.

To identify the environmentally superior alternative in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, Table 6-4 presents a comparison of the impacts related to the alternatives. As shown in Table 6-4, the Partial Historic Preservation Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, because it would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural resources that would be caused by the construction and operation of the proposed plan’s Residential Project, and would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts related to leaving the existing library in place under the No Project, No Development Alternative. The Partial Historic Preservation Alternative also meets all the plan objectives.

**Table 6-4: Summary of Alternatives’ Impacts**

Impact	Proposed Plan	Alternative 1— No Project Alternative	Alternative 2— Code Compliant Alternative	Alternative 3— Partial Historic Preservation Alternative
Aesthetics	LTSM	NI	LTSM (similar)	LTSM (similar)
Air Quality	LTSM	NI	LTSM (similar)	LTSM (similar)
Biological Resources	LTSM	NI	LTSM (similar)	LTSM (similar)
Cultural and Tribal Resources	SUM	NI	LTSM (similar)	LTS (lesser)
Geology and Soils	LTSM	SU (greater)	SU (greater)	LTSM (similar)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy	LTSM	NI	LTSM (similar)	LTSM (lesser)

**Table 6-4 (cont.): Summary of Alternatives’ Impacts**

Impact	Proposed Plan	Alternative 1— No Project Alternative	Alternative 2— Code Compliant Alternative	Alternative 3— Partial Historic Preservation Alternative
Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire	LTSM	SU (greater)	SU (greater)	LTSM (similar)
Hydrology and Water Quality	LTSM	NI	LTSM (similar)	LTSM (similar)
Land Use and Planning	LTS	NI	LTS (similar)	LTS (same)
Noise	LTSM	NI	LTSM (lesser)	LTSM (similar)
Population and Housing	LTS	NI	LTS (lesser)	LTS (similar)
Public Services	LTSM	NI	LTSM (similar)	LTSM (lesser)
Recreation	LTSM	NI	LTSM (greater)	LTSM (similar)
Transportation	LTSM	NI	LTSM (similar)	LTSM (similar)
Utilities and Service Systems	LTSM	NI	LTSM (similar)	LTSM (similar)
Notes: NI= No Impact LTS = less than significant LTSM = less than significant with mitigation incorporated SU = significant and unavoidable SUM = significant and unavoidable with mitigation incorporated Source: Compiled by FCS 2019.				

To identify the environmentally superior alternative in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, Table 6-5 presents a summary of whether the alternatives meet the Civic Project, and Residential Project objectives.

As shown in Table 6-5, the Partial Preservation Alternative (Alternative 3) would meet all of the proposed plan objectives with the exception of the objectives associated with the Residential Project, as it would not maximize the construction of housing in light of the critical need. The No Project, No Development Alternative (Alternative 1) would meet none of the Civic Project no Residential Project objectives, while the Code Compliant Alternative (Alternative 2) would not meet the library or recreational components of the Civic Project objectives.

**Table 6-5: Summary of Alternatives’ Meeting of Project Objectives**

Objective	Proposed Plan	Alternative 1— No Project Alternative	Alternative 2— Code Compliant Alternative	Alternative 3— Partial Historic Preservation Alternative
<b>Civic Project</b>				
Park Component	All	None	None	All
Library Component	All	None	None	All
Roadway, Trail, Creek, and Floodplain Improvements Component	All	None	All	All
<b>Residential Project</b>	All	None	All	Some
Notes: All = meets all respective identified plan objectives Some = meets some respective identified plan objectives None = meets no respective identified plan objectives Source: Compiled by FCS 2019.				

**6.9 - Alternatives Considered but Rejected from Further Consideration**

The following alternatives were also initially considered. However, for reasons discussed below, they were dismissed from further consideration.

**6.9.1 - Full Historic Preservation Alternative**

The existing library building complex would be preserved in full in order to retain the library’s historic integrity pursuant to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR 68). However, this alternative would not achieve the Civic Project Objective to provide a state of the art library facility.

**6.9.2 - Historic Structure Relocation Alternative**

The existing library building would be moved to another location. However, moving the existing library building off-site would not retain the library’s historic integrity pursuant to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR 68).

**6.9.3 - Alternate Location(s) Alternative**

Within the City of Pleasant Hill and surrounding area, no alternative sites were available for the Civic Project and Residential Project that would meet project objectives.

## CHAPTER 7: LIST OF PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS

### 7.1 - CEQA Lead Agency

#### 7.1.1 - City of Pleasant Hill

City Manager .....June Catalano  
Assistant City Manager .....Andrew Murray

#### Planning Division

Senior Planner ..... Troy Fujimoto  
City Engineer..... Mario Moreno, PE  
Senior Civil Engineer .....Ananthan Kanagasundaram, PE  
Senior Civil Engineer .....Deirdre Castillo, PE

### 7.2 - Other Agency CEQA Support

#### Contra Costa County

Principal Real Property Agent..... Karen Laws  
Development Consultant..... Jim Kennedy  
Development Consultant..... Scott Stringer  
Principal Planner.....Telma Moreira

#### Contra Costa County Library

County Librarian ..... Melinda Cervantes  
Deputy County Librarian..... Alison McKee

#### Pleasant Hill Recreation and Park District

General Manager ..... Michelle Lacy

#### Contra Costa County Fire Protection District

Fire Prevention Captain ..... Tracie Dutter  
Media Relations Contact ..... Steve Hill

#### Pleasant Hill Police Department

Chief..... Bryan Hill  
Lieutenant..... Scott Vermillion

#### Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

Division Manager ..... Tim Jensen  
Engineering Technician ..... Jon Suemnick

### 7.3 - Project Sponsors

#### 7.3.1 - City of Pleasant Hill

City Manager ..... June Catalano  
Assistant City Manager ..... Andrew Murray

#### 7.3.2 - Contra Costa County

Principal Planner ..... Telma Moreira  
Principal Real Property Agent ..... Karen Laws  
Development Consultant ..... Jim Kennedy  
Development Consultant ..... Scott Stringer

#### 7.3.3 - Pleasant Hill Recreation and Park District

General Manager ..... Michelle Lacy

#### 7.3.4 - Swinerton Builders

Project Executive ..... John Baker  
Project Manager ..... Stan Wong

### 7.4 - Consultants

#### 7.4.1 - FirstCarbon Solutions (Environmental Impact Report)

Project Director ..... Mary Bean  
Senior Project Manager ..... Kelsey Bennett  
Deputy Project Manager ..... Liza Baskir  
Senior Graphic Designer ..... Yiu Kam  
Senior Air Quality Specialist ..... Jason Paukovits  
Air Quality Specialist ..... Kimber Johnson  
Senior Biologist ..... Brian Mayerle  
Biologist ..... Robert Carroll  
Biologist ..... Joaquin Pacheco  
Senior Cultural Resources Specialist ..... Dana DePietro  
Senior Noise Specialist ..... Phil Ault  
Noise Specialist ..... Eric Soycher  
Environmental Analyst ..... Spencer Pignotti  
Editor ..... Susie Harris  
Word Processor ..... Ericka Rodriguez  
Graphics ..... Karlee McCracken



**7.4.2 - Musco Sports Lighting (Light and Glare Analysis and Lighting Control Summary)**

Project Engineer .....K. Reynolds

**7.4.3 - HortSciences (Arborist Report)**

Certified Arborist..... James R. Clark

**7.4.4 - Live Oak Associates, Inc. (Biological Constraints Analysis)**

Staff Ecologist ..... Emily Moffitt

**7.4.5 - Daly & Associates (Historic Resource Evaluation Report)**

Principal Architectural Historian..... Pamela Daly

**7.4.6 - ENGEO, Inc. (Geotechnical Report)**

Principal ..... Macy Tong, GE  
Project Engineer ..... Bahareh Heidarzadeh, PhD, PE  
Staff Engineer ..... Spencer Waganaar, EIT

**7.4.7 - ENGEO, Inc. (Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report)**

Principal ..... Jeffrey A. Adams, PhD, PE  
Project Engineer .....Kelsey Gerhart, PE

**7.4.8 - Jonas & Associates, Inc. (Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report)**

Registered Environmental Assessor .....Romena Jonas, REA

**7.4.9 - WRECO (Floodplain Evaluation Report)**

Senior Engineer ..... Joyce Cheng, PE

**7.4.10 - Balance Hydrologics, Inc. (Flood Plain Evaluation Report Peer Review)**

Civil Engineer/Hydrologist ..... Anna Nazarov, PE, CFM

**7.4.11 - Fehr & Peers (Transportation Impact Study)**

Principal .....Kathrin Tellez

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK