

**Final
Environmental Impact Report**

**Saratoga Retirement Community
Campus Master Plan**

SCH#2021110366

April 2024

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Prepared for:

City of Saratoga
13777 Fruitvale Avenue
Saratoga, CA 95070
www.saratoga.ca.us

Prepared by:

AECOM
4 North Second Street, Suite 675
San Jose, CA 95113
www.aecom.com

Contents

1	Introduction.....	1-1
1.1	CEQA Process	1-1
1.2	Document Organization	1-2
2	Agencies, Organizations and Persons Commenting on the Draft Environmental Impact Report	2-1
3	Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EIR.....	3-1
3.1	Master Responses	3-1
3.1.1	MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project	3-1
3.1.2	MASTER-2: Support for No Project Alternative	3-2
3.1.3	MASTER-3: Support for Residents’ Alternative (Alternative 1).....	3-2
3.1.4	MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents’ Alternative (Alternative 1)	3-3
3.1.5	MASTER-5: Appropriateness of Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative 2)	3-11
3.1.6	MASTER-6: Support for Applicant’s Alternative (Alternative 3)	3-12
3.1.7	MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.....	3-12
3.1.8	MASTER-8: Residents Not Informed of Project	3-14
3.1.9	MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.....	3-14
3.1.10	MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building	3-15
3.1.11	MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.....	3-17
3.1.12	MASTER-12: Impacts of Construction Vibration on the Historic Manor Building.....	3-18
3.1.13	MASTER-13: Construction Duration.....	3-20
3.1.14	MASTER-14: Construction Noise	3-22
3.1.15	MASTER-15: Construction Vibration	3-26
3.1.16	MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality	3-28
3.1.17	MASTER-17: Construction Staging	3-29
3.1.18	MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Center Renovations	3-30
3.1.19	MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients	3-32
3.1.20	MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.....	3-35
3.1.21	MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors	3-36
3.1.22	MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.....	3-37
3.1.23	MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space	3-41
3.1.24	MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation	3-43
3.1.25	MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption	3-47
3.1.26	MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety	3-50
3.1.27	MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Quality	3-51
3.2	Responses to Form Letters	3-53
3.2.1	Comment Letter FORM-1	3-53
3.2.2	Comment Letter FORM-2	3-54
3.2.3	Comment Letter FORM-3	3-56
3.2.4	Comment Letter FORM-4	3-57
3.2.5	Comment Letter FORM-5	3-58
3.2.6	Comment Letter FORM-6	3-59

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

3.2.7	Comment Letter FORM-7	3-59
3.2.8	Comment Letter FORM-8	3-60
3.2.9	Comment Letter FORM-9	3-61
3.2.10	Comment Letter FORM-10	3-62
3.2.11	Comment Letter FORM-11	3-64
3.2.12	Comment Letter FORM-12	3-67
3.2.13	Comment Letter FORM-13	3-68
3.2.14	Comment Letter FORM-14	3-69
3.2.15	Comment Letter FORM-15	3-70
3.2.16	Comment Letter FORM-16	3-71
3.2.17	Comment Letter FORM-17	3-72
3.2.18	Comment Letter FORM-18	3-73
3.2.19	Comment Letter FORM-19	3-73
3.2.20	Comment Letter FORM-20	3-74
3.2.21	Comment Letter FORM-21	3-77
3.2.22	Comment Letter FORM-22	3-78
3.2.23	Comment Letter FORM-23	3-81
3.2.24	Comment Letter FORM-24	3-82
3.2.25	Comment Letter FORM-25	3-84
3.2.26	Comment Letter FORM-26	3-85
3.2.27	Comment Letter FORM-27	3-86
3.2.28	Comment Letter FORM-28	3-86
3.2.29	Comment Letter FORM-29	3-87
3.2.30	Comment Letter FORM-30	3-89
3.2.31	Comment Letter FORM-31	3-90
3.3	Responses to Comments from Agencies and Organizations	3-93
3.3.1	Commenter: Valley Water (VW).....	3-93
3.3.2	Commenter: Preserve SRC (PRESERVE).....	3-95
3.3.3	Commenter: Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society (SCVAS).....	3-107
3.3.4	Commenter: Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC)	3-117
3.4	Responses to Comments from Individuals	3-121
3.4.1	Commenter ABRUZZINI-H	3-121
3.4.2	Commenter ACKUNAS-L	3-123
3.4.3	Commenter ANDERSON-U	3-123
3.4.4	Commenter AUSTIN-T&J	3-124
3.4.5	Commenter BARDIN-T	3-125
3.4.6	Commenter BASHAM-M	3-136
3.4.7	Commenter BERG-J.....	3-136
3.4.8	Commenter BERG-M	3-137
3.4.9	Commenter BERGLUND-R.....	3-137
3.4.10	Commenter BREWER-C	3-140
3.4.11	Commenter BREWER-D	3-140
3.4.12	Commenter BRITTAIN-C	3-141
3.4.13	Commenter BRITTAIN-J.....	3-144
3.4.14	Commenter BRITTAIN-J&C.....	3-149
3.4.15	Commenter CAPUTO	3-153
3.4.16	Commenter CAPUTO-J&R.....	3-153

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

3.4.17	Commenter CAPUTO-J.....	3-153
3.4.18	Commenter CAPUTO-R.....	3-155
3.4.19	Commenter CARROL-M.....	3-156
3.4.20	Commenter CHAN-C.....	3-157
3.4.21	Commenter CHAN-M.....	3-159
3.4.22	Commenter CHAN-R.....	3-163
3.4.23	Commenter CHU-S.....	3-164
3.4.24	Commenter CLAYDON-R.....	3-164
3.4.25	Commenter CONNELLY-H.....	3-165
3.4.26	Commenter COOPER-B.....	3-166
3.4.27	Commenter CORNEY-J.....	3-167
3.4.28	Commenter CUMMINS-C.....	3-168
3.4.29	Commenter CURRY-B.....	3-174
3.4.30	Commenter CURRY-R.....	3-175
3.4.31	Commenter DARLENE.....	3-177
3.4.32	Commenter DAY-J.....	3-178
3.4.33	Commenter DIXSON-J.....	3-180
3.4.34	Commenter DOLUCA-T&I.....	3-184
3.4.35	Commenter DROBNICH-L.....	3-186
3.4.36	Commenter DUBRIDGE-D&P.....	3-187
3.4.37	Commenter DUBRIDGE-P.....	3-187
3.4.38	Commenter DUBRIDGE-R.....	3-189
3.4.39	Commenter FARRIS-M.....	3-194
3.4.40	Commenter GRIFFIN-M.....	3-195
3.4.41	Commenter HOWELL-C.....	3-198
3.4.42	Commenter HUNTER-J.....	3-199
3.4.43	Commenter JACKSON-J.....	3-200
3.4.44	Commenter JAIN-N.....	3-202
3.4.45	Commenter JOE-V.....	3-204
3.4.46	Commenter JOHNSON-G.....	3-205
3.4.47	Commenter JOHNSON-S.....	3-205
3.4.48	Commenter JOHNSON-S&E.....	3-206
3.4.49	Commenter JOHNSON&MARSHALL.....	3-206
3.4.50	Commenter KING-A.....	3-206
3.4.51	Commenter KING-C.....	3-207
3.4.52	Commenter KLEIN-E.....	3-207
3.4.53	Commenter LAHANN-MG&J.....	3-209
3.4.54	Commenter LANDERGREN-E.....	3-210
3.4.55	Commenter LEWIS-P.....	3-213
3.4.56	Commenter LEWIS-P&D.....	3-213
3.4.57	Commenter LIN-L.....	3-214
3.4.58	Commenter LIU-M.....	3-215
3.4.59	Commenter LUNG-C.....	3-215
3.4.60	Commenter MANIES-M.....	3-216
3.4.61	Commenter MANSBRIDGE-J&V.....	3-224
3.4.62	Commenter MAXFIELD-J.....	3-225
3.4.63	Commenter MAXFIELD-M.....	3-226

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

3.4.64	Commenter MCGLYNN-P	3-227
3.4.65	Commenter MERRILL-B.....	3-229
3.4.66	Commenter MEYERCORD-P.....	3-230
3.4.67	Commenter MEYERCORD-W	3-231
3.4.68	Commenter NG-H&B.....	3-232
3.4.69	Commenter NIEMAND-B.....	3-237
3.4.70	Commenter OFLAHERTY-M	3-238
3.4.71	Commenter OMURA-J	3-239
3.4.72	Commenter ONN-D	3-239
3.4.73	Commenter PANELL-J	3-240
3.4.74	Commenter PANELL-P.....	3-243
3.4.75	Commenter PARKER-R	3-244
3.4.76	Commenter PEARSONHALL	3-245
3.4.77	Commenter PELTA-E	3-246
3.4.78	Commenter PELTA-E&D	3-249
3.4.79	Commenter PERATA-D	3-249
3.4.80	Commenter PERATA-U	3-250
3.4.81	Commenter PERATA-U&D	3-250
3.4.82	Commenter PFEIFFER-P.....	3-252
3.4.83	Commenter PRICE-J.....	3-253
3.4.84	Commenter PRICE-R.....	3-253
3.4.85	Commenter RAMOS-J.....	3-254
3.4.86	Commenter RAVIKUMAR-R.....	3-255
3.4.87	Commenter REDIG-J	3-278
3.4.88	Commenter ROSIER-M.....	3-278
3.4.89	Commenter SAYRE-L.....	3-282
3.4.90	Commenter SCHMIDEK-D.....	3-283
3.4.91	Commenter SCHMIDEK-J&V.....	3-327
3.4.92	Commenter SHEW-R	3-328
3.4.93	Commenter SILBERMAN-N	3-329
3.4.94	Commenter SNOWBRIDGE-S	3-338
3.4.95	Commenter SORENSON-D	3-339
3.4.96	Commenter STRATMAN-J&T.....	3-340
3.4.97	Commenter STRATMAN-T.....	3-340
3.4.98	Commenter TALTY-C.....	3-342
3.4.99	Commenter TIERNAN-F	3-345
3.4.100	Commenter UMBACH-L	3-346
3.4.101	Commenter VANDERSTEEN-R	3-346
3.4.102	Commenter WAGGONER-J	3-348
3.4.103	Commenter WALLACE-B	3-348
3.4.104	Commenter WEILER-H&F.....	3-349
3.4.105	Commenter WESSLING-A	3-353
3.4.106	Commenter WHIPPLE-C.....	3-354
3.4.107	Commenter WHITBY-STREVENS-P&C.....	3-355
3.4.108	Commenter ZAVOSHY-J&Y	3-357
3.5	Responses to Verbal Comments.....	3-359
3.5.1	Speaker-1: Michael Griffin	3-359

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

3.5.2 Speaker-2: Jill Hunter 3-360
 3.5.3 Speaker-3: Tsing Bardin 3-361
 3.5.4 Speaker-4: Marian Chan 3-362
 3.5.5 Speaker-5: CK Chan 3-363
 3.5.6 Speaker-6: Pat McGuire 3-364
 3.5.7 Speaker-7: Marilyn Basham 3-366
 3.5.8 Speaker-8: Barry Lamé 3-367
 3.5.9 Speaker-9: Marilyn Manies 3-368
 3.5.10 Speaker-10: Robert Berglund 3-369
 3.5.11 Speaker-11: Tony Vandersteen 3-370
 3.5.12 Speaker-12: Chuck Cummins 3-371
 3.5.13 Speaker-13: Don Schmidek 3-373
 3.5.14 Speaker-14: Pat DuBridge 3-374
 3.5.15 Speaker-15: Dick DuBridge 3-375
 3.5.16 Speaker-16: Nitin Jain 3-376
 3.5.17 Speaker-17: Frank Tiernan 3-377

4 Changes to the Draft EIR in Response to Comments 4-1
 4.1 Changes to Specific Sections of the Draft EIR 4-1
 4.1.1 Changes to the Executive Summary 4-1
 4.1.2 Changes to Section 2 4-2
 4.1.3 Changes to Section 3 4-2
 4.1.4 Changes to Section 4 4-13
 4.1.5 Changes to Section 5 4-19
 4.2 Global Edits throughout the Draft EIR 4-19
 4.3 New or Updated Figures in the Draft EIR 4-19
 4.4 New or Updated References in the Draft EIR 4-20
 4.5 New or Updated Appendices to the Draft EIR 4-20
5 Additional References 5-1

Appendices

- Appendix A – Written Comments and Transcript of Verbal Comments
- Appendix B – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
- Appendix C – New or Updated Figures
- Appendix D – New or Updated Appendices to the EIR

Tables

Table 2-A List of Written Comments Received During Public Review Period 2-1
 Table 2-B List of Verbal Comments Received at the Public Meeting 2-7
 Table 3-A Comparison of Alternative 1 and Preserve SRC Submission. 3-5
 Table 3-B Summary of Existing and Proposed Buildings in Project Area 3-260

Exhibits

Exhibit 3-A: Comparison of views from South College Circle toward Manor Building 3-210

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AARP	American Association of Retired Persons,
ADU	additional dwelling unit
AES	Aesthetics
AIR	Air Quality
ALAN	Artificial Light At Night
Alternative 1	Residents' Alternative
Alternative 2	Reduced Development Alternative
Alternative 3	Applicant's Alternative
BIO	Biological Resources
BMPs	Best Management Practices
CAAQS	California ambient air quality standards
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CALGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CCRC	Continuing Care Retirement Communities
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
City	City of Saratoga
CO	carbon monoxide
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CUL	Cultural Resources
DBA	doing business as
dBA	weighted dB
DEIR	Draft Environmental Impact Report
Draft EIR	Draft Environmental Impact Report
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
EIA	U.S. Energy Information
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EMR	Emergency Medical Response
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency's
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
Final EIR	Final Environmental Impact Report
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
ft	feet
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GEO	Geology
GHG	Greenhouse Gas Emissions
GSP	Groundwater Sustainability Plan
GWMP	Groundwater Management Plan
HAZ	Hazards and Hazardous Materials
HCAI	Health Care Access and Information
HCC	Health Care Center

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

HEPA	high-efficiency particulate air
HPCR	high-pressure common rail
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
in/sec	inches per second
IOOF	Independent Order of Odd Fellows
km ²	square kilometer
lead agency	City of Saratoga
Leq	equivalent continuous noise level
LOS	Level of Service
MEIR	maximally-exposed individual resident”
MEIW	maximally-exposed individual worker”
MFS	mandatory findings of significance
MM	mitigation measure
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
NAAQS	national ambient air quality standards
NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide
NOI	Noise
NO _x	nitrogen oxide
OEHHA	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
OFHC	Odd Fellows Home of California Board
PEBTAC	Pedestrian, Equestrian & Bicycle Trails
PM ₁₀	particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than 10 microns
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than 2.5 microns
POP	Population and Housing
PPV	peak particle velocity
Project	Saratoga Retirement Community Master Plan Update
PRS	Pacific Retirement Services
REC	Recreation
ROGs	reactive organic gases
SCH#	State Clearing House number
SCVAS	Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society
SF	square feet
SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
SRC	Saratoga Retirement Community
Standards	Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation
TCR	Tribal Cultural Resources
TRA	Transportation
UCLA	University of California Los Angeles.
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
UTI	Utility/Service Systems
UTM	Universal Transverse Mercator
Valley Water	Santa Clara Valley Water District
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
WF	Wildfire

1 Introduction

1.1 CEQA Process

On July 6, 2023, the City of Saratoga (City or lead agency) released for public review a Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the proposed Saratoga Retirement Community Master Plan (State Clearing House number [SCH#] 2021110366) pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The 45-day public review and comment period on the Draft EIR began on July 6, 2023 and closed on August 21, 2023. A public meeting to receive comments on the Draft EIR was held on August 2, 2023.

Section 15088(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states that:

The lead agency shall evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft EIR and shall prepare a written response. The lead agency shall respond to comments received during the noticed comment period and any extensions and may respond to late comments.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a) outlines parameters for submitting comments and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of Draft EIRs should be, “on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and ways in which significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated. Comments are most helpful when they suggest additional specific alternatives or mitigation measures that would provide better ways to avoid or mitigate the significant environmental effects. At the same time, reviewers should be aware that the adequacy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible, in light of factors such as the magnitude of the project at issue, the severity of its likely environmental impacts, and geographic scope of the project. CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR.”

This response to comments document, including the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached as Appendix B and other appendices, together with the Draft EIR as published, together constitute the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the Project.

Certification of the Final EIR as adequate and complete must take place before the City may approve the Project (or one of the alternatives). Certification of the Final EIR as being complete is not approval of the Project; certification is required for ultimate project approval, but the approval is a separate action by the City.

1.2 Document Organization

Pursuant to Section 15132 of the CEQA Guidelines, a Final EIR shall consist of:

- a) The Draft EIR or a revision of the draft
- b) Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary
- c) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR
- d) The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process
- e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency.

This Final EIR is divided into the following sections and appendices:

- Section 1, “Introduction,” describes the CEQA process and the organization of this document.
- Section 2, “Agencies, Organizations and Persons Commenting on the Draft EIR,” lists all agencies, organizations and persons that submitted written or oral comments on the Draft EIR during the public review and comment period. The list also indicates the receipt date of each written correspondence and the comment code assigned to each commenter.
- Section 3, “Comments Received and Responses to Comments,” details the specific comments received during the public review period and provides the City’s response to each comment. Each substantive comment within a particular comment letter is assigned a unique number along with the comment code for that commenter, with corresponding responses similarly numbered. Verbal comments received during the public meeting held during the review period are summarized and responded to in turn.
- Section 4, “Revisions to the Draft Environmental Impact Report,” contains text changes to the EIR made in response to comments received on the Draft EIR, or initiated by City staff.

Appendix A contains full copies of the comment letters and emails received in their original format, along with a transcript of verbal comments that were presented during the public meeting on the Draft EIR. Appendix B contains the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), which identifies mitigation measures and the responsible parties, tasks, and schedule for monitoring mitigation compliance. Appendix C contains new and/or revised figures that have been added to the EIR in response to comments, and Appendix D contains new and/or revised appendices that were added in response to comments.

2 Agencies, Organizations and Persons Commenting on the Draft Environmental Impact Report

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, this document includes written responses to email and letter comments received by the City on the Draft EIR during the public review period, as well as to verbal comments from the public meeting held on August 2, 2023.

Table 2-A below lists all written comments received on the Draft EIR, and Table 2-B lists all speakers at the public meeting. Each commenter is given a unique commenter code, which is used in Section 3 of this document to identify individual subtopics raised by the commenters and the City’s responses to those comments. Full copies of each written comment letter are contained in Appendix A, along with a transcript of verbal comments from the public meeting.

Table 2-A List of Written Comments Received During Public Review Period

Commenter Code	Name of Commenter	Commenter Type	Date Comment(s) Received
VW	Valley Water	Agency	August 2, 2023
PRESERVE	Preserve SRC Campus Interest Group	Organization	August 21, 2023 (x2)
SCVAS	Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society	Organization	August 21, 2023
SRC	Saratoga Retirement Community	Organization	August 15, 2023
ABRUZZINI-H	Helen Abruzzini	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x7)
ACKUNAS-L	Lita Ackunas	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x3)
ANDERSON-U	Ursula M. Anderson	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x2)
AUSTIN-T&J	Tom and Jean Austin	SRC Resident	August 7, 2023 (x2)
BARDIN-T	Tsing Bardin	SRC Resident	July 16, 2023 July 24, 2023 (x4) July 29, 2023 August 4, 2023 August 5, 2023 August 7, 2023 August 11, 2023 (x3) August 17, 2023 August 19, 2023 August 21, 2023 (x17)

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Commenter Code	Name of Commenter	Commenter Type	Date Comment(s) Received
BASHAM-M	Marilyn Basham	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x2)
BERG-J	Joe Berg	SRC Resident	July 31, 2023
BERG-M	Marilyn Berg	SRC Resident	July 31, 2023
BERGLUND-R	Robert Berglund	SRC Resident	August 3, 2023 August 6, 2023 August 10, 2023 August 11, 2023
BREWER-C	Celia Brewer	SRC Resident	August 20, 2023
BREWER-D	David M. Brewer	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023
BRITTAIN-C	Carol Brittain	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x16)
BRITTAIN-J&C	John & Carol Brittain	SRC Residents	August 15, 2023 (x2)
BRITTAIN-J	John Brittain	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x29)
CAPUTO	Caputo [first name illegible]	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023
CAPUTO-J	Janet Caputo	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x8)
CAPUTO-J&R	Janet & Richard Caputo	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023
CAPUTO-R	Richard Caputo	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x8)
CARROL-M	Mary E. Carrol	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023
CHAN-C	C.K. Chan	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023
CHAN-M	Marian Chan	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023 (x2)
CHAN-R	Rosalind Chan	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x2)
CHU-S	Sylvia Chu	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x3)
CLAYDON-R	Roger Claydon	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023
CONNELLY-H	Helen Connelly	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x4)
COOPER-B	Bill Cooper	SRC Resident	August 15, 2023
CORNEY-J	Judy Corney	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x5)
CUMMINS-C	Charles F. Cummins	SRC Resident	July 31, 2023 August 1, 2023 August 2, 2023 August 21, 2023
CURRY-B	Betty Curry	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023 (x4)
CURRY-R	Roger Curry	SRC Resident	July 27, 2023 (x5)
DARLENE	Darlene [surname]	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x3)

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Commenter Code	Name of Commenter	Commenter Type	Date Comment(s) Received
	illegible]		
DAY-J	John Day	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x5)
DIXSON-J	James A. Dixson	SRC Resident	August 19, 2023 August 21, 2023
DOLUCA-T&I	Tunc Doluca (on behalf of Isik Doluca)	SRC Resident	August 11, 2023
DROBNICH-L	Lorry Droblich	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023
DUBRIDGE-D&P	Dick & Pat DuBridge	SRC Residents	August 21, 2023
DUBRIDGE-P	Pat DuBridge	SRC Resident	July 27, 2023 August 7, 2023 August 21, 2023
DUBRIDGE-R	Richard DuBridge	SRC Resident	July 30, 2023 (x2) August 21, 2023
FARRIS-M	Marcia Farris	SRC Resident	July 30, 2023
GRIFFIN-M	Michael Griffin	SRC Resident	August 3, 2023 August 21, 2023 (x7)
HOWELL-C	Carol Howell	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x4)
HUNTER-J	Jill Hunter	City Resident	August 7, 2023
JACKSON-J	Joan Jackson	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x10)
JAIN-N	Nitin Jain	City Resident (adjacent neighbor)	August 21, 2023
JOE-V	Virginia Joe	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x6)
JOHNSON-G	Gayle P. Johnson & Marmaduke	SRC Residents	August 21, 2023 (x4)
JOHNSON&MARSHALL	Gayle P. Johnson & Norma Marshall	SRC Residents	August 21, 2023
JOHNSON-S	Steve Johnson	SRC Resident	August 9, 2023
JOHNSON-S&E	Steve & Eleonore Johnson	SRC Residents	August 21, 2023
KING-A	Alan King	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x2)
KING-C	Carol King	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023
KLEIN-E	Elaine Klein	SRC Resident	August 19, 2023
LAHANN-MG&J	MaryAnn, Gerald, and Joyce Lahann	SRC Residents	July 10, 2023
LANDERGREN-E	Elizabeth (Betsy)	SRC Resident	August 10, 2023

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Commenter Code	Name of Commenter	Commenter Type	Date Comment(s) Received
	Landergren		August 21, 2023 (x6)
LEWIS-P&D	Patricia & David Lewis	SRC Residents	August 21, 2023 (x6)
LEWIS-P	Patricia Lewis	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023
LIN-L	Ling Lin	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x3)
LIU-M	May Liu	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x3)
LUNG-C	Cecelia Lung	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x3)
MANIES-M	Marilyn Manies	SRC Resident	August 11, 2023 August 21, 2023 (x15)
MANSBRIDGE-J&V	Vera & Jonathan Mansbridge	SRC Residents	August 14, 2023
MAXFIELD-J	Jack Maxfield	SRC Resident	July 30, 2023 August 6, 2023 (x2)
MAXFIELD-M	Mona Maxfield	SRC Resident	July 30, 2023 (x2) August 6, 2023 (x2)
MCGLYNN-P	Patricia E. McGlynn	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x14)
MERRILL-B	Barbara Merrill	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x2)
MEYERCORD-P	Phyllis Meyercord	SRC Resident	August 4, 2023 August 21, 2023 (x3)
MEYERCORD-W	Wade Meyercord	SRC Resident	August 4, 2023 August 21, 2023 (x2)
NG-H&B	Harlen & Beata Ng	SRC Residents	August 6, 2023 (x4) August 7, 2023 (x3) August 9, 2023
NIEMAND-B	Brenda Niemand	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x5)
OFLAHERTY-M	Marie O'Flaherty	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x2)
OMURA-J	Jim K. Omura	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x2)
ONN-D	Daniel Onn	SRC Resident	July 10, 2023
PANELL-J	Jan Panell	SRC Resident	July 31, 2023 (x3) August 7, 2023 August 20, 2023
PANELL-P	Paul Panell	SRC Resident	August 7, 2023 (x2)
PARKER-R	Ruth Parker	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x6)
PEARSONHALL-M	Marcia Pearson Hall	SRC Resident	August 7, 2023
PELTA-E&D	Edmond R. Pelta and	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Commenter Code	Name of Commenter	Commenter Type	Date Comment(s) Received
	Darlene [surname illegible]		
PELTA-E	Edmond R. Pelta	SRC Resident	August 10, 2023 August 21, 2023 (x5)
PERATA-D	Don Perata	SRC Resident	July 30, 2023
PERATA-U	Ulrike Perata	SRC Resident	July 30, 2023 August 4, 2023
PERATA-U&D	Ulrike & Don Perata	SRC Resident	August 7, 2023 August 21, 2023
PFEIFFER-P	Patricia Ann Pfeiffer	SRC Resident	August 7, 2023
PRICE-J	John Price	SRC resident	August 21, 2023
PRICE-R	Rosalie Price	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023
RAMOS-J	Jon Ramos	SRC Resident	July 30, 2023
RAVIKUMAR-R	Ravi Ravikumar	City Resident (adjacent neighbor)	August 21, 2023
REDIG-J	Jeanne S. Redig	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x2)
ROSIER-M	Mary Ann Rosier	SRC Resident	August 7, 2023 (x3) August 21, 2023 (x9)
SAYRE-L	Lynda Sayre	SRC Resident	August 7, 2023
SCHMIDEK-D	Don Schmidek	SRC Resident	July 15, 2023 August 1, 2023 (x4) August 2, 2023 August 4, 2023 August 11, 2023 (x3) August 12, 2023 August 14, 2023 August 16, 2023 August 20, 2023 (x3) August 22, 2023
SCHMIDEK-J&V	Jan & Virginia Schmidek	SRC Residents	August 21, 2023 (x4)
SHEW-R	Ruby Shew	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x4)
SILBERMAN-N	Nathan Silberman	SRC Resident	August 19, 2023 (4) August 20, 2023 (3)
SNOWBRIDGE-S	Sandra Snowbridge	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023
SORENSEN-D	Donna Sorenson	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x6)
STRATMAN-J&T	Judy & Terry Stratman	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023
STRATMAN-T	J. Terry Stratman	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x6)

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Commenter Code	Name of Commenter	Commenter Type	Date Comment(s) Received
TALTY-C	Carol Talty	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x16)
TIERNAN-F	Frank Tiernan	SRC Resident	August 10, 2023 August 21, 2023
UMBACH-L	Linda L. Umbach	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x4)
VANDERSTEEN-R	Robina Vandersteen	SRC Resident	August 6, 2023
WAGGONER-J	Judy Waggoner	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023
WALLACE-B	Beverly Wallace	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x3)
WEILER-H&F	Hans & Frauke Weiler	SRC Residents	August 15, 2023 August 21, 2023
WESSLING-A	Alice Wessling	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023 (x5)
WHIPPLE-C	Carolyn Whipple	SRC Resident	August 9, 2023
WHITBY-STREVENS	Pat & Colin Whitby- Strevens	SRC Resident	August 21, 2023
ZAVOSHY-J&Y	John & Yvonne Zavoshy	SRC Residents	August 5, 2023

Notes:

City = City of Saratoga

SRC = Saratoga Retirement Community

Table 2-B List of Verbal Comments Received at the Public Meeting

Code	Name of Commenter	Affiliation (if provided)	Comment Date
SPEAKER-3	Tsing BARDIN	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-7	Marilyn BASHAM	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-10	Robert BERGLUND	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-5	CK CHAN	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-4	Marian CHAN	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-12	Chuck CUMMINS	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-15	Dick DUBRIDGE	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-14	Pat DUBRIDGE	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-1	Michael GRIFFIN	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-2	Jill HUNTER	City Resident	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-16	Nitin JAIN	City Resident (adjacent neighbor)	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-8	Barry Lamé	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-9	Marilyn MANIES	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-6	Pat McGUIRE	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-13	Don SCHMIDEK	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-17	Frank TIERNAN	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023
SPEAKER-11	Tony VANDERSTEEN	SRC Resident	August 2, 2023

Notes:

City = City of Saratoga

SRC = Saratoga Retirement Community

3 Responses to Comments Received on the Draft EIR

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, this document includes written responses to all comments received by the City on the Draft EIR during the public review period. See Section 2 of this document for a full list of all commenters, and Appendix A for full copies of all written comments received and a transcript of verbal comments presented at the public meeting.

To the extent that the comments received relate to significant environmental issues, they are addressed in the response to comments. Section 3.1 presents a series of “master responses” to key topics that were raised by multiple commenters. Section 3.2 presents responses to “form letters” (i.e., letters for which identical [or near identical] copies of the same letter were received by multiple commenters). Section 3.3 presents the responses to written comments received from the project applicant, public agencies, and organizations, and Section 3.4 presents the responses to written comments received from individuals. Section 3.5 presents responses to verbal comments that were presented at the public meeting.

Where changes to the Draft EIR are made in response to a comment, the response to the particular comment states this and explains which section of the Draft EIR has been modified. All text changes to the Draft EIR are presented in Section 4, “Revisions to the Draft EIR,” of this Final EIR.

3.1 Master Responses

3.1.1 MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed general opposition to parts (such as the Meeting Room addition and/or Building A) or to all of the proposed campus expansion and/or requested that the City decline to approve the project.

Master Response

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that a lead agency respond to comments that raise significant environmental issues. Comments concerning general support or opposition to the project do not raise significant environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR.

No edits to the Draft EIR or additional response are required for these comments. To the extent that commenters raised specific environmental concerns regarding the project in support of their opposition, such comments are addressed within the responses to individual comments.

3.1.2 MASTER-2: Support for No Project Alternative

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed support for the No Project Alternative, and/or which requested that the City approve the No Project Alternative (or deny the Proposed Project).

Master Response

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that a lead agency respond to comments that raise significant environmental issues. Comments regarding general support or opposition to an alternative do not raise significant environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR.

No edits to the Draft EIR or additional response are required for these comments.

3.1.3 MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1)

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed support for the Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1), and/or which requested that the City approve the Residents' Alternative instead of the Proposed Project. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- that the Residents' Alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable impact to the historic Manor Building
- that the Residents' Alternative would have less construction impacts than the Proposed Project (and/or other alternatives), including construction traffic, construction noise and vibration, air quality.
- that the Residents' Alternative would have less impact to trees, open space and recreational areas than the Proposed Project (and/or other alternatives).
- that the Residents' Alternative would avoid establishing construction zones within the busiest parts of the campus.
- that the Residents' Alternative plan is the only alternative which addresses how to take care of the Health Center patients during construction or addresses the emergency evacuation access for the Health Center patients, because of the proximity of the new Skilled Nursing facility.

Master Response

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that a lead agency respond to comments that raise significant environmental issues. Comments regarding general support or opposition to an alternative do not raise significant environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR.

As to comments stating that Alternative 1 (the Residents' Alternative) would reduce impacts, Section 4.4.3 of the Draft EIR contains the analysis of potential environmental

impacts from Alternative 1 and acknowledges that this alternative would avoid the Proposed Project's significant and unavoidable impact to cultural resources and would also reduce several construction-related impacts, compared to the Proposed Project. The Draft EIR also describes that Alternative 1 would result in less tree removal than the Proposed Project and would avoid all impacts associated with the Proposed Project's construction of the Meeting Room and Building A. A comparison of the impacts of the Proposed Project to all alternatives is contained in Section 4.7 of the Draft EIR.

No edits to the Draft EIR or additional response are required for these comments.

See also response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative and response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

3.1.4 MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1)

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern that the details of Alternative 1 (the Residents' Alternative) as analyzed in the Draft EIR did not match the details submitted by Preserve SRC Campus (Preserve SRC) during the EIR Scoping Period, and as such, that the analysis of potential environmental impacts of Alternative 1 was not accurate.

Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- That Building D as described by the Preserve SRC submission would have the following differences compared to the version of Building D described and analyzed in the Draft EIR as part of Alternative 1 (the Residents' Alternative):
 - The footprint would be smaller, identical to that of the existing Health Center, and therefore would not extend as close to the steep grade and riparian area as the footprint analyzed in the Draft EIR and would not require any additional tree removal.
 - The building height would be one story shorter and would not exceed the height of any treetops.
 - The underground parking garage and associated excavation volume would be smaller than that analyzed in the Draft EIR.
 - The maximum depth of excavation would be shallower than that analyzed in the Draft EIR.
 - The size of the meeting room would be bigger than that analyzed in the Draft EIR.
- That Building C as described by the Preserve SRC submission would be shorter in length compared to the version of Building C described and analyzed in the Draft EIR as part of Alternative 1 (the Residents' Alternative), such that:
 - Realignment of Colfax Lane and Manor Circle would not be required; and

- Removal of the existing redwood and oak trees at the corner of Colfax and Manor Drive would not be required.
- That the Draft EIR incorrectly calculated the number of parking spaces for Building C and/or Building D.
- That the alternative site plan as described by the Preserve SRC submission would have less construction-related impacts (noise, vibration, traffic) than the Draft EIR concluded for Alternative 1 (the Residents' Alternative).
- That the Draft EIR should be revised to evaluate the alternative site plan proposed by Preserve SRC.

Master Response

As described in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIR, CEQA requires that an EIR describe and evaluate a “reasonable range” of alternatives to the proposed Project. The “range of alternatives” is governed by the “rule of reason,” which requires the EIR to describe and consider only those alternatives necessary to permit informed public participation, and an informed and reasoned choice by the decision-making body (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), (f)). The range of alternatives must include alternatives that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project and could avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)-(c)).

It is typical practice for the EIR authors, in conjunction with the Lead Agency, to develop a range of alternatives to the proposed project for consideration and analysis within the EIR. This typically occurs after the initial analysis of environmental impacts of the proposed project, with minimal or no input from the general public until the Draft EIR public review period.

In the case of this project, an alternative development plan was submitted by a group of existing SRC residents (Preserve SRC) during the Draft EIR scoping period (i.e., prior to development of the Draft EIR). Therefore, one of the alternatives considered within the Draft EIR was based upon the general concept submitted by Preserve SRC. Because certain key details (e.g., detailed floor plan and construction estimates) necessary in order to analyze potential environmental impacts in a meaningful way were not provided with the Preserve SRC submission, and due to the need for any alternatives included in the EIR to be potentially feasible, Alternative 1 (the Residents' Alternative) was formulated using the Preserve SRC plan as a base, while also proposing how the new independent living units might feasibly be designed to fit in the location of the existing Healthcare Center. Information from both the Preserve SRC submission and from the supplementary information provided by the project applicant were used to develop Alternative 1 as described and analyzed in the Draft EIR.

Within the remainder of this master response, the alternative described and analyzed in Section 4.4 of the Draft EIR is referred to as “the Draft EIR’s Alternative 1” whereas the alternative development plan as submitted by Preserve SRC is referred to as “the Preserve SRC submission”.

The differences between the Preserve SRC submission and the Draft EIR’s Alternative 1 are detailed in Table 3-A below.

Table 3-A Comparison between the Draft EIR’s Alternative 1 and Preserve SRC’s Submission.

Feature	Draft EIR’s Alternative 1	Preserve SRC Submission
Building D	52 independent living units.	52 independent living units.
	3,700 SF auditorium.	3,000 SF auditorium.
	Approx 30,000 SF footprint (different shape to existing Health Center, but same location).	Approx 40,000 SF footprint (identical to existing Health Center).
	Approx. 90,000 SF finished floor area plus 50,000 SF parking area.	Approx. 80,000 SF finished floor area plus 40,000 SF parking area.
	3 stories (approx. 40 to 51 feet above existing grade) with 1 level underground parking (119 spaces).	2 stories (approx. 28 feet above grade) with 1 level underground parking (90 spaces).
Building C	40 skilled nursing units and associated amenities.	40 skilled nursing units and associated amenities.
	Approx. 18,500 SF footprint.	Approx. 16,000 SF footprint.
	Approx. 41,700 SF finished floor area plus 26,000 SF parking area.	Approx. 29,300 SF finished floor area plus 33,000 SF parking area.
	2 stories (approx. 28 ft above grade) with 2 levels of underground parking (77 spaces).	2 stories (approx. 28 ft above grade) with 2 levels of underground parking (67 spaces).
Other Site Improvements	Fitness Center, identical to Proposed Project.	Identical to Proposed Project and Alternative 1.
	Manor Building internal improvements, identical to Proposed Project.	Identical to Proposed Project and Alternative 1.
	Secondary emergency access, identical to Proposed Project.	Identical to Proposed Project and Alternative 1.
	Demolition of Health Center.	Identical to Alternative 1.
	Realignment of Colfax Lane intersection with Odd Fellows Drive.	Very similar to Alternative 1. Although the reduced length of Building C may allow the intersection to be slightly further east than Alternative 1, it would still be further west than existing conditions.

Feature	Draft EIR's Alternative 1	Preserve SRC Submission
Construction Phases	1. Building C (28 months) 2. Patient Transfer (1 month) 3. Demolition (2 months) 4. Building D & other improvements (26 months)	1. Building C (30 months) 2. Patient Transfer (1 month) 3. Demolition (2 months) 4. Building D & other improvements (30 months)
Construction Equipment, Workers, and Excavation Volumes	See Tables 4.4-1 and 4.4-2 of Draft EIR.	Details not provided in PRC Submission. Assumed to be similar or slightly less than described for Alternative 1 due to minor differences in building and/or parking garage size as described above.

- Notes:
- Draft EIR = Draft Environmental Impact Report
 - ft = feet
 - PRC = Public Resources Code
 - Proposed Project = Saratoga Retirement Community Campus Expansion
 - SF = square feet
 - SRC = Saratoga Retirement Community

There is no requirement under CEQA that the alternatives considered and evaluated within the EIR be limited to those suggested during the public scoping period nor that an alternative suggested during the scoping period be included for analysis in the Draft EIR with exactly the same details as proposed in the scoping comment. Rather, the range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice (Section 15126.6(f) of the CEQA Guidelines).

Nevertheless, even if Buildings C and D were to exactly match those proposed in the Preserve SRC submission, the conclusions in Section 4.4 of the Draft EIR with respect to this alternative would remain unchanged, as briefly discussed below for several key environmental topics.

- **Aesthetics (AES):** although the 2-story Building D from the Preserve SRC submission would not be as tall as the 3-story Building D described for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1, there would still be no impact to scenic vistas, scenic resources and scenic quality (Impacts AES-1 through AES-2), and the impact from light and glare (Impact AES-4) would continue to be less than significant, for the same reasons described in Section 4.4.3 of the Draft EIR.
- **Air Quality (AIR):** the Preserve SRC submission would require construction of approximately 15 percent less finished floor area (approximately 110,000 square feet (SF) for Buildings C and D combined, compared to approximately 132,000 SF for all buildings under the Draft EIR's Alternative 1), and approximately 4 percent less underground parking space (approximately 73,000 SF for Buildings C and D of the Preserve SRC submission, compared to approximately 76,000 SF for all buildings under the Draft EIR's Alternative 1). As such, a slight reduction in

the number of construction worker commute trips and haul trips for building materials and soil export would be expected, resulting in a slight reduction in construction-related emissions for the Preserve SRC submission compared to that described for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1. However, the impact from criteria pollutants (Impact AIR-2) would still be less than significant with mitigation due to the need to follow BAAQMD's basic construction methods (mitigation measure [MM]-AIR-2). Furthermore, the Preserve SRC submission would still require demolition of the existing Health Center and construction of a new building in its place, which is closer to the sensitive receptors at Fellowship Plaza than the proposed project's construction zones, and would still require an updated health risk assessment (MM-AIR-3-ALT1) and use of clean construction equipment (MM-AIR-3) in order reduce potential impacts to nearby sensitive receptors to less than significant with mitigation (Impact AIR-3).

- **Biological Resources (BIO):** Even if the finished footprint of the new Building D were identical to the existing footprint of the Health Center as proposed by the Preserve SRC submission, additional temporary disturbance outside of the permanent building footprint would be required to facilitate demolition of the existing building and construction of the new building, as described for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1. This may still require ground disturbance, excavation or placement of fill, and/or potential removal of trees within the riparian corridor associated with the unnamed tributary to Vasona Creek on the eastern boundary of the campus. Mitigation measures MM-BIO-1, MM-BIO-1-ALT1, MM-BIO-2-ALT1, MM-BIO-3-ALT1, and MM-BIO-4 would still be required to reduce potential impacts to nesting birds and other special status species (Impact BIO-1), riparian habitats (Impact BIO-2), state or federally protected wetlands (Impact BIO-3), and roosting bats (Impact BIO-4) to less than significant with mitigation. Similarly, the existing Health Center could not be demolished, and a new building constructed in its place, without removing the trees within the landscaped areas between the wings of the building, and possibly some of the existing trees within the riparian corridor. Although the number of protected trees requiring removal might be slightly lower for the Preserve SRC submission compared to the Draft EIR's Alternative 1, any removal of trees that are protected by the City's Tree Ordinance would require preparation of an arborist report that would be reviewed by the City arborist to ensure that trees proposed for removal meet the City's criteria for removal and that appropriate conditions (including replanting and protection of retained trees) are imposed. Therefore, the overall impact in relation to local policy conflicts (Impact BIO-5) would continue to be less than significant.
- **Cultural Resources (CUL):** The differences between the Draft EIR's Alternative 1 and the Preserve SRC submission would not change the conclusion of a less-than-significant impact to built historical resources (Impact CUL-1). With respect to buried archaeological resources, even if the finished footprint of the new Building D were to match exactly with the existing footprint of the Health Center (as proposed by the Preserve SRC submission), additional temporary disturbance outside of the permanent building footprint would be required to facilitate demolition of the existing building and construction of the new building, and additional depth of disturbance would be required to construct a level of underground parking, similar to that analyzed for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1. Mitigation measure MM-CUL-2 would still be required to reduce impacts to

archaeological resources to less than significant with mitigation (Impact CUL-2). Similarly, the potential for uncovering human remains would still be present, and compliance with applicable state laws would mean that impacts to human remains would continue to be less than significant.

- **Energy (ENE):** The differences between the Draft EIR's Alternative 1 and the Preserve SRC submission would not change the conclusion of a less-than-significant impact in relation to energy consumption or conflicts with energy-related plans. Whilst energy use during construction and operation would be slightly less under the Preserve SRC submission, due to the approximately 15 percent less finished floor area and 4 percent less underground parking space, total energy use would still not be considered wasteful or inefficient, nor would it conflict with applicable energy policies or plans, for the same reasons as described for the and the Draft EIR's Alternative 1 in Section 4.4.3 of the Draft EIR.
- **Geology (GEO):** Even if the finished footprint of the new Building D were to match exactly with the existing footprint of the Health Center (as proposed by the Preserve SRC submission), the building would be an additional story compared to existing and would require deeper foundations to accommodate the underground parking garage. Mitigation measure MM-GEO-1-ALT1 would still be required to investigate site-specific conditions and make project-specific recommendations regarding foundation design to reduce potential impacts from seismic hazards (Impact GEO-1) and unstable soils (Impact GEO-3) to less than significant with mitigation. Similar to the discussion for cultural resources, additional temporary disturbance outside the permanent building footprint and additional depth of excavation compared to the existing building foundation would also require mitigation measure MM-GEO-6 to reduce impacts to paleontological resources (Impact GEO-6) to less than significant with mitigation.
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG):** The differences between the Draft EIR's Alternative 1 and the Preserve SRC submission would not change the conclusion of a less than significant with mitigation impact in relation to GHG emissions or conflicts with GHG-related plans. Neither the Preserve SRC submission nor the Draft EIR's Alternative 1 included the require number of off-street electric vehicle spaces to meet California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) Tier 2 standards; therefore, mitigation measure MM-GHG-1a would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant with mitigation, when evaluated against BAAQMD-recommended design features. Any potential reduction in construction or operational GHG emissions due to the smaller size of Building C proposed in the Preserve SRC submission would be offset by a corresponding increase in emissions due to the increased size of Building D such that the overall GHG emissions would be similar and the service population of both scenarios would be identical. As such, MM-GHG-1b would still be recommended to meet the 2030 GHG efficiency threshold described in Section 3.8.3.
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials (HAZ):** The differences between the Draft EIR's Alternative 1 and the Preserve SRC submission would not change the conclusion of a less-than-significant impact in relation to Impacts HAZ-1 through HAZ-4, as none of these impacts are dependent on the exact layout or size of buildings. Although there could be less construction worker commute trips and

material delivery trips during construction, due to approximately 15 percent less finished floor area being constructed under the Preserve SRC submission compared to the Draft EIR's Alternative 1, and a slight reduction in soil export haul trips due to approximately 4 percent less excavation for parking; mitigation measure MM-TRA-3a would still be required to reduce potential impacts relating to construction-related interference with emergency plans (Impact HAZ-5) to less than significant with mitigation.

- **Hydrology and Water Quality (HYD):** The differences between the Draft EIR's Alternative 1 and the Preserve SRC submission would not change the conclusion of a less-than-significant impact in relation to hydrology and water quality. As previously described, even if the permanent footprint of Building D were exactly the same as the existing Health Center (as proposed by the Preserve SRC submission), temporary disturbance within the riparian corridor immediately adjacent to the existing building would be required. Such disturbance would have a very similar impact to water quality and hydrology as that described for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1, which was determined to be less than significant.
- **Land Use and Planning (LUP):** The differences between the Draft EIR's Alternative 1 and the Preserve SRC submission would not change the conclusion of a less-than-significant impact in relation to conflicts with land use plans, policies, or regulations, and no impact from physical division of an established community.
- **Noise (NOI):** The differences between the Draft EIR's Alternative 1 and the Preserve SRC submission would not substantially change the analysis of construction noise or vibration nor the conclusion that these impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. Noise from demolition of the existing Health Center would be identical for both the Draft EIR's Alternative 1 and the Preserve SRC submission, and noise from construction of Buildings C and D of the Preserve SRC submission would be very similar to those described for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1 in Table 4.4-7 of the Draft EIR. Minor differences in the exact footprint and/or size of the buildings would not be anticipated to result in substantial changes to the predicted construction noise levels, as the noise levels were calculated based on the distance from the acoustic center of the construction site to the nearest receptors. The duration of construction-related traffic noise might be slightly less under the Preserve SRC submission, due to the slightly lower volume of excavated soil requiring offsite disposal compared to the Draft EIR's Alternative 1, however the proposed mitigation measures MM-NOI-1a would still be required to mitigate construction noise levels to less than significant with mitigation. Similarly, vibration levels from demolition of the existing Health Center would be identical, and from construction of Buildings C and D would be very similar, to those described in Table 4.4-8, as the distance between vibration activities and sensitive receptors would be the same or very similar. Mitigation measures MM-NOI-1a and MM-NOI-2 would still be required to reduce vibration impacts to less than significant with mitigation.

Operational noise from heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment on the roof of Building D would be slightly different under the Preserve SRC scenario than predicted for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1 in Figure 4.4.3 of the Draft EIR, due to the lower height of the building and the reduced distance

from the building to the adjacent property boundary to the east. Mitigation measure MM-NOI-1b would still be required to reduce noise levels on adjacent property to less than the 40 dBA threshold.

- **Population and Housing (POP), Public Services, Recreation (REC), and Utility/Service Systems (UTI):** These impacts are generally influenced by the number of people to be served by the proposed development, rather than the exact design and footprint of the proposed buildings, therefore the analysis provided in Section 4.4 for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1, and the overall conclusion of no impact or less-than-significant impact for these topics, would be the same as for the Preserve SRC submission.
- **Transportation (TRA):** Construction traffic generated under the Preserve SRC submission could be slightly less than that described for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1. Construction worker trips and material delivery trips could be less for the Preserve SRC submission than for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1, due to the approximately 15 percent less finished floor area being constructed under the Preserve SRC scenario. Similarly, the number of soil export trips could be slightly less for the Preserve SRC submission than that described for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1, due to approximately 4 percent less underground parking space requiring excavation. The demolition of the existing Health Center would generate the same amount of demolition debris for offhaul from the site and a similar volume of excess soil under both the Preserve SRC submission and the Draft EIR's Alternative 1. Therefore, the impacts of the Preserve SRC submission from construction traffic would be slightly less than that described for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1. However, mitigation measure MM-TRA-3a, requiring a Construction Traffic Control Plan, would still be needed to reduce the potential for construction traffic from the Preserve SRC submission to cause traffic safety hazards or interfere with emergency access. Therefore, the construction traffic impacts of the Preserve SRC submission would be less than significant with mitigation, as described for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1.

Operational traffic generated under the Preserve SRC submission would be identical to that described for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1, as the number of residents and employees on site would be identical. Mitigation measure MM-TRA-3b-ALT1, requiring an updated traffic study, would still be required, because even if the footprint of Building D were to match exactly with the existing Health Center (as proposed by the Preserve SRC submission), a new parking garage entrance would still be required on McLaren Drive similar to that described for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1. The operational traffic impacts of the Preserve SRC submission would therefore be less than significant with mitigation, as described for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1.

- **Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR):** As previously described, even if the permanent footprint of Building D were the same as the existing Health Center (as proposed by the Preserve SRC submission), temporary disturbance immediately adjacent to the existing building and at depths exceeding the existing foundation depths would be required to facilitate demolition and construction, similar to that described and analyzed for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1. The inadvertent discovery protocols described in mitigation measure MM-CUL-

2 would still be required to reduce impacts to tribal cultural resources to less than significant with mitigation (Impact TCR-1).

- **Wildfire (WF):** The minor differences between the Draft EIR's Alternative 1 and the Preserve SRC submission would not change the conclusion of a less-than-significant impact in relation to Impacts WF-1, WF-2 and WF-3, as none of these impacts are dependent on the exact layout or size of Building D. Although there could potentially be less construction-related trips associated with the Preserve SRC submission due to a smaller finished floor area and parking space being constructed, mitigation measure MM-TRA-3a would still be required to reduce potential impacts relating to construction traffic interfering with emergency plans (Impact WF-4) to less than significant with mitigation.

For all of the reasons described above, the alternative site plan described in the Preserve SRC submission would have very similar environmental impacts as described for the Draft EIR's Alternative 1 in Section 4.4.3 of the Draft EIR, and the overall significance conclusions for each impact would be the same between the two scenarios. The Preserve SRC submission would not avoid any additional significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project than the Draft EIR's Alternative 1, and would not substantially lessen the severity of any significant environmental impacts.

3.1.5 MASTER-5: Appropriateness of Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative 2)

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern that the EIR authors created and analyzed an additional alternative (Alternative 2, the Reduced Development Alternative), rather than only analyzing the alternative submitted by Preserve SRC during the public scoping period (Alternative 1, the Residents' Alternative) and the alternative developed by the project applicant (Alternative 3, Applicant's Alternative).

Response to Master Comment

As described in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIR, CEQA requires that an EIR describe and evaluate a "reasonable range" of alternatives to the proposed Project. The "range of alternatives" is governed by the "rule of reason," which requires the EIR to describe and consider only those alternatives necessary to permit informed public participation, and an informed and reasoned choice by the decision-making body (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), (f)). The range of alternatives must include alternatives that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project and could avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)-(c)).

It is typical practice for the EIR authors, in conjunction with the Lead Agency, to develop a range of alternatives to the proposed project for consideration and analysis within the EIR. This typically occurs after the initial analysis of environmental impacts of the proposed project, with minimal or no input from the general public until the Draft EIR is released for public review.

There is no requirement under CEQA that the alternatives considered and evaluated within the EIR be limited to those suggested during the public scoping period or developed by the project applicant, or that additional alternatives should not be analyzed.

No edits to the Draft EIR are required for these comments.

3.1.6 MASTER-6: Support for Applicant's Alternative (Alternative 3)

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed support for the Applicant's Alternative, and/or which requested that the City approve the Applicant's Alternative instead of the Proposed Project. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- that the Applicant's Alternative would meet consumer demand for 2-bedroom Independent Living units and maintain the current ratio of 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom units.
- that the Applicant's Alternative would reduce the significant historical impact, meet the project objectives, is feasible, and should be deemed the environmentally superior alternative.

Master Response

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that a lead agency respond to comments that raise significant environmental issues. Comments regarding general support or opposition to an alternative do not raise significant environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR.

Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR contains the analysis of potential environmental impacts from Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative) and acknowledges that this alternative would avoid the Proposed Project's significant and unavoidable impact to cultural resources and that all other impacts would be less than significant with mitigation, less than significant, or no impact. A comparison of the impacts of the Proposed Project to all alternatives is contained in Section 4.7 of the Draft EIR.

No edits to the Draft EIR or additional response are required for these comments.

See also response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.

3.1.7 MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern as to the methodology for selecting the environmentally superior alternative and/or disagreement with the Draft EIR conclusion that Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative) was the next environmentally superior alternative after the no project alternative.

Master Response

As described in Section 4.7 of the Draft EIR, CEQA requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative be selected from those analyzed in the EIR, and that the reasons for such selection be disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would generate the fewest or least severe adverse impacts.

Table 4.7-1 of the Draft EIR sets out the significance conclusion for each impact for the Proposed Project, No Project Alternative, Alternative 1 (Residents’ Alternative), Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative), and Alternative 3 (Applicant’s Alternative). The significance conclusions shown in the table are based on the analysis of proposed impacts in Section 3 (for Proposed Project) and Sections 4.3 through 4.6 (for each alternative) of the Draft EIR. Section 4.7 of the Draft EIR also identifies the environmentally superior alternative and describes the reasons for that selection. Additional information regarding the selection process is provided below, for additional context.

The number of significant or potentially significant impacts of the Proposed Project that would be avoided or substantially reduced by each of the alternatives is identified at the bottom of Table 4.7-1 of the Draft EIR, along with the number of impacts that would have an increased level of significance under an alternative compared to the Proposed Project. The environmentally superior alternative was selected as being the alternative that avoided or reduced the greatest number of environmental impacts and introduced the fewest number of additional or increased environmental impacts.

As described in Section 4.7 of the Draft EIR, the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, as it would avoid 47 of the Proposed Project’s environmental impacts and introduce no new or increased impacts. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires that another alternative be identified if the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative. As can be seen in Table 4.7-1, all three of the other alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2 and 3) would avoid the significant and unavoidable impact to the historic Manor Building (Impact CUL-1) and are therefore superior to the Proposed Project.

Alternative 1 (Residents’ Alternative) would reduce Impact CUL-1 to a less-than-significant level but would introduce four additional potentially significant impacts (impacts BIO-2, BIO-3, GEO-1 and GEO-3), requiring additional mitigation not required for the Proposed Project.

Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative) would reduce Impact CUL-1 to a level of less than significant with mitigation and would not introduce any new significant or potentially significant impacts than the Proposed Project, nor raise the significance level of any impacts.

Alternative 3 (Applicant’s Alternative) would also reduce Impact CUL-1 to a level of less than significant with mitigation and would not introduce any new significant or potentially significant impacts than the Proposed Project, nor raise the significance level of any impacts.

Alternatives 2 and 3 would have very similar levels of environmental impacts to each other, and both are substantially superior to the proposed project (i.e., both would decrease the significance level of one environmental impact and would not increase the significance level of any other environmental impacts). The Draft EIR identified

Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative) as slightly superior to Alternative 3 because Alternative 3 would slightly increase the intensity of several impacts compared to the Proposed Project due to the larger construction footprint and extended construction duration, even though the significance level for those impacts would be the same as for Alternative 2.

No edits to the Draft EIR are required for these comments.

3.1.8 MASTER-8: Residents Not Informed of Project

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern that SRC management did not provide adequate information to recent residents before they moved into the facility and committed substantial financial and emotional investment and/or that existing residents have invested considerable money to live at SRC that would not be refunded if they move out due to the construction disruption.

Master Response

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that a lead agency respond to comments that raise significant environmental issues. Comments on the information (or lack thereof) provided to SRC residents by SRC management, or to financial implications for SRC residents if they were to move out due to the Project, do not raise significant environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR. The City followed public notification and noticing for the Proposed Project as required by CEQA, as described in Section 1.2 of the Draft EIR and Section 1.1 of this Final EIR, above.

No edits to the Draft EIR or additional response are required for these comments.

3.1.9 MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed doubts regarding the financial need for the project and/or the ability of the project to meet the applicant's financial objectives. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- Concern that financial objectives should not be included within the EIR.
- Request for provision of additional supporting information if analysis of financial impacts is included in the EIR.
- Doubts that the proposed project is required to ensure the viability of SRC.

Master Response

With respect to those comments questioning the appropriateness of including the applicant's financial objectives for the project within the list of project objectives in Sections 2.2 and 4.1.1 of the Draft EIR, CEQA Section 15123(b) requires that an EIR include a statement of objectives sought by the proposed project. The intent of the

objectives is to help the lead agency develop a reasonable range of alternatives to evaluate in the EIR, and to aid the decision makers in preparing findings or a statement of overriding considerations, if necessary. The statement of objectives should include the underlying purpose of the project and may discuss the project benefits.

The objectives for the project, including Objective #3 relating to the generation of additional income stream to help offset the cost of upgrading the existing Health Center and maintaining a strong financial position, were provided to the City by the applicant and were included in the Draft EIR as required by the CEQA Guidelines. Although the project objectives were used to help define the “reasonable range of alternatives” analyzed in Section 4 of the Draft EIR, and a brief assessment was provided in Sections 4.3.2, 4.4.2 and 4.5.2 as to the ability of each alternative to achieve the applicant’s objectives, the objectives had no bearing on the analysis of potential environmental impacts that might result from either the project or any of the alternatives.

Furthermore, CEQA requires an EIR to evaluate the environmental impacts of a project and does not require an EIR to analyze the economic merits of a project. No edits to the Draft EIR or additional response are required for these comments.

3.1.10 MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building

Summary of Concerns

Several of the comments received expressed concerns regarding the proposed attachment of the Meeting Room addition to the western wall of the Manor Building. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- Concern that the addition would permanently destroy the original symmetry of the Manor Building, detract from the Manor’s classic beauty, ruin the aspect of a beautiful building, intrude on the Manor’s setting, and/or would reduce or obscure views of the Manor.
- Requests that the Meeting Room be studied in more detail and/or that a specific evaluation under impact CUL-1 and Secretary of the Interior criterion #9 be undertaken.
- Concern that even if the new Meeting Room were to be sensitively designed to complement the Manor, it will diminish the visual impact of that grand structure and destroy the style of the classical building, which is defined by symmetry.
- Statements that the Manor Building is on the Heritage Resources Inventory of City and that the project must comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of the Historic Properties (in particular Standards 1, 2 and 9).

Master Response

Impact CUL-1 in Section 3.5.3 of the Draft EIR addresses potential impacts of the addition of the Meeting Room to the Manor Building. The character-defining features of the Manor House and its setting that qualify it as a historical resource are identified on page 3-87 of the Draft EIR.

As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(3): Generally, a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer, shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historical resource. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards) as set forth in 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 67.7 may be used to determine if a project will have a significant impact on a historical resource under CEQA. The intent of the Standards is to assist the long-term preservation of a property's significance through the preservation of historic materials and features, including buildings, additions, and related landscape features.

An analysis of the proposed project against the Standards is summarized in Table 3.5-1 of the Draft EIR and detailed in the text following the table (pages 3-94 through 3-102). The analysis specifically addresses the potential impacts of the addition of the Meeting Room to the Manor Building, and concludes that the introduction of the Meeting Room will not alter the historic purpose or use of the Manor Building, nor will it destroy any of the character-defining features of the Manor Building, its site, or its environment; therefore, there is no conflict between the Meeting Room addition and the Manor Building under Standard 1 (page 3-94 of the Draft EIR). Under Standard 2, the analysis addresses the preservation of the historic character of the Manor Building, concluding that the removal and/or alteration of a small quantity of representative character-defining features in the west (secondary) elevation, including stucco siding, arched windows, and one-over-one sash windows, would not substantially diminish the character of the Manor Building. The Draft EIR also states that the Meeting Room Addition would alter the original T-shaped plan of the Manor Building, which is a character-defining feature, and create an asymmetrical design of the Manor Building footprint, but that the majority of character-defining features of the Manor Building and its setting would remain, including all of its Mission Revival-style architectural features. Therefore, the Meeting Room Addition would not result in a conflict under Standard 2 (pages 3-94 through 3-95 of the Draft EIR). Under Standard 9, which specifically addresses new additions, the Draft EIR points out that the proposed Meeting Room Addition would be connected to the Manor Building by a narrow hyphen on the west side of the building, sited along a secondary elevation of the Manor Building, and set back from the primary north-facing elevation (pages 3-99 to 100). These elements of the Meeting Room Addition design would differentiate the addition and create a separation from the Manor Building, which would not compromise the symmetrical façade or footprint of the historic building. The analysis found only one potential conflict with the Standards (Standard 9), due to the close proximity of the construction of the Meeting Room addition that could result in damage to the Manor Building from physical impact from construction equipment and vehicles or construction-related vibration (page 3-100 of the Draft EIR), even though the building was seismically upgraded and had stucco replaced as part of the early 2000s remodel. However, as described on page 3-103 of the Draft EIR, implementation of mitigation measure MM-CUL-1a would reduce the potential impacts of the Meeting Room addition construction to less than significant, by implementing a Historical Resource Protection Plan that includes protocols to be followed before, during, and after construction of the Meeting Room Addition to ensure the project is consistent with Standard 9. Furthermore, if the Meeting Room addition were to be removed in the future, the essential form (including the symmetry of the

Manor Building) and integrity of the historic property and its environment would not be impaired (Standard 10).

For all of the reasons above and the additional information and analysis in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR, with implementation of mitigation measures MM-CUL-1a, MM-CUL-1b, and MM-CUL-1c, the proposed Meeting Room addition would not conflict with the SOI Standards and would not “materially alter” or cause a “substantial adverse change” in the significance of a historical resource. None of the comments presented new information that would affect the conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to the impact of the proposed Meeting Room on the historical resource, and no edits to the Draft EIR are required for these comments.

3.1.11 MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park

Summary of Concerns

Several of the comments received expressed concerns regarding the impacts of the Proposed Project (in particular, construction of Building A), on the Odd Fellows Home of California Historical Park. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- That construction of Building A would cover up most of the green space currently designated as Odd Fellows Home of California Historical Park, dedicated with a plaque on the site in August 2008. The proposed meeting room addition to the Saratoga City Heritage landmark Manor building, also a part of the Historical Park, would permanently destroy the architectural symmetry of the beautiful Manor. Together, the new buildings would completely wipe out these important historic resources. The Draft EIR needs to include the cultural and historic impact of the development covering the entire Historical Park.
- That the Odd Fellows Home Historical Park was declared a park over 100 years ago by the Odd Fellows and it still has a 100-year-old sign designating it as the Odd Fellows Historical Park.

Note that comments relating to the loss of trees and/or open space within the Odd Fellows Home Historical Park area are addressed in response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees and MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

Master Response

CEQA Section 15064.5(a) defines the term “historical resource” as a resource listed in or determined eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); or a resource included in a local register or identified as significant in a valid local survey; or a historically significant resource determined eligible by the lead agency.

Appendix D of the Draft EIR contains a “*Supplemental Evaluation to Support CEQA Analysis for Saratoga Retirement Community Expansion*” (AECOM 2021b). This report includes a historical resource evaluation of the property under the CRHR and Saratoga Heritage Resources Inventory criteria to identify historical resources. Based on significant alterations to the landscape during the early 2000s, when the majority of the site was razed, graded, and the 26 modern buildings were constructed, the evaluation found that the portion of the campus historically called McLaren Grove, after famed landscape architect John McLaren who is credited for the original landscape design at

the Odd Fellows Home, was redeveloped in the early 2000s, removing trees and installing a putting green, bocce ball court, and horseshoe pits in an area renamed “Odd Fellows Home Historical Park.” Due to a lack of historical associations, the Odd Fellows Historical Park area does not meet the CEQA definition of a historical resource and is not subject to consideration for potential significant impacts (in relation to historical resources).

None of the comments presented new information that would affect the conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to the identification of historical resources within the project area or the impact of the proposed project on identified historical resources, and no edits to the Draft EIR are required for these comments.

3.1.12 MASTER-12: Impacts of Construction Vibration on the Historic Manor Building

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern regarding vibration levels during construction of the Meeting Room addition and resulting impacts on the adjacent Manor Building (an historic building) and its foundations. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- Concern that vibration from heavy construction equipment and soil compaction from the weight of the new addition on recently excavated ground could cause irreparable damage to the foundation of the Manor Building.
- Concern that the mitigation measures proposed in the Draft EIR would not successfully reduce vibration-related impacts to the Manor Building to a less-than-significant level.

Note that comments relating to vibration impacts in general (i.e., not in relation to the historic Manor Building structure and its foundation) are addressed in response to MASTER-15: Construction Vibration. Comments relation to vibration and other impacts to patients of the existing Health Center during its proposed renovation are addressed in response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

Master Response

Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR addresses potential impacts of the proposed project in relation to noise and vibration, with impact NOI-2 in Section 3.12.3 specifically analyzing the potential impacts from vibration. Table 3.12-10 presents the predicted levels of vibration that would be generated at the Manor Building (and other nearby vibration-sensitive receptors) from the use of heavy equipment at various construction zones associated with the project, and compares the estimated level of maximum vibration generated, to the applicable threshold for building damage. In the case of the Manor Building, the threshold for building damage used was the threshold for a “non-engineered timber and masonry” building (0.2 inches per second [in/sec] peak particle velocity [PPV]). As discussed under the subheading “Standard of Significance” for Impact NOI-2, the thresholds for construction vibration damage are based on guidance from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual. The threshold for “non-engineered timber and masonry” buildings

is considered appropriate for the Manor Building, as it is not considered to be a building “extremely susceptible to vibration damage” (the next lowest threshold) given the particular characteristics of the Manor Building. These characteristics include the building’s concrete foundation, the seismically strengthening work that occurred during renovations in the early 2000s, and because the plaster and stucco surfaces on the building (features that typically are the most susceptible to damage from vibration) were also replaced at that time. The “extremely susceptible to vibration damage” threshold would typically be used for buildings in extreme disrepair or with particularly fragile features.

As described in the Draft EIR, based on the predicted levels of vibration from heavy machinery operating in close proximity to the Manor Building (e.g., from construction of the Meeting Room and Building B), the threshold of 0.2 in/sec PPV would be exceeded, therefore a potentially significant impact was identified and mitigation measures (MM-NOI-1, MM-NOI-2, and MM-CUL-1a) were recommended to reduce potential impacts. The measures in MM-NOI-2 (a) and (b) were specifically recommended to minimize impacts to the Manor Building and include limiting the use of large vibratory equipment within a specified “buffer distance” from the Manor Building by using smaller equipment that generates lower levels of vibration or other alternative construction methods within that buffer distance, to the extent feasible. The buffer distances were calculated using reference values for the various equipment types (taken from guidance manuals prepared by California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the FTA) and adjusted for increasing distances between the source and receptor using standard vibration attenuation rates (based on methodology from the same guidance documents) until the resulting vibration levels were below the threshold of 0.2 in/sec PPV. If use of large vibratory equipment within specified buffer zone could be totally avoided (e.g., by use of smaller equipment or alternative construction methods that generate lower levels of vibration), then the vibration levels at the Manor Building would not exceed the applicable threshold, and the potentially significant impact would be avoided. However, in recognition of the probable need for at least some use of large vibratory equipment within the buffer zone, in order to achieve the necessary compaction levels needed to support the proposed buildings, the Draft EIR concluded that MM-NOI-2 alone were not sufficient to protect the Manor Building from potential damage, therefore Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-1a (the full text of which is presented on pages 3-102 to 3-103 in Section 3.5.3 of the Draft EIR, and summarized below) was also recommended.

The mitigation proposed in MM-CUL-1a requires that a Historical Resource Protection Plan for the Manor Building, including a vibration management and monitoring plan in conjunction with MM-NOI-2, be prepared prior to construction and be implemented for the duration of construction activities. Under the vibration management and monitoring plan, conducted by a qualified structural engineer and monitored by a qualified architectural historian, both optical survey targets and crack monitors will be used to measure whether construction vibration is approaching levels where damage to the historical resource could possibly occur. Construction methods shall be reevaluated if measurements and levels of vibration are found to exceed the levels established in the vibration management and monitoring plan and/or if damage to the historical resource may be possible. The mitigation will reduce the potential for substantial adverse change to the historical resource from vibration damage and will reduce the potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

None of the comments presented new information that would affect the conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to vibration impacts to the Manor Building, and no edits to the Draft EIR are required for these comments.

3.1.13 MASTER-13: Construction Duration

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern as to whether the construction schedule described in the Draft EIR was accurate and/or if construction delays might extend beyond the described schedule, which would mean that the duration of construction-related impacts would also be extended.

Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- Concern based on previous experience with balcony renovations at the campus, that similar issues with delays and construction disruption would occur.
- Requests that the City impose conditions and/or penalties to ensure that the contractor kept on schedule and/or define a process for a review of impacts including mitigation if delays exceed acceptable thresholds.
- Concern that the duration of construction was defined differently in different sections of the EIR, and that the accuracy of the schedule is questionable given the assumption of manpower availability (e.g., that due to the capacity of the worker shuttle, it would take over one hour to shuttle all the workers to the worksite, which would extend the duration of construction by approximately 15 percent or more).
- Statements that a construction duration of up to 7 years was mentioned in a July 2023 meetings with residents and/or that the Independent Order of Odd Fellows (IOOF) organization has committed to residents that they would not construct Building A for 7 years after the approval of the project.

Master Response

Information regarding the estimated duration for construction of the proposed project, including the duration of and approximate start and end dates for each construction phase is presented in Section 2.4.1 of the Draft EIR, and was based on information prepared by the applicant's construction contractor (RCP Construction Inc., 2021; 2022). This section of the Draft EIR acknowledges that the project schedule is dependent on market conditions, regulatory approvals, and other factors and, therefore, is subject to change. Although the anticipated start date of the overall project has been delayed from that described in the Draft EIR (i.e., construction did not commence in July 2023 as originally planned when the project application was submitted to the City in 2021), the overall duration of construction and duration of individual phases are still considered to be generally applicable for the purposes of analyzing potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. CEQA does not require technical perfection in an EIR, but rather adequacy, completeness, and a good-faith effort at full disclosure (CEQA Guidelines Section 15003).

With respect to suggestions that the construction duration would be longer due to the time it would take to shuttle workers to the site from the off-site parking area at West

Valley College, the Draft EIR analysis generally assumed a “worst case” scenario of one 10-passenger shuttle making continuous round trips between the staging area and project site, as this results in a more conservative (i.e., higher) estimate of average daily shuttle trips than if multiple shuttles were to be used at the same time and stay at the project site during the work day, as described in Section 3.16.3 of the Draft EIR (footnote 61 on page 3-278).

With respect to concerns that construction duration was defined inconsistently within the Draft EIR, some commenters appear to have confused the construction duration described for the alternatives as a “change” or “inconsistency” in the construction duration for the proposed project itself. For clarity, the estimated construction duration of the proposed project and each alternative are summarized below, along with the page reference in the Draft EIR where the durations are described:

- Proposed Project: approximately 25 months total (just over 2 years), with construction of all four phases occurring concurrently during 11 of those months (pages 2-33 to 2-34 in Section 2.4.1).
- Alternative 1 (Residents’ Alternative): approximately 58 months total (just under 5 years), with no overlap between phases (page 4-10 in Section 4.4.1).
- Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative): approximately 25 months total (just over 2 years), with construction of all three phases occurring concurrently during 13 of those months (pages 4-78 to 4-79 in Section 4.5.1).
- Alternative 3 (Applicant’s Alternative): approximately 48 months total (4 years), with limited overlap between phases due to staging logistics (page 4-126 in Section 4.6.1).

The estimated construction duration of 25 months for the proposed project was utilized for the analysis for all environmental topics of the proposed project (where relevant) in Section of the Draft EIR, such as for Air Quality (Section 3.3.3, page 3-37), Greenhouse Gas (Section 3.8.3, page 3-158), Noise (Section 3.12.3, page 3-224), and Transportation (535 work days equals 25 months at an average of 21 work days per month, per Section 3.16.3, page 3-278).

With respect to concerns that construction duration may be inaccurate and is likely to be longer than that described in the Draft EIR, it is common in CEQA for analyses of environmental topics to make assumptions about certain project details, in order that the analysis covers the “worst case” scenario with respect to the impact being analyzed.

For example, if the construction duration were longer than that assumed in the Draft EIR, the traffic-related impacts would decrease, as same total number of truck trips for each phase (as presented in Table 3.16-2 on page 3-278) would be spread over a larger number of days. This would result in a longer period of time that construction trucks would be accessing the SRC campus, but fewer truck trips per day than shown in the table, as the same amount of excess soil and construction/demolition debris would need to be removed from the site, and the same amount of clean fill, concrete, and other construction materials would need to be delivered to the site no matter the duration of construction. The average number of construction workers (and associated commute and shuttle trips) per day may also decrease slightly, but could also stay the same or similar, depending on if the prolonged construction was due to fewer workers being

available to do the work or due to unexpected difficulties or delays despite the same number of workers.

Assuming a shorter construction duration is also generally considered conservative for the analysis of construction-related traffic noise in Section 3.12.3 of the Draft EIR, as a shorter duration would generally result in a higher number of truck and worker commute trips per day (on average), which would have a greater effect on traffic noise than if the construction duration were longer with a lower number of truck trips per day on average. Similarly, if the duration of construction were to extend longer than was assumed in the air quality analysis in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR, then the period over which construction-related emissions would occur would also increase; however, the average daily emissions would be lower than those shown in Table 3.3-5 (page 3-38), as the same (or very similar) amount of construction work would be undertaken over a longer period of time, requiring less intensive use of construction equipment and/or less truck trips per day. In addition, the emissions presented in Table 3.3-5 are conservative as they assume a construction start year of 2023. If construction would actually occur in later years than was analyzed in the Draft EIR, construction activities are anticipated to result in lower levels of exhaust-related emissions due to advancements in engine technology, retrofits, and on-road and off-road equipment fleet turnover as stricter regulatory standards take effect, as was described in Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR for Alternative 3 (which had a longer construction period than the proposed project).

Therefore, even if the duration of construction were to extend beyond the estimates provided in Section 2.4.1 of the Draft EIR, the overall conclusions of the Draft EIR would not be expected to result in additional potentially significant impacts or require additional or more stringent mitigation measures. However, to aid in transparency and disclosure, minor edits are proposed to various sections of the Draft EIR (including Section 3.3.3, 3.6.3, 3.8.3, 3.12.3, and 3.16.3) relating to construction-related impacts to explain that if the duration of construction were to extend beyond the estimated durations presented in Section 2.4.1, then the duration of construction-related impacts would also be extended.

These recommended edits to the Draft EIR text are shown in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.

With respect to those comments suggesting potential delays of Building A construction for 7 years, the construction schedule described in the Project Description in Section 2 of the Draft EIR is based on information provided in the applicant's submittal package and subsequent documentation provided to the City. As discussed above, the Draft EIR includes acknowledgement that the construction schedule is subject to change based on various factors. Furthermore, as discussed above, any delay in construction start date for all or portions of the project would be anticipated to result in lower levels of air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, due to decreased emissions from vehicles and equipment from advancements in engine technology, retrofits, and on-road and off-road equipment fleet turnover as stricter regulatory standards take effect.

3.1.14 MASTER-14: Construction Noise

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern regarding the impacts of construction noise to existing SRC residents during construction of the proposed project

and effectiveness of mitigation measures. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- That daytime noise levels throughout the construction period would be a significant impact, not less than significant as identified in the Draft EIR. Especially given that the retired community members are generally at home during the day.
- That the noise assumptions are overly conservative¹ and likely to last much longer than the stated construction schedule.
- Questions as to why the Draft EIR used noise thresholds based on Federal Transit Administration standards for highway construction, rather than more rigorous thresholds that take into consideration the sensitivity of retired occupants living within the construction site.
- Questions as to why the Draft EIR didn't suggest the use of noise measurement devices or sound meters to monitor construction noise.
- Concern that some construction sites use older tractors and vehicles lacking modern sound-deadening features.
- That mitigation measures requiring prior notice of noise-generating activities is not sufficient to reduce impacts and that residents have nowhere else to go during those periods.
- That the Draft EIR did not consider the physical and mental health impacts, particularly for an already vulnerable elderly population, of exposure to elevated noise levels over the construction duration.

Master Response

Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR addresses potential impacts of the proposed project in relation to noise and vibration, with Impact NOI-1 in Section 3.12.3 specifically focused on noise impacts generated by construction and operation of the project. As discussed under the subheading “Standard of Significance” for Impact NOI-1, the threshold of significance for noise impacts is based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (threshold XIII.a), which considers whether the Project would generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Based on the established standards in City’s Ordinance Code applicable to construction activities, a significant construction noise impact would be identified if construction activities would:

- Occur outside the allowable construction hours of 7:30 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday; or
- Cause noise levels exceeding 100 dBA at a distance of 25 feet from the noise source.

With respect to the first threshold (allowable construction hours), as discussed in Section 2.4.1 of the Draft EIR, construction activities associated with the project would

¹ The term “overly conservative” as used in some comments is inferred to mean that the commenter is concerned that assumptions used in the Draft EIR resulted in an underestimation of potential impacts. This is inferred use of the term “conservative” by the commenter is different to the way in which the term is typically used in CEQA documents, where if the assumptions are described as “conservative” then this indicates that the assumptions are the “worst case”, and that the analysis likely overestimates the impact level.

generally occur between 7:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and Saturdays between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. On occasion, construction activities may be undertaken outside of these hours, but would be limited to between 7:30 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays, and would therefore comply with Section 7-30.060 of the City's Code of Ordinances.

With respect to the second threshold (noise exceeding 100 dBA at a distance of 25 feet from the source), as discussed in Section 3.12.3 of the Draft EIR (Table 3.12-4), the combined predicted noise level from construction equipment during the noisiest phases of construction (Phases 1 through 3) would be 92 dBA at a distance of 25 feet from the source, which is below the City's threshold.

Therefore, the proposed project would meet both criteria of the City's Ordinance Code pertaining to construction noise, and therefore would not generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of applicable standards established by the City.

However, as described on page 3-222 of the Draft EIR, because there are sensitive receptors (existing on-site residential units) that would be closer than 25 feet to the construction zones, there is potential for construction noise to cause a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels for sensitive receptors within those closest residential units, even though the Project would technically comply with the City's Code of Ordinance.

For this reason, Draft EIR also looked at an additional threshold to account for the fact that construction would be occurring within 25 feet of sensitive receptors. The FTA "Detailed Analysis" criterion of 80 dBA equivalent continuous noise level (L_{eq})/8-hour exterior noise level at the receptor is considered to be appropriate for this situation because it is the most stringent of the available guidance limit options targeting construction noise exposure. This noise level limit would be experienced as approximately 3 times quieter than the City construction noise level limit (i.e., a 10 dBA reduction is perceived as a halving in noise level and the FTA limit selected for impact assessment is 20 dBA lower than City's).

As described on page 3-228 of the Draft EIR, the proposed mitigation measures would reduce the potentially significant construction noise impacts to below the FTA criterion/threshold of significance, as Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1a requires that the preliminary Construction Noise Management Plan be updated to include a suite of measures to minimize the generation of construction noise, including but not limited to the installation of temporary sound barriers to obstruct the line-of-sight from construction zones to receptors that are predicted to experience construction noise in excess of the threshold or installation of temporary window inserts to increase the attenuation of noise from exterior to interior (item E.ii of MM-NOI-1a). Furthermore, item F.iii of MM-NOI-1a, requires noise monitoring/measurements to verify if the noise barriers are performing as intended. If monitoring indicates that noise levels at receptors exceed the FTA criterion, construction activities generating the exceedance shall be stopped until either construction noise levels can be reduced to within the limits or affected residents can be temporarily relocated. Whilst such relocation, if required, would be disruptive to the affected residents, the temporary, daytime-only nature of the disturbance and relatively small number of residents that might require relocation (if any), would not constitute a significant environmental effect under CEQA. Although providing prior notice to

residents about upcoming noisy activities would not, on its own, reduce the level of noise generated or its effects on nearby residents, as discussed above, it is but one of a suite of measures required to be included in the Construction Noise Management Plan, that together would act to reduce the impacts of construction-generated noise to a less-than-significant level.

Therefore, with implementation of the full suite of measures contained in mitigation measure MM-NOI-1a to reduce, minimize, avoid and/or monitor construction noise levels as received by nearby receptors, the impacts from construction-generated noise would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation, as concluded by the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, minor edits to Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1a are proposed in response to this comment to provide clarification that the Construction Noise Mitigation Plan should be updated by a qualified acoustic consultant and approved by the City prior to implementation, and that specific measures (e.g., design and installation of sound barriers and undertaking of noise monitoring activities) should be overseen by a qualified acoustic consultant. **These recommended edits to the Draft EIR text are shown in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.** These minor edits do not meet any of the triggers for recirculation as detailed in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

With respect to the appropriateness of assumptions used in the noise analysis, as described on pages 3-222 and 3-223 of the Draft EIR, the predicted noise levels presented in Tables 3.12-5 and 3.12-6 were calculated using reference noise levels and methodology from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA 2006) and FTA Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (FTA 2006), which are industry standard methods to estimate construction-related noise from all types of construction projects, not just roadway construction projects. Furthermore, the results are generally expected to be an overestimation (i.e., the predicted noise level shown in the tables is likely to be higher than actual noise levels generated at the site), because the calculations are based on the simultaneous use of multiple pieces of equipment, from the acoustic center of the construction zone and do not account for any screening that might be provided by fences, vegetation, buildings, or other objects between the source and receptor, which would act to dissipate noise energy. Actual noise levels perceived by receptors would fluctuate over time and space, depending on the number and type of equipment used, the location of the equipment within the construction zone, and any screening or shielding from objects. Therefore, the predicted construction noise levels described in the Draft EIR represent the “worst case” scenario, and actual noise levels experienced by nearby receptors are anticipated to be less than the levels described.

With respect to the duration of construction noise impacts, the duration for each construction phase is based on estimated schedule provided by the applicant’s construction contractor. As discussed in response to *MASTER-13: Construction Duration*, Section 2.4.2 of the Draft EIR acknowledges that the project schedule is dependent on market conditions, regulatory approvals, and other factors and, therefore, is subject to change. As discussed in that Master Response, edits are proposed to Section 3.12.6 of the EIR to explicitly acknowledge that if the construction schedule is extended, then the duration of construction noise impacts may also be extended. However, because the mitigation proposed in MM-NOI-1a would still be applicable no matter the duration of construction, which would require that construction noise levels at nearby receptors be reduced to below the FTA threshold of 80dBA (and would require monitoring to verify that the appropriate reductions are achieved), the overall impact

from construction noise would remain less than significant with mitigation, as concluded in the Draft EIR, even if the duration of construction were to exceed the estimated schedule.

With respect to those comments suggesting that the Draft EIR did not consider the physical and mental health impacts of exposure to elevated noise levels, Section 3.12.1 of the Draft EIR (under subheading “Negative Effects of Noise on Humans”) discusses the impacts of noise exposure on the human body, including physical health impacts such as damage to the auditory system and hearing loss, as well as impacts associated with mental health such as anxiety, stress, and sleep interference.

With respect to those comments concerned about the potential for older equipment to be used during construction, which may lack modern sound-deadening features, MM-NOI-1a requires the applicant to specify the use of quieter equipment/procedure alternatives, where practicable, in the contract documents and to require that all equipment produces noise levels that do not exceed the City’s 100 dBA limit at 25 feet. Furthermore, mitigation measure MM-AIR-3 (in Section 3.3.3) requires the construction contractor to use equipment that meets the United States Environmental Protection Agency’s (USEPA’s) Tier 4 Final emissions standards for off-road diesel-powered construction equipment with engines rated 50 horsepower or greater. Given that the Tier 4 requirements came into effect between 2008 and 2013, and generally required the development of new technologies to meet the emissions standards, such modern equipment would be generally expected to contain sound-attenuating features such as mufflers. In addition, some Tier 4 technologies themselves result in lower noise generation compared to more traditional technologies – for example, the high-pressure common rail (HPCR) fuel system injects fuel multiple times during each combustion cycle, allowing the combustion to last longer to create more energy and lower peak engine pressure. Lower peak engine cylinder pressure results in reduced engine noise levels (Doosan 2024).

None of the comments presented new information that would affect the conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to construction noise impacts of the proposed project, and no edits to the Draft EIR are required for these comments.

3.1.15 MASTER-15: Construction Vibration

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern regarding the impacts of construction vibration to existing SRC residents during construction of the proposed project and the effectiveness of mitigation measures. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- That the Draft EIR does not cover all the heavy equipment ground vibration that residents will experience.
- That the vibration assumptions are overly conservative² and difficult to measure and enforce.

² See previous footnote for inferred differences in how commenters have used the term “conservative” compared to how it is typically used in CEQA documents.

- That mitigation requiring provision of advance notice to residents of anticipated high-vibration activities would not reduce the impact.
- Concern that the analysis in the Draft EIR did not address impacts of vibration to people living and working within the Manor Building.

Note that comments relating to vibration and other impacts to patients of the existing Health Center during its proposed renovation are addressed in response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

Comments relating to the impacts of construction-related vibration on the actual structure and foundations of the Manor Building (an historic building) are addressed in response to MASTER-12: Impacts of Construction Vibration on the Historic Manor Building.

Master Response

Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR addresses potential impacts of the proposed project in relation to noise and vibration, with impact NOI-2 in Section 3.12.3 specifically analyzing the impacts from vibration. As discussed on page 3-233 of the Draft EIR (subheading “Standard of Significance”), the threshold of significance for vibration impacts is whether the project would generate “excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels” (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G, Threshold XIII,b).

The vibration analysis in the Draft EIR utilized a list of potential construction equipment that was provided by applicant’s contractor and used reference vibration levels from industry-standard guidance manuals (FTA 2018; Caltrans 2020), as shown in Table 3.12-9 on page 3-234 of the Draft EIR. The equipment with the highest reference vibration levels proposed for the project (vibratory roller) was then used to calculate the estimated maximum vibration levels at nearby sensitive receptors (as presented in Table 3.12-10 on page 3-325), using the minimum distance between the construction zone and the receptor. The estimated maximum vibration levels shown in the table are therefore the “worst-case” vibration levels, as they assume the highest-vibration generating equipment working at the closest possible distance to the receptor. The greater the distance between the equipment and receptor, the lower the level of vibration experienced, as vibration attenuates over distance (FTA 2018).

Actual vibration levels experienced during project construction would generally be less than the values shown in the table, as the highest-vibration equipment would not be used continuously over the full construction duration and the distance between the equipment and receptor would also vary throughout the construction period. For example, as described on page 3-236 of the Draft EIR, vibratory rollers are only estimated to be used approximately 16 hours at each building site. The next highest-vibration equipment, large bulldozers and hoe rams, have a reference vibration level less than half of a vibratory roller, as shown on Table 3.12-9. Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1a also requires that foundation and shoring systems be designed to eliminate noise- and vibration intensive work, (e.g., pile driving).

With respect to those comments questioning the enforceability and/or effectiveness of mitigation measures, prior notification to residents is only one of a suite of mitigation measures proposed in the Draft EIR. MM-NOI-2 requires that use of high-vibration equipment within specified buffer distances of occupied buildings be avoided to the extent possible and that smaller equipment be used instead, where feasible. Whilst that

might not completely eliminate the generation of vibration at levels which exceed the annoyance threshold, it would minimize the number and duration of instances when such levels are exceeded. MM-NOI-1a also requires that residents be notified of when such high-vibration activities are scheduled to allow residents the opportunity to adjust their daily routines to reduce exposure, and provided with a contact number for complaints, which could be used if contractor does not adhere to the specified buffer distances or other mitigation measures.

For all of the reasons above and the information and analysis in Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR, and with implementation of mitigation measures MM-NOI-1a, MM-NOI-2, and MM-CUL-1a, the project is not expected to not generate “excessive groundborne vibration” and therefore impacts of the project in relation to vibration would be less than significant with mitigation, as concluded in the Draft EIR. None of the comments presented new information that would affect the analysis or conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to vibration impacts, and no edits to the Draft EIR are required for these comments.

See also response to MASTER-12: Impacts of Construction Vibration on the Historic Manor Building.

3.1.16 MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern regarding the impacts to air quality during construction and associated health impacts to existing SRC residents. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- The Draft EIR did not consider the compound effect of all air quality elements being present at the same time during construction.
- The Draft EIR did not consider environmental impacts or mitigation related to dust, pollens, and/or gases emitted during construction.

Note that comments relating to air quality and other impacts to patients of the existing Health Center during its proposed renovation are addressed in response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

Master Response

Air quality impacts, including those from both construction and operation were evaluated in Section 3.3.3 of the Draft EIR.

As discussed in that section for Impact AIR-2, construction-related emissions of reactive organic gases (ROGs), nitrogen oxide [NO_x], particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than 10 microns [PM₁₀], and particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than 2.5 microns [PM_{2.5}] associated with the Project would not exceed the average daily thresholds of significance. The average daily emissions of criteria pollutants were calculated by considering the Project construction schedule, which accounts for overlapping phases, and summing all emissions that would occur in a single year. Annual emissions were then divided by the number of construction workdays in a year to calculate average daily emissions. Therefore, the average daily emissions presented

within the Draft EIR already take consideration of the Project's overlapping construction activities and emissions in any given year. As described in Impact AIR-2, construction-related emissions associated with the Project would not exceed the average daily thresholds of significance.

To protect public health and the environment, the EPA and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) set the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) and the California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS), respectively. These standards are set for six common air pollutants, known as criteria air pollutants: ground-level ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and lead. Pollen is generated by natural sources and is not a criteria air pollutant identified by the USEPA or CARB. Therefore, pollen is not a pollutant or emissions source that is evaluated within the air quality analysis under CEQA. However, with implementation of MM-AIR-2, BAAQMD's Best Management Practices (BMPs) for fugitive dust control during construction would be implemented, which would also minimize emissions of airborne pollen and dust.

None of the comments presented new information that would affect the analysis or conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to air quality impacts, and no edits to the Draft EIR are required for these comments.

3.1.17 MASTER-17: Construction Staging

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern that the current open space on campus (particularly the existing open space/recreational area between West Cottages Drive and Pavilion Circle) would be used for staging activities throughout the entire duration of construction. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- Concern with impacts to residents from the use of "the Park" as a staging area for the entire duration of construction.
- Request that the applicant should provide a detailed workable plan to mitigate the negative effects of the proposed construction staging area.

Master Response

Proposed construction staging for the project is described in Section 2.4.4, Construction Staging, Haul Routes, and Traffic Control and shown in Figure 2.4-1 in the Draft EIR. Although the estimated dates of construction for each phase presented in Figure 2.4-1 and Section 2.4.4 are now outdated, the overall durations for each phase, which were based on a construction schedule prepared by the applicant's construction contractor (RCP Construction, Inc. 2021) are still considered reasonably accurate, as described in response to *MASTER-13: Construction Duration*.

As presented in Figure 2.4-1, the only on-site staging area that would be utilized for the entire duration of project construction would be the Temporary Trailer/Facility Lot area that would be established at the existing employee parking lot in the northwest corner of the SRC campus. Use of other on-site staging areas would occur within the fenced construction zones for particular the associated construction activities, and would only be used for staging during those phases of construction, as summarized below:

- The existing “park” between West Cottages Drive and Pavilion Circle (proposed location of Building A) would be fenced around the perimeter and utilized for construction activities, including use for staging, for approximately 16 months during Phase 1;
- The area between the Manor Building and Odd Fellows Drive (proposed location of Building B) would be fenced around the perimeter for approximately 16 months during Phase 2;
- The area between the Assisted Living Building and Odd Fellows Drive (future location of Building C) would be fenced around the perimeter for approximately 19 months during Phase 3. The area between the Manor Building and West Cottages Drive (i.e., the proposed Meeting Room location) would not be fenced off until the entry plaza of Building B is complete and access to the front of the Manor Building is restored, therefore the Meeting Room location would only be used for construction and staging activities for approximately 8 to 9 months during the latter portion of Phase 3.

The environmental impacts related to use of construction staging areas are considered part of the impacts of the proposed Project as a whole and were analyzed in several sections of the Draft EIR. For example, temporary noise impacts from construction crews traveling to the proposed staging/construction areas and from construction equipment working within the staging/construction areas were analyzed Section 3.12, Noise of the Draft EIR, with suggested mitigation to reduce any potential significant environmental effects. Similarly, temporary impacts from construction traffic on emergency access and site circulation are addressed in Section 3.16, Transportation of the Draft EIR. No additional environmental impacts would result from using construction staging areas beyond those already discussed within this EIR. Please also refer to response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space with respect to impacts of the project on the existing picnic area, bocce ball court, and other recreational facilities within the area between Pavilion Circle and West Cottages Drive.

None of the comments presented new information that would affect the conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to impacts associated with construction staging activities. To the extent that the comments are concerned that the recreational and open space areas would not be usable during construction, it is noted that all of the staging areas (with the exception of the Temporary Trailer/Facility Lot) would be the site of permanent buildings once construction is completed, and that the Draft EIR analyzes the environmental impacts resulting from the permanent reduction in open space as a result of the project. No edits to the Draft EIR are required for these comments.

3.1.18 MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Center Renovations

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern regarding the proposed renovation of the existing Health Center (also referred to as Skilled Nursing) and/or requested additional details regarding the schedule and phasing for renovation. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- That the Draft EIR did not include details of the proposed Health Center renovations.
- Questions regarding the schedule for Health Center renovations, such as whether the renovations would be sequential or in parallel, and if the renovations would be completed while patients are in the building.
- That the renovation of the Health Center should be the first stage of the project, particularly in light of recent studies showing that COVID spreads more rapidly in facilities with shared rooms, and associated concerns that the renovations might be delayed and/or not occur at all.
- Concern based on previous experience with balcony renovations at the campus, that similar issues with delays and construction disruption would occur.
- That the EIR failed to address the requirement for a health center while the current one is remodeled and didn't consider the residents' proposed plan to keep using the existing health center while a new one was built (i.e., Alternative 1, the Resident's Alternative).

Note that comments relating to impacts on existing patients of the Health Center are addressed in response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

Master Response

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that a lead agency respond to comments that raise significant environmental issues. Comments on the importance of the proposed renovation of the existing Health Center (also referred to as Skilled Nursing), and/or whether the proposed schedule and phasing for the renovation are appropriate given COVID-related concerns, do not raise significant environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR.

The proposed construction phasing is discussed in Section 2.4.1, Construction Phasing and Schedule, in the Draft EIR. As presented in the Draft EIR, Phase 4 (the final phase) of the project, which includes renovation and conversion of double-occupancy rooms within the existing Health Center and assisted living buildings, is estimated to occur in stages over a two-year period, which would overlap with Phases 1 through 3. Additional information in Section 3.12.3 of the Draft EIR (pages 3-223 and 3-224) indicates that the internal renovations would be undertaken one wing at a time, with patients in the affected wing being relocated to other wings while the work occurs. Therefore, three of the four wings of the existing Health Center would be operational at any one time. The Health Center is not currently operating at full capacity, therefore the proposed phasing of work would not displace existing patients from the building or limit the current level of service.

With respect to concerns raised that the Draft EIR didn't consider the residents' proposed plan to keep using the existing health center while a new one was built, the Draft EIR included evaluation of the Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1), which was based on the Preserve SRC submission and included continued use of the existing health center whilst a new one was built in the location of Building C. This analysis of Alternative 1 is contained within Section 4.4 of the Draft EIR, and additional discussion relating to Alternative 1 can also be found in response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Resident's Alternative (Alternative 1).

With respect to those comments concerned that the Health Center renovations might be delayed and/or more disruptive than anticipated (based on residents' experience with prior construction projects at the SRC campus), Section 2.4.1 of the Draft EIR acknowledges that the project schedule is dependent on market conditions, regulatory approvals, and other factors and, therefore, is subject to change. As discussed in response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration, although an extension of construction duration would result in a corresponding increase in the duration of construction-related impacts, the overall magnitude of the impacts would generally be similar or slightly less than those described in the Draft EIR because the same amount of work would be spread out over a longer period of time. Further discussion of the impacts of construction on patients within the Health Center due to the proposed renovations is provided in response to MASTER 19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients, below.

None of the comments presented new information that would affect the analysis or conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to the proposed renovation of the existing Health Center, and no edits to the Draft EIR are required for these comments.

3.1.19 MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern that the Draft EIR did not adequately consider impacts from renovation of the Health Center on existing patients within that building. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- Concerns that the Draft EIR is missing impact analysis related to Health Center renovation, including discussion of interior air quality, noise, and vibration impacts to Health Center patients.
- Comments that reference a study reported in The Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine, October 1, 2019, Amjad Kanj MD et al reported in article, "What are the Risks to Inpatients During Hospital Construction or Renovation", which found that "Hospital construction ultimately will serve the interests of patients but it also can put in-patients at risk of mold disease, Legionnaires Disease, sleep deprivation, and exacerbation of lung disease."
- Concerns that the project and other alternatives fail to address the requirement for a health center while the current one is remodeled.
- Concerns that Alternative 1 (Residents' Alternative) is the only discussed alternative that avoids problems by building a new up-to-standard Health Care Center first.

Master Response

This master response is broken into the following subtopics for ease of discussion, each of which are addressed in turn, below:

- Air quality
- Noise and vibration

- Alternatives

Air Quality

Air quality impacts to sensitive receptors, including the existing residents of SRC such as Health Care Center patients, were evaluated in Section 3.3, Air Quality in the Draft EIR, with construction-related and operational air quality impacts to sensitive receptors described in Section 3.3.3. As discussed in the Draft EIR, Impact AIR-3 specifically addresses impacts to sensitive receptors from exposure to pollutants during all construction phases, including health risk impacts from renovation of the Health Care Center on existing residents in the community and patients within that building. The health risk assessment prepared to evaluate the Project's sources of toxic air contaminant emissions and exposure to on-site and off-site sensitive receptors is provided in Appendix C of the Draft EIR. As shown in Figure 5 in Appendix C, the health risk assessment considered receptors within the Health Care Center.

As detailed in Impact AIR-3, the project's sources of toxic air contaminant emissions and exposure to on-site sensitive receptors would not exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance for excess cancer risk and chronic non-cancer risk. However, Project construction annual PM_{2.5} concentrations would exceed the recommended BAAQMD threshold. Table 3.3-8 in the Draft EIR presents the unmitigated Project construction maximum annual PM_{2.5} concentrations. These maximum annual PM_{2.5} concentrations would occur at the Health Care Center building (as denoted by the Universal Transverse Mercator [UTM] coordinates in the table notes). However, as shown in Table 3.3-11, implementation of MM-AIR-3 would reduce these impacts to less than significant and ensure that maximum annual PM_{2.5} concentrations at the Health Care Center would not exceed thresholds of significance. With respect to excess cancer risk, the maximum total excess cancer risk for on-site receptors was estimated to be 0.08 in a million, as shown in Table 3.3-12, and would occur at receptors located in the Manor Building. The maximum total excess cancer risk of 0.08 in a million would not exceed the BAAQMD threshold of 10 in a million. The excess cancer risk for receptors within the Health Care Center was estimated to be 0.02 in a million, which would be lower than the maximum total excess cancer risk of 0.08 in a million and also less than the threshold of 10 in a million. Therefore, the existing patients within the Health Care Center would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Furthermore, as described in Section 3.12.3 of the Draft EIR, the renovation of the Health Center would occur in stages, one wing at a time, with nearby patients relocated to other wings not under construction and away from ongoing construction activities. Additional information provided to the City by the applicant (Ankrom Moisan 2023a) describes how the areas under construction would be sealed off from other spaces to control dust and maintain adequate air quality, with temporary systems provided to exhaust areas under construction and maintain indoor air quality, and air quality testing typically also conducted. The applicant's general contractor is also familiar and skilled with this type of work and has successfully completed similar healthcare projects elsewhere in California. Furthermore, any renovation to the existing Health Center would require California's Department of Health Care Access and Information (HCAI) review, monitoring, and approval, and HCAI compliance officers would visit the site regularly to monitor conditions. HCAI requires that an Infection Control Risk Assessment process be completed prior to initiating construction in a healthcare setting, which consider risks such as particulates and airborne microbes being introduced into the

hospital ventilation systems, water stagnation and contamination, and transporting of waste and construction debris (HCAI 2023).

For all of the reasons described above, and also based on the information and analysis within Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR, the impacts of the proposed project to sensitive receptors from exposure to pollutants, including impacts to existing patients within the Health Center, is considered to be less than significant with mitigation. No edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to these comments.

Noise and Vibration

Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR addresses potential impacts of the proposed project in relation to noise and vibration, with Impact NOI-1 in Section 3.12.3 specifically focused on noise impacts generated by construction and operation of the project. Table 3.12-5 on page 3-222 presents the combined predicted noise level from operation of the types of construction equipment that are anticipated to be used during Phase 4 (renovation of the Health Center). As discussed in response to *MASTER-14: Construction Noise*, the City's standards for construction noise require noise levels not to exceed 100 dBA at a distance of 25 feet from the source, and that construction noise be limited to the specified hours in the Ordinance Code. The predicted construction noise level for Phase 4 would be 89 dBA at 25 feet, and would occur during the permissible hours, therefore the City standards would be met. There is potential that construction activities could still result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels if sensitive receptors were located within 25 feet of the noise sources, as described for Phases 1 through 3 in the Draft EIR and in response to *MASTER-14: Construction Noise*. However, for Phase 4 construction activities, as described in Section 3.12.3 of the Draft EIR, the renovation of the Health Center would occur in stages, one wing at a time, with nearby patients relocated to other wings not under construction and away from ongoing construction activities. Therefore, sensitive receptors would be located more than 25 feet from the renovation activities, and the internal walls and doors of the Health Center would act to screen and attenuate noise levels even further.

Impact NOI-2 in Section 3.12.3 specifically focused on vibration impacts generated by construction and operation of the project, with Table 3.12-9 showing typical vibration levels from various construction equipment types and Table 3.12-10 showing the estimated maximum vibration levels at sensitive receptors from use of such equipment during construction of various components of the proposed project. Estimated vibration levels from construction equipment from Phase 4 activities (renovation of the existing Health Center) were not calculated, as none of the equipment proposed for use during Phase 4 (hand tools, compressor, and/or concrete saw) generate substantial vibration levels.

Furthermore, in addition to the Infection Control Risk Assessment described above, HCAI also requires a Pre-Construction Risk Assessment, which focuses on both the systems within the health care facility and how the construction-related activity may disturb patient safety. Noise and vibration are two of topics specifically mentioned in the guidance as key criteria that should be addressed (HCAI 2023).

For all of the reasons described above, and also based on the information and analysis within Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR, the impacts from construction-related noise and vibration, including impacts to existing patients within the Health Center, is considered

to be less than significant with mitigation. No edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to these comments.

Alternatives

Several comments expressed concern that the project and other alternatives (except for Alternative 1, the Residents' Alternative) fail to address the requirement for a health center while the current one is remodeled. As discussed in response to MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Center Renovations, Phase 4 (the final phase) of the project, which includes renovation and conversion of double-occupancy rooms within the existing Health Center and assisted living buildings, is estimated to occur in stages over a two-year period. Additional information in Section 3.12.3 of the Draft EIR (pages 3-223 and 3-224) indicates that the internal renovations would be undertaken one wing at a time, with patients in the affected wing being relocated to other wings while the work occurs. Therefore, three of the four wings of the existing Health Center would be operational at any one time. The Health Center is not currently operating at full capacity; therefore, the proposed phasing of work would not displace existing patients from the building or limit the current level of service. Renovation of the existing Health Center under Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative) and under Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative) would occur in an identical manner to that described for the proposed project; therefore, the same logic would apply.

None of the comments presented new information that would affect the analysis or conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to the proposed renovation of the existing Health Center under the proposed project or any of the alternatives, and no edits to the Draft EIR are required for these comments.

3.1.20 MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern that the project would destroy the existing peaceful environment and/or impact the quality of life for existing residents. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- Project-related construction would cause severe disruption to residents.
- Concern that excavation, construction, and tree removal activities would infringe on current and prospective residents' quality of life for many years, possibly to the point of endangering physical and mental health.
- More living spaces and buildings would be detrimental to the peaceful environment.
- Concerns that the impact on scenic quality is substantial and completely destroys the bucolic, semi-urban atmosphere, leaving a cluster of apartment buildings spread over the campus.
- Concerns that the project would destroy many features (e.g., peacefulness, rural feel, trees, quality of life, open space) which contributed to residents choosing SRC as their retirement community.

Master Response

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that a lead agency respond to comments that raise significant environmental issues. The CEQA Guidelines do not define “quality of life”; rather, the Draft EIR is intended to disclose to the public and decision-makers the specific environmental consequences of the proposed project. The Draft EIR analyzes specific impacts of the proposed project (and the alternatives) with respect to many environmental topics, several of which may contribute to perceptions of quality of life, including but not limited to aesthetics (Section 3.2), air quality (Section 3.3), noise (Section 3.12), recreation (Section 3.15), and traffic (Section 3.16). As discussed in those sections, any potentially significant physical impacts on the environment (other than to historical resources) would either be less than significant or could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Whilst scenic quality is a subjective parameter, under CEQA it is analyzed using the established thresholds of significance based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (described in Section 3.2.3 of the Draft EIR, under Impact AES-3). For urbanized areas such as the project site, the applicable threshold of significance for impacts to scenic quality is whether the project would conflict with applicable regulations governing scenic quality. As discussed in that section, the project would result in an intensification of existing residential and related land uses at the site; however, with approval of the requested Planned Combined District overlay, the project would not conflict with applicable zoning. Therefore, although the Project may alter the “bucolic nature” of the project site, such changes would not be a significant impact to scenic quality under CEQA.

To the extent that comments raise concerns regarding the contribution of the facility’s peacefulness, rural feel, and other factors to residents’ decisions to move to the SRC community, such matters are outside of the scope of CEQA, therefore no response to such comments is required in this Final EIR.

None of the comments presented new information that would affect the conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to the specific environmental impacts of the proposed project, and no edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to these comments.

See also, related comments and responses described in response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors, Master Response MASTER-22: Loss of Trees, Master Response and MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

3.1.21 MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern that the EIR did not take account of the particular characteristics of the resident population at SRC. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- Concerns that the Draft EIR has not addressed fully the impacts on SRC residents.
- Concerns that the Draft EIR mischaracterizes the resident population, particularly the fact that most residents are elderly and retired, and many have physical impairments, and that the mitigation should meet the needs of this population.

- Requests that more detailed studies be undertaken to address the elderly resident population.
- Concerns regarding the impact of project-related disruptions, noise, and confusion for elderly residents.

Master Response

The Draft EIR completed for the proposed project contains detailed information concerning the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the project. In compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a), the Draft EIR includes an analysis of potential project impacts on the environment, including any significant environmental effects the project might cause by bringing additional development and people into the area affected. Where applicable, the analysis of potential significant impacts highlights specific or unique impacts to sensitive populations, including elderly residents. The Draft EIR also identifies those physical environmental impacts that affect existing residents within the SRC campus.

As detailed in Impact AIR-3, a health risk assessment (Appendix C of the Draft EIR) was prepared to evaluate the Project's sources of toxic air contaminant emissions and exposure to on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. The health risk assessment considered the demographic of the on-site residents. For on-site residential receptors, the probability of contracting cancer risk from the Project's emission sources was evaluated over the construction duration beginning at a potential exposure age of 55 years. Therefore, the analysis considered the elderly resident population and compared the Project's maximum PM_{2.5} annual concentrations, excess cancer risk, and chronic non-cancer risks to the applicable BAAQMD thresholds of significance. The BAAQMD has not developed specific thresholds of significance to evaluate project-level risks or hazards to the elderly population. Impact AIR-3 concludes that Project construction activities would not expose on-site receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (i.e., the excess cancer risk for onsite receptors would not exceed the BAAQMD threshold of significance). However, the maximum annual PM_{2.5} concentrations would exceed the BAAQMD threshold of significance. With implementation of MM-AIR-3, the maximum annual PM_{2.5} concentrations would be reduced below the recommended threshold of significance. Therefore, the on-site, elderly residents would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations.

None of the comments presented new information that would affect the conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to the specific environmental impacts of the proposed project, and no edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to these comments.

3.1.22 MASTER-22: Loss of Trees

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern regarding the number of trees proposed for removal as part of the Project, and/or disagreement that loss of trees would be a less-than-significant impact. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- Concerns regarding the number of trees proposed for removal as part of the project, many of which are protected, mature trees and disagreement with the Draft EIR conclusion that the impact of such tree removal would be less than significant.
- Concerns that replanting of replacement trees cannot mitigate the loss of existing, mature redwood and oak trees, some of which are more than 100 years old and/or 100 feet tall.
- Concerns that the Draft EIR does not address impacts resulting from the removal of trees, as such as impacts to air quality, aesthetics, carbon sequestration, climate control, soil stabilization, noise buffering, bird habitat, and shade.
- Concerns that the City Arborist determined that many of the trees are under stress after recent years of drought, but they are not near the point where they need to be removed.
- Concerns that the project applicant refuses to consider alternative options that provide the same benefits and results in less disruption to the SRC campus.

Master Response

As discussed in Section 3.4.3 of the Draft EIR (Impact BIO-5), projects that conflict with local ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation ordinances, are generally considered to have a significant environmental impact. The proposed project would require the removal of 120 trees, 65 of which are protected by the City's tree ordinance. None of the trees proposed for removal are designated as "Heritage Trees" by the City but are protected due to their size and/or species. As such, the City's tree ordinance requires that a tree removal permit be obtained from the City for the removal of these trees. The tree removal permit would include the arborist report prepared for the Project and a Tree Preservation Plan, as stipulated in the ordinance. As discussed in the Draft EIR (Appendix B-2), the City Arborist had confirmed that the trees proposed for removal meet the City's criteria and that findings can be met allowing them to be removed and replaced as part of the project. The City Arborist also recommended various conditions of approval for the project, which would be imposed as part of the tree removal permit, including the replanting of replacement trees in accordance with the requirements of the ordinance.

Note that the City Arborist's approval was reissued in July 2023, just after the Draft EIR was published, to account for the fact that Tree #112 had fallen during the 2023 storm season. The updated approval, contained in Appendix D of this Final EIR, supersedes the version that was included as Appendix B to the Draft EIR. However, the conclusions of the approval report remain unchanged and the conditions of approval are almost identical, with only minor revisions to conditions 9 and 10. With adherence to the permit conditions of the updated Arborist's approval, the proposed project would not conflict with the City's tree ordinance and potential impacts would be less than significant.

With respect to those comments stating that the required replanting is inadequate to replace or mitigate the loss of mature trees, the City Arborist has calculated the value of the tree replacement planting in accordance with the International Society of Arboriculture Tree Valuation Formula, as required by the City's Tree Ordinance. Comments relating to the adequacy of the ordinance and/or its method of calculating replacement value do not represent comments on the environmental impacts of the

proposed project nor the adequacy of the Draft EIR, and therefore do not require a further response.

With respect to the potential impacts of tree removal on habitat for special status and other bird species, this topic is discussed in under Impact BIO-1 in the Draft EIR, and includes mitigation measure MM-BIO-1, Nesting Bird Avoidance Measures, to reduce impacts of tree removal and other construction activities on nesting birds to less than significant with mitigation. Additional information in relating to the impact of tree removal on bird species, and in particular on acorn woodpeckers, is provided in Response to Comment SCVAS-1.5 in Section 3.3.3 of this Final EIR, below.

With respect to those comments concerned with potential impacts to air quality from the proposed removal of trees, it is important to note that the health risk assessment, including the excess cancer risk and chronic non-cancer risk impacts and modeled PM_{2.5} concentrations, conservatively did not model or account for any vegetation within the Project site. As detailed in Impact AIR-3 and shown in Tables 3.3-14, 3.3-15, and 3.3-16, Project operational activities would not expose off-site and on-site sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, the Project's mass emissions of criteria air pollutants (shown in Table 3.3-6) would also not exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance. Since this modeling did not consider or account for any effects of the surrounding vegetation, the removal of trees would not affect the analysis or conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to air quality impacts.

Similarly, with respect to those comments concerned with potential loss of “noise buffering” from the proposed tree removal, the analysis in Section 3.12.3 of the Draft EIR with respect to both construction and operational noise conservatively did not model or account for any vegetation within the project site. Therefore, differences in the number of trees on site between pre-project and with-project conditions would not affect the analysis or conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to noise impacts.

With respect to those comments concerned with potential soil stabilization impacts from the proposed removal of trees, the analysis within Section 3.7.3 of the Draft EIR, and in particular impact GEO-2) already accounts for the impacts of the project, including not only the proposed buildings but also the removal of trees, grading, and other activities necessary to construct the project. Because the Project would disturb more than 1 acre of land, the Project Applicant is required by law to prepare a SWPPP and implement associated BMPs that are specifically designed to reduce the potential for erosion during construction, including stabilization of bare soil and revegetation of disturbed areas. Furthermore, the majority of trees to be removed are within the proposed building footprints and/or are in relatively flat areas (e.g., between proposed Building C and the Assisted Living Building) where soil stability is less of an issue than on steep slopes.

With respect to those comments concerned with potential aesthetic impacts from the proposed removal of trees, the analysis within Section 3.2.3 of the Draft EIR already accounts for the impacts of the project, including not only the proposed buildings but also the removal of trees, grading, and other activities necessary to construct the project. Views of existing trees on campus are not an identified scenic vista or scenic resource; therefore, while their removal may alter the existing views from some nearby residences, the proposed removal of trees would not alter views of the scenic vistas or of Saratoga's low-lying foothills and the Santa Cruz Mountains beyond, nor would it substantially alter views from nearby public vantage points such as the Villa Montalvo

Lookout Point (Impact AES-1) or result in impacts to scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway (Impact AES-2). As discussed for Impact AES-3 on page 3-17 of the Draft EIR, consideration of impacts to scenic quality in urbanized areas are limited to whether the project would conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. As discussed above, the project would not conflict with the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance. Furthermore, the proposed removal of trees would not create a new source of light and glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Whilst some of the trees to be removed may currently be providing some screening of existing light sources from individual residences on the SRC campus or adjacent properties, CEQA is typically concerned about impacts on the environment of persons generally, rather than impacts on particular persons. Therefore, although the removal of trees might alter the sources of light that are visible from certain private residential units and adjacent private residences and from a limited number of public streets in the vicinity of the Project site, the new (or newly visible) sources of light associated with the project would not substantially alter general views of the area for the general public, and therefore would not constitute a significant aesthetic impact under CEQA.

As discussed in Section 3.6.3 of the Draft EIR, the new buildings would meet the energy efficiency standards set forth by Title 24 of the California Administrative Code and the Appliance Efficiency Regulations, which regulates energy consumption for the heating, cooling, ventilation, and lighting of residential buildings. The project would also be designed to meet "Build It Green" energy standards. Each of the proposed apartment buildings would be provided with roof mounted solar photovoltaic system and battery storage, and mitigation measure MM-GHG-1b would require participation in the Silicon Valley Clean Energy "GreenStart" or "GreenPrime" program, which provide 100 percent GHG emissions free electricity to participating customers, or meet 100 percent of their electricity demand through on-site renewable energy, such as solar panels. Therefore, the overall impact of the project with respect to energy use and greenhouse gas emissions would be mitigated to a less-than-significant impact.

With respect to those comments concerned with a potential reduction in carbon sequestration due to the proposed removal of trees, trees of different ages play different roles in removing carbon from the atmosphere and storing it in wood. Although old trees have typically accumulated more carbon than younger trees, young trees grow rapidly and remove much more CO₂ each year from the atmosphere than older trees, as the rate of sequestration declines over the tree's lifetime (NCASI 2021). Furthermore, as discussed above, due to energy efficient building design and mitigation measures requiring participation in green energy programs, the overall impact of the project with respect to greenhouse gas emissions would be mitigated to a less-than-significant impact.

Moreover, there are many mature trees and vegetation on and around the SRC campus that would not be removed as part of the project, many of which are protected under an open space easement. Therefore, the removal of 120 trees from the 37-acre campus, whilst important, does not constitute a significant impact because of the heavily vegetated nature of the surrounding areas. For context, the SRC campus is approximately 40 times larger than a standard 40,000 SF residential lots, therefore the proposed removal of 120 trees from the campus is roughly equivalent to the removal of 3 trees from a standard residential lot.

None of the comments presented new information regarding the removal of trees that would affect the conclusions of the Draft EIR, and no edits to the Draft EIR are required for these comments.

3.1.23 MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern regarding the proposed loss of recreational facilities (bocce ball court, picnic area, etc.) and loss of open space on campus, particularly due to the proposed construction of Building A. In addition to the loss of these facilities for existing SRC residents, some comments also mentioned that other neighbors use the SRC grounds for recreational purposes, and that such users would have to use other local parks if SRC facilities were no longer available. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- Disagreement with the conclusions of the Draft EIR that the impacts to recreational resources would be less than significant.
- Concerns that the project would eliminate the only outdoor recreational space on campus.
- Concerns that the proposed indoor recreational facilities (fitness center expansion) and other existing indoor recreational opportunities on campus are not an adequate substitute for the loss of outdoor recreational facilities and open space.
- Concerns that the Draft EIR identified San Marcos Open Space as an alternative recreation area within 300 feet of the site, but did not acknowledge that the stated distance is a straight-line distance, and accessing the open space from the SRC campus requires a 2.5-mile round trip via paved streets, due to the presence of a steep embankment.
- Concerns that many SRC residents do not drive, therefore off-site public recreational facilities are not a realistic alternative to on-site recreational facilities, as having close-by recreation is vital to the health of senior citizens.
- Concerns that the Draft EIR did not consider the equal access law in California that prevents discrimination against disabled persons, as many SRC residents have mobility issues requiring canes, walkers, wheelchairs, or motorized assistance to get around and therefore cannot access nearby offsite public recreational facilities.
- Concerns regarding the loss of the existing full-size bocce ball court and other on-site recreational facilities. In particular, the proposed replacement with a reduced-size bocce court does not meet the needs of those who utilize the existing court.
- Concerns that the proposed removal of the outdoor recreational space on the SRC campus would also affect neighboring residents who regularly walk their dogs, jogging, or bicycling through the campus, as well as visitors to the campus (children and grandchildren) and residents of the neighboring Fellowship Plaza.
- Concerns that the proposed project conflicts with City policies regarding open space.

Master Response

As discussed in Section 3.15.3 of the Draft EIR, there are two thresholds of significance for impacts to recreational resources, which are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The first threshold (analyzed under Impact REC-1 in the Draft EIR) is whether the project would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of those facilities would occur or be accelerated. The second threshold (Impact REC-2) is whether the project would include construction of new or expanded recreational facilities that would themselves have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The City has not adopted any thresholds of significance for the purposes of CEQA that relate to the loss, or reduction in size, of existing private recreational facilities on private property.

With respect to Impact REC-1, as discussed in the Draft EIR, the proposed increase in population at the site and the reduction in available private outdoor recreational facilities on the SRC campus is unlikely to result in substantial increased use of local public parks and other public recreational facilities in the area. As several commenters pointed out, many of the existing (or future) SRC residents would be unlikely or unable to travel to offsite public recreational facilities due to limited mobility. Although it is acknowledged that neighboring residents of the community may also use the existing private streets and open space on the SRC campus for informal recreational activities such as jogging, bicycling and/or walking dogs, such activities would be anticipated to continue to occur within or near the same areas, as the majority of such activities are typically undertaken within the vicinity of the person's immediate neighborhood. Furthermore, even if a minor increase in the occurrence of these informal recreational activities were to occur at nearby public parks, they would be unlikely to result in substantial physical deterioration of recreational facilities given the low impact nature of the activities, the relatively robust nature of the affected facilities (bike trails and pedestrian paths) and because the increased use would likely be spread among various facilities. Therefore, the Draft EIR concluded that Impact REC-1 would be less than significant.

With respect to Impact REC-2, as discussed in the Draft EIR, the only new recreational facilities proposed by the project include expansion of the fitness center, construction of a smaller bocce court and other outdoor recreational facilities, and dedication of an easement and installation of wayfinding signage along Odd Fellows Drive. The construction-related impacts of these new recreational facilities are discussed throughout the analysis in Section 3 of the Draft EIR and were concluded to be less than significant (or less than significant with mitigation).

None of the comments presented new information that would affect the analysis or conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to Impact REC-1 or Impact REC-2. However, minor edits to Section 3.15 are required to clarify that the San Marcos Open Space is not directly accessible from the SRC campus, as pointed out by several commenters. **These recommended edits to the Draft EIR text are shown in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.**

To the extent that comments raise concerns regarding the availability of and access to outdoor recreational areas and open space within the SRC campus and, the importance of such areas to the health and wellbeing of senior citizens (including those with disabilities), and the contribution of such features towards residents' decisions to move

to the SRC community, such matters are outside of the scope of CEQA, therefore no response to such comments is required in this Final EIR.

Similarly, comments relating to California’s “equal access” laws and alleged discrimination of the project design towards disabled persons or SRC residents with mobility issues by removing or restricting access to private recreational areas on the campus do not fall within the scope of environmental impacts under CEQA as they do not concern impacts to public recreational facilities (Impact REC-1) or environmental impacts of proposed new recreational facilities (Impact REC-2). Compliance with applicable provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act is assessed during the building permit review process.

With respect to the multiple comments received regarding the loss of the full-sized bocce court and inadequacy of the smaller court included for the proposed project, the Project Applicant has submitted a revised design for the area immediately west of Building A, which would eliminate the circular access driveway/drop-off zone to make space for a full size bocce court (see Appendix E). The City and Santa Clara County Fire Department (SCCFD) have reviewed the revised plan to confirm compliance with applicable City standards, building codes, and fire safety regulations, among other factors, and identified no concerns with the revised design (SCCFD 2023). Potential environmental impacts of the revised design would be similar in nature to those analyzed and described for the original design within the Draft EIR, as construction activities would be similar in scale, nature, and intensity to those for the original design, and the majority of operational details, such as the number of new residents and the design and scale of the proposed buildings, would be unchanged. Removing the access driveway/drop-off zone would eliminate two new curb cuts on West Cottages Lane and would not introduce any additional features that would adversely affect traffic safety compared to the original project design.

With respect to those comments concerned that the proposed project would reduce the availability of open space and/or would conflict with City policies regarding open space, Government Code Section 65560 defines open space as any parcel or area of land or water which is essentially unimproved and devoted to an open space use and which is designated on a local, regional, or state open space plan. Within the SRC campus, the only such designated open space is an approximately 10.6-acre open space easement along the northeastern edge of the property (east of McLaren Lane) and to the south of the existing Health Center and Eucalyptus Lane, as shown on Figure 2.3.1 of the Draft EIR and Sheet CS-0.5 of the project plans. As discussed within Section 3.4.3 of the Draft EIR (Impact BIO-2), the proposed project would not involve any construction or disturbance within or immediately adjacent to this riparian corridor/open space easement.

3.1.24 MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern regarding the ability of residents to evacuate the campus quickly in an emergency and/or for emergency vehicles to service the campus, and the potential for the project to further exacerbate these issues. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

- Concern that the EIR does not address the extent or flow of traffic into and out of SRC and Fellowship Plaza in the event of a forest fire or other catastrophe requiring the evacuation of those properties.
- Concern that the EIR does not address the project's impact (or cumulative impacts) to the City's identified evacuation route on Fruitvale Avenue, from traffic evacuating the project site onto Fruitvale Avenue.
- Concern that mitigation measure MM-TRA-3A is not sufficient to mitigate the significant impact to emergency access from the project.
- Request that an access road to accommodate emergency vehicles from Chester to Odd Fellows Road be provided.
- Concern that the gates on Chester Avenue are inadequate for emergency evacuation of extra SRC campus residents and additional residents at adjacent Fellowship Plaza, and/or that regular cars are unable to exit the "bump" at the Chester exit.
- Concern regarding how Health Center patients would be evacuated in an emergency, including the potential for conflicts between independent residents evacuating the campus and/or ambulances entering the campus to assist in evacuation of the Health Center.
- Concern that only Alternative 1 (the Residents' Alternative) addressed evacuation access from the Health Center.

Master Response

Proposed emergency access for the project is presented in Section 2.3.4, Site Access, Parking, and Circulation. As discussed in that section, the existing resident emergency vehicular access between Odd Fellows Drive and Chester Avenue (north of proposed Building C) would be retained and would have a sliding manual gate and fire department Knox Box. In addition, a second emergency access point would also be provided between Odd Fellows Drive and Chester Avenue (further to the east than the existing gate), which would also have a sliding, manual gate and fire department Knox Box. SCFFD requires that this new secondary access point be constructed and completed prior to all other construction activities at the site.

Potential impacts in relation to the impairment of emergency response or evacuation plan implementation were evaluated in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Impact HAZ-5), Section 3.16, Transportation (Impact TRA-4), and Section 3.19, Wildfire (Impact WF-1) in the Draft EIR.

With respect to those comments concerned about emergency response and evacuation during project construction, Impact HAZ-5 concluded that the proposed temporary road closures during construction and the movement of large construction vehicles and equipment within the Project site and along Odd Fellows Drive could interfere with evacuation of the SRC campus or the neighboring Fellowship Plaza residential development during an emergency situation. The Draft EIR identified mitigation measure MM-TRA-3a (Construction Traffic Control Plan) to reduce this impact. This mitigation measure would require the construction contractor to develop and implement a detailed plan to manage construction traffic and internal road closures throughout the construction period and ensure that the new emergency access, sized to accommodate

large vehicles such as fire trucks, would be fully functional prior to initiation of other construction activities. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to emergency response and evacuation during project construction to less than significant, as it would require emergency access routes to be maintained throughout construction, identification of detour routes for temporary internal road closures on campus, and communication regarding road closures, detours, and other pertinent information to SRC residents, neighboring properties such as Fellowship Plaza, and emergency service providers, and ensure that a suitable secondary access via Chester Avenue is available in case access via Odd Fellows Drive is congested.

Several comments were received that expressed concern that the increased population introduced by the project and/or changes to campus layout would hinder emergency evacuation of existing residents and/or would impact use of Fruitvale Avenue as an identified City evacuation route due to increased traffic. As discussed in Section 3.9.3 of the Draft EIR, the SRC Campus has an Emergency Disaster Manual, prepared in compliance with the requirements of California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 19, Section 3.09 and the Saratoga Fire Code Section 13.302(c) that includes detailed evacuation and relocation procedures, including for full-facility evacuation, if required. The plan considers the special needs of residents in determining the types of transportation required, and addresses methods of notifying and evacuating all residents, including those within the Health Center and under nursing care, guests, and employees in a safe and efficient manner in the event of an emergency. The facility's Emergency Disaster Manual must be updated annually, and therefore would be updated to account for the additional population and changes to campus layout/facilities that would be implemented by the project.

The Emergency Disaster Manual identifies SRC as a "Shelter In Place" facility and states that total evacuation of the SRC facility is unlikely because unaffected areas of SRC may prove to be safer and more desirable than relocation of residents to a disaster center, depending on the nature of the emergency. Furthermore, as described in Section 3.19.1 of the Draft EIR (page 3-321), the project site is not within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone or Wildland-Urban Interface area and is approximately half a mile from such areas. The City's recently updated Safety Element (City of Saratoga 2024) indicates that fire hazards in the flat, urbanized areas of Saratoga are relatively low because these areas lack excessive amounts of combustible vegetation.

During an emergency requiring large-scale evacuation within the City, evacuation orders would typically be staged to prioritize evacuation of areas most-at-risk, to reduce potential for overcrowding of evacuation routes. The County Sheriff's Office would be responsible for managing traffic flow on identified evacuation routes, utilizing traffic controls at key junctions and/or other methods (e.g., temporary reverse flows) to reduce congestion as needed (Valenzuela, pers. comm. 2024; Brown, pers. comm. 2024).

In the unlikely event that a full-facility evacuation of SRC is required, the proposed project could result in additional traffic from 52 new independent living units that might self-evacuate from the facility during an emergency. Such traffic would be in addition to existing evacuation traffic from properties with primary access via San Marcos Road/Fruitvale Avenue, which includes the existing 143 independent living units³ at

³ Assisted Living and Skilled Nursing Facility residents have not been included in these calculations, as SRC is a "Shelter In Place Facility" with full facility evacuation identified as a last resort (SRC 2022). Given the logistics required to evacuate assisted living and

SRC, approximately 11 private residences, and 150 residential apartments at the adjacent Fellowship Plaza property. The proposed 52-unit increase therefore represents an increase of approximately 17 percent above the existing 304 dwelling units that could be self-evacuating in an emergency. Under cumulative conditions (i.e., including the future development of 80 new units on the Fellowship Plaza property) the proposed project's 52 additional units would represent approximately 12 percent of the 436 total dwelling units anticipated to be evacuating. Under both project and cumulative conditions, evacuating residents from these properties would have the option of utilizing the primary route via San Marcos to Fruitvale Avenue or secondary routes via Chester Avenue, which leads to City-identified evacuation routes on Quito Road (at north end of Chester Avenue) and Allendale Avenue (via south end of Chester Avenue and connections along Sobey Road), thereby dispersing the impact of the additional units on any one evacuation route. Currently, there is one (undersized) emergency access on the SRC property between Oddfellows Road and Chester Avenue, and on the adjacent Fellowship Plaza property that meets required fire standards. The project would introduce an additional emergency access meeting required fire standards on the SRC property, thereby facilitating more efficient evacuation of the property compared to existing conditions, despite the small increase in population.

With respect to those comments that expressed concern that the gates on Chester Avenue would be inadequate for emergency evacuation of extra SRC campus residents and additional residents at adjacent Fellowship Plaza, and/or that the existing "bump" cannot be navigated by regular cars, the project already proposes to include an additional emergency/secondary access point where one currently does not exist, while also maintaining the existing resident emergency vehicular access between Odd Fellows Drive and Chester Avenue. The existing emergency access is navigable by regular passenger cars, as demonstrated by SRC management on August 9, 2023 (Stel, pers. comm. 2024a). The SCCFD has also reviewed the development plans to ensure adequate emergency access pursuant to the requirements in Section 503 of the California Fire Code (Title 24, CCR, Part 9) (SCCFD 2021a; 2021b), and would verify that the final project design continues to meet the required standards as part of the building permit process. As discussed in Section 3.16.3 of the Draft EIR (Impact TRA-4) several features of the Project, including the proposed removal of the traffic circle at the entrance to Odd Fellows Drive, and the creation of a second emergency access from Odd Fellows Drive to Chester Avenue, were included to address SCCFD review comments on preliminary project plans.

For all of the reasons above and based on the information and analysis within Sections 3.9, 3.16, and 3.19 of the Draft EIR, with implementation of MM-TRA-3 neither project construction nor operation would impair emergency response or evacuation at the SRC campus.

With respect to those comments expressing concern as to how Health Center patients would be evacuated in an emergency and/or that only Alternative 1 (the Residents' Alternative) addressed evacuation access from the Health Center, as discussed above, the facility has an Emergency Disaster Manual that outlines evacuation procedures. The proposed project would also decrease the number of assisted living, skilled nursing, and memory care beds on campus from the current 200 beds down to 155 beds, thereby

skilled nursing residents in accordance with the facility's Emergency Disaster Manual, these residents are unlikely to be evacuating at the same time as more mobile independent living residents.

reducing the potential number of non-ambulatory patients who require additional staffing and specialized transportation during a full facility evacuation.

As discussed in response to *MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Residents*, renovations to the Health Center under the proposed project (and also for Alternatives 2 and 3) would occur one wing at a time, with patients in the affected wing being temporarily relocated to other wings during construction. As such, the proposed construction activities within one wing of the Health Center would not impede evacuation of other wings. Furthermore, renovations of the Health Center would require review and approval of the California Department of Health Care Access and Information, which includes a Pre-Construction Risk Assessment process that focuses on both the systems within the health care facility and how the construction-related activity may disturb patient safety. Emergency procedures are specifically mentioned in the guidance as a key criterion that should be addressed in the Pre-Construction Risk Assessment (HCAI 2023).

For all of the reasons above and based on the information and analysis within Sections 3.9, 3.16, and 3.19 of the Draft EIR, with implementation of MM-TRA-3 neither project construction nor operation would impair emergency response or evacuation at the SRC campus.

None of the comments presented new information regarding emergency response or evacuation that would affect the conclusions of the Draft EIR, and no edits to the Draft EIR are required for these comments.

3.1.25 MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern about the project's impacts relating to traffic congestion within the SRC campus and disruption to residents during project construction and/or operation. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- Concerns that the Draft EIR did not address street closures and impacts to circulation within the SRC campus, and specifically did not address impacts to elderly residents with mobility, hearing, and/or vision impairments.
- Concerns that the Draft EIR did not address the impacts of congestion at the Manor Building's loading dock, particularly given the proximity of the proposed entrance to the Building A underground parking and additional traffic associated with Building A.
- Concern regarding adequacy of mitigation to address project's impacts from traffic congestion.
- Concern that project construction activities might limit access to SRC residents' garages (particularly for the cottages on West Cottages Lane).
- Concerns regarding impacts of the project on parking availability on-campus and/or whether the project would provide sufficient parking to serve the existing and proposed additional population.

Note that comments relating to impacts of construction-related traffic on emergency access and evacuation are addressed in response to MASTER-24: Emergency

Access/Evacuation, and additional discussion regarding impacts to pedestrian safety area addressed in response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

Note that comments relating to impacts of construction-related traffic on emergency access and evacuation are addressed in response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation, and additional discussion regarding impacts to pedestrian safety area addressed in response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

Master Response

Proposed site circulation and parking associated with the project are presented in Section 2.3.4, Site Access, Parking, and Circulation. As discussed, no changes are proposed to the existing vehicular access to the SRC property, which would continue to be accessed from Fruitvale Avenue via San Marcos Road and Odd Fellows Drive. A parking garage would be provided under each of the new apartment buildings (A through C) and under the meeting room, with additional surface parking spaces distributed throughout the site, for a total of 569 parking spaces—an increase of 109 spaces over existing. The City has determined that the proposed number of parking spaces to be provided on campus meets the City’s requirements based on the land use (and actually exceeds the City’s requirements by six spaces).

As described in Section 2.3.4 of the Draft EIR, parking for construction workers would be provided off-site at West Valley College throughout project construction and a shuttle would transfer these workers from the staging area to the construction zones on the SRC campus, thereby limiting the use of onsite parking spaces by construction workers.

As described within Section 3.1.1 of the Draft EIR, the City has utilized the thresholds of significance from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For transportation, the applicable thresholds include whether the project would: conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities (Impact TRA-1), conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) by increasing vehicle miles traveled (Impact TRA-2), create a substantial traffic-related hazard (Impact TRA-3), or result in inadequate emergency access (Impact TRA-4). The analysis of the project with respect to these thresholds is provided in Section 3.16.3.

With respect to Impact TRA-1, the programs, plans, ordinances and policies addressing the circulation system that are applicable to the project, as described in Section 3.16.2, all relate to public transportation facilities such as public roads, public transit, and public bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Therefore, impacts relating to circulation on private roadways and sidewalks on private property, whilst an important consideration for SRC management to address directly with their construction contractor and existing residents, are not considered to be an environmental impact under CEQA, unless the project causes substantial traffic-related hazards or inadequate emergency access, as discussed in Impacts TRA-3 and TRA-4, respectively.

As discussed in Section 3.16.3 for those impacts, potentially significant impacts were identified for the proposed project, and mitigation measures MM-TRA-3a and MM-TRA-3b were imposed to reduce the impacts to less than significant with mitigation. MM-TRA-3a requires the construction contractor to develop and implement a construction traffic control plan to mitigate potential impacts relating to traffic safety hazards and emergency access, including those from temporary lane closures or traffic controls

within the SRC campus during construction. Such a plan would also serve to reduce disruption to the internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation system within the Project site during construction. For example, provisions in the construction traffic control plan requiring the maintenance of emergency access to all units throughout construction, would also serve to maintain access for residents to their units during non-emergency situations, and any temporary disruptions to individual driveways and/or garages would be required to be communicated to residents (and emergency services).

With respect to those comments stating that the Draft EIR did not consider impacts to residents with mobility, hearing and/or vision impairments, additional text has been added to MM-TRA-3a to specifically require that the Construction Traffic Control Plan include consideration of pedestrians with mobility, hearing, and/or vision impairments. **The edits made in response to these comments are shown in Section 4 of this Final EIR.**

With respect to those comments concerned regarding impacts from the location of the Building A parking garage entrance to the loading area for the Manor Building, the Traffic Study prepared for the project (contained within Appendix F of the Draft EIR) specifically addressed issues related to traffic safety from this new “driveway”, and recommends that stop signs be installed for exiting vehicles and that adequate sight distances in accordance with industry standard guidelines be maintained. In addition, the Traffic Study recommended measures to limit the number of deliveries at any one time, and to discourage unsafe practices such as delivery trucks backing up into the one-way Pavilion Circle from the northern exit to West Cottages Lane, instead of driving all the way around in the intended circulation direction, or parking in non-designated spaces. The recommendations of the Traffic Study are incorporated into MM-TRA-1b of the Draft EIR; however, edits are proposed to this mitigation measure to reflect that the sight distances recommended by the Traffic Study are not 150 feet in every case but vary based on the speed limit of the roadways. Edits have also been made to MM-TRA-3b to expand the requirements for maintenance of sight distance to include signs and ancillary structures as well as vegetation, as discussed in response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-3.2. **These proposed edits are described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.**

Responsibilities for implementing mitigation measures during project construction as well as throughout ongoing operations would be defined in the Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program that is required to be prepared and adopted by the City, if the project (or an alternative) is adopted. Ultimately, the City, as Lead Agency, would be responsible for verifying that mitigation measures are implemented.

As of July 2020, Senate Bill 743 directs CEQA lead agencies to evaluate transportation impacts based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT) instead of traffic congestion or Level of Service (LOS). Therefore, traffic congestion is no longer a potential physical effect on the environment requiring analysis under CEQA. Impacts to the Project's consistency with CEQA guidelines relating to VMT is analyzed in Section 3.16, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Impact TRA-2 concluded that because the estimated VMT per capita for the Project site (7.14) is more than 15 percent lower than the average daily VMT per capita for the City (17.97), the impact on VMT would be less than significant and no mitigation is required. Even though LOS is no longer considered under CEQA, an intersection LOS and delay assessment was prepared for the Project so that the City could evaluate

other non-CEQA transportation impacts of the Project, such as congestion (see Appendix F of the Draft EIR).

3.1.26 MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern with the general safety of pedestrians at intersections and nearby garage exits, with particular concern given to residents with impaired mobility. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- Concern with increased traffic making it unsafe for residents to walk at certain intersections and garage exits.
- Concern with hazardous walking conditions for residents along access road for Buildings B and C.
- No consideration for pedestrians near San Marcos Road and Fruitvale Avenue during an evacuation.
- Inadequacy of driveways and sidewalks for pedestrians.
- Concern regarding length and geometry of driveways to proposed underground garages not allowing for adequate visibility of pedestrians and/or other traffic.

Master Response

Proposed site access and internal circulation for the project are described in Section 2.3.4, Site Access, Parking, and Circulation. As discussed, modifications to the pedestrian network would be undertaken as part of the project, with sidewalks along the proposed new driveways/roads and four new crosswalks proposed, including crosswalks across Odd Fellows Drive just east of West Cottages Lane and just west of McLaren Lane.

Potential impacts to pedestrian safety were analyzed in Section 3.16, Transportation. Impact TRA-3 concluded that potential for the creation of substantial traffic-related hazards would be less than significant with the implementation of MM-TRA-3a. MM-TRA-3a would require the construction contractor to develop and implement a construction traffic control plan to mitigate potential impacts relating to traffic safety and emergency access, ensuring safe circulation for and movement by vehicular traffic and pedestrians are maintained to City standards. As described above in response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption, edits are proposed to this mitigation measure to require that the Construction Traffic Control Plan include consideration of pedestrians with mobility, hearing, and/or vision impairments. **The edits made in response to these comments are shown in Section 4 of this Final EIR.**

Impact TRA-3 also described the conclusions of the Traffic Study undertaken for the Project, which concluded that the intersection geometry, including proposed crosswalks and exits from parking garages, is adequate, provided the recommendations of the Traffic Study (included in the Draft EIR as MM-TRA-3b) are implemented. With respect to those comments concerned regarding the length of driveways from the parking garages being insufficient to provide adequate visibility for pedestrians and/or drivers, the City does not have specific standards for the length of driveways exiting from multi-

residential parking garages. The City's Development Engineer reviewed the project plans and was satisfied with the proposed driveway length.

3.1.27 MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Quality

Summary of Concerns

Several comments were received that expressed concern that the project would alter the scenic quality and/or visual character of the area, and/or would disrupt views from residential units on the SRC campus or adjoining properties or would limit views of the historic Manor Building. Specific comments include, but are not limited to:

- Concerns that the impact on scenic quality is substantial and completely destroys the bucolic, semi-urban atmosphere, leaving a cluster of apartment buildings spread over the campus.
- Concerns that the Draft EIR only focuses on aesthetic impacts for people living in other areas of Saratoga, and not individual residents or immediate neighbors.

Master Response

With respect to those comments concerned with loss of views due to proposed construction of new buildings and/or removal of trees, it is noted that views of the SRC campus, including views of the Manor Building, are not an identified scenic vista or scenic resource; therefore, while the proposed project may alter the existing views from some nearby residences or on-campus residential units, the proposed project would not alter views of the scenic vistas or of Saratoga's low-lying foothills and the Santa Cruz Mountains beyond, nor would it substantially alter views from nearby public vantage points such as the Villa Montalvo Lookout Point (Impact AES-1) or result in impacts to scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway (Impact AES-2).

Whilst scenic quality is a subjective parameter, under CEQA it is analyzed using the established thresholds of significance based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. As described in Section 3.2.3 of the Draft EIR, under Impact AES-3, the applicable threshold of significance for impacts to scenic quality within urbanized areas is whether the project would conflict with applicable regulations governing scenic quality. As discussed in that section, the project would result in an intensification of existing residential and related land uses at the site; however, with approval of the requested Planned Combined District overlay, the project would not conflict with applicable zoning. Therefore, although the Project may alter the "bucolic nature" or semi-urban atmosphere of the project site, or views from the homes of SRC residents and adjoining neighbors, such changes would not be a significant impact to scenic quality under CEQA.

Page left blank to facilitate double-sided printing.

3.2 Responses to Form Letters

Form letters are those letters for which identical (or near identical) copies of the same letter were received by multiple commenters. To avoid repetition, each form letter is addressed and responded to once within this section, and a list of all the parties that sent a copy of the particular form letter are also listed. Copies of each form letter received by the City are contained in Appendix A.

In cases where individuals included additional statements along with the standard content of the form letter, the additional comments are addressed within the individual comments in Section 3.3 below, under the commenter name.

A copy of each form letter was reviewed and individual comments within each letter (each containing a single theme, issue, or concern) were assigned a number. For example, the first topic raised in the first form letter (FORM-1) would be coded as FORM-1.1, the second topic in the same letter would be coded as FORM-1.2. The first topic raised in the second form letter (FORM-2) would be coded as FORM-2.1. A copy of the first form letter (FORM-1) sent by John Doe would have all of the content identical to the content of FORM-1 coded as DOE-J-1.1, and additional comments within the letter (if any) would be coded as DOE-J-1.2, DOE-J-1.3, etc.

The full text or a summary of each comment topic raised in each form letter is reproduced below, followed by the City's response to that comment topic, in turn. Note that minor spelling and/or grammatical errors have been corrected within "verbatim" comments and introductory text not pertinent to the issues being raised may not have been reproduced for brevity.

3.2.1 Comment Letter FORM-1

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- ABRUZZINI-H-1
- BARDIN-T-16 and BARDIN-T-19
- BRITTAIN-J-11
- CAPUTO-J-4
- JACKSON-J-7
- LANDERGREN-E-3
- LEWIS-P&D-1 and LEWIS-P&D-5
- MANIES-M-4
- MCGLYNN-P-4
- MEYERCORD-P-3
- NIEMAND-B-2
- SHEW-R-1
- TALTY-C-2, TALTY-C-5, TALTY-C-6 and TALTY-C-15

- WESSLING-A-4

FORM-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Saratoga Retirement community is already solvent, in the black! Yes we need improvements to our Health Care Center, but we don't need the enormous building projects proposed by PRS. This proposed project will not only negatively affect the residents for the rest of their lives, but all our neighbors will be subjected to noise, pollution, traffic, & disruption for years. And the result? More money for PRS & a remaining campus of buildings-not mature trees, not a park, not flat outdoor space for the residents. Welcome to New York City.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreation/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

3.2.2 Comment Letter FORM-2

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- BARDIN-T-8, BARDIN-T-30, and BARDIN-T-31
- BRITTAIN-C-1 and C-2
- BRITTAIN J-2 and J-24
- DAY-J-1

FORM-2.1:

Comment (verbatim)

We are residents at the Saratoga Retirement Community. We read the DEIR and found that the Residents Alternative plan, aka Alt. 1 in the DEIR is mis-represented. The EIR consultants used the Ankrom Moisan architect firm for the interior design Table 4.4-2. The design did not use the footprint that the Residents' Alternative plan proposed Table 4.4-1. We want to challenge this gross mistake and the consequences.

The residents submitted their alternative plan on June 21 2021 and updated on March 21, 2022 to the City of Saratoga for consideration and inclusion as an alternative in the Environmental Impact Report proceedings for the expansion of the Saratoga Retirement Community project submitted by Pacific Retirement Services (PRS).

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

We believe this alternative plan is a more acceptable alternative for the expansion of the Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC). It provides less construction impact on the current senior residents of SRC, significantly reduces the environmental impact on the historic rural campus of the Odd Fellows, provides an up to date, competitive right sized Skilled Nursing Facility, and provides the same number of additional Independent Living units (52) as the PRS plan to assure SRC's future sustainability.

*We have specifically asked "We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this alternative plan further with you and others at your earliest convenience." We have included our website in the submission
http://www.preservesrccampus.org/Residents_Alternative_Submission_for_SRC_Expansion_20210621.pdf*

But after more than two years, EIR never came back to us for more information, instead they used the PRS's architectural firm to sketch something which is completely different from our plan.

The new plan adds a third story, requires up to 12 feet of additional excavation, and replaces the proposed auditorium with a much smaller meeting room. This change was done without consulting Preserve SRC, and Preserve SRC would never have allowed the change. For the reasons stated below, Preserve SRC feels that the DEIR needs to be changed to evaluate Alternative 1 as it was submitted and not as it was misrepresented by AECOM using the Ankrom Moisan design.

The square footage at the current Health Center provides enough space for a two-story building 52 apartments, a meeting room, and underground parking. The three-story building substituted by AECOM/Ankrom Moisan requires a 20-foot foundation depth, which requires significant additional excavation over the Preserve SRC proposal.

Although the AECOM/Ankrom Moisan-proposed three-story building might exceed the height of current treetops, the two-story Preserve SRC Building D would not exceed the height of any treetops.

The DEIR incorrectly calculated parking at the Preserve SRC proposed Building D. The Preserve residents' plan provides 20 surface parking spaces and 90 underground parking slots; not the 77 spaces stated in the DEIR. Ankrom Moisan did not take advantage of the current elevated empty space under the building with heights varied from 12 feet to 0 feet, as we have planned as part of the underground parking.

Because the Preserve SRC Building D preserves the footprint of the current Health Center, no additional trees would be removed during reconstruction. The AECOM/Ankrom Moisan-proposed Building D requires the removal of at least 48 trees and possible disruption of adjacent riparian areas. Using the same footprint as the existing Health Center means no change to soil instability. No known soil instability has been reported since 1999. Because there will be less excavation and less new construction, construction-related traffic its impact will also be much less than the current DEIR anticipates. Estimated maximum vibration levels and similar impacts must also be re-evaluated based on the actual Preserve SRC proposal. Our Residents' Alternative plan uses the exact footprint as the existing Health Care Center. The environmental report from 1999 studied this exact site. We do not agree with the current DEIR analyses because they used the wrong data. It is imperative to make the corrections in the current DEIR. Many environmental impacts reported in the current

DEIR should be mitigated to Less than significant according to the 1999 report if they used the same footprint. The DEIR must be changed to evaluate the impacts of Building D as originally proposed by Preserve SRC.

Additionally, the Preserve SRC proposal for Building C is also inconsistent with the footprint shown by AECOM/Ankrom Moisan in the DEIR. The Residents' proposed Building C' would not require modification of Colfax Lane, and does not require removing the redwood tree and oak tree at the corner of Colfax and Odd Fellows lane.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

FORM-2.2:

Comment (verbatim)

The Residents' Alternative plan is the ONLY plan which addresses how to take care of the Health Care Center patients during construction. None of the other plans even mentioned it. The Residents' Alternative plan is the only plan which addresses the emergency evacuation access for the Health Care Center patients, because of the proximity of the new Skilled Nursing facility.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

FORM-2.3:

Comment (verbatim)

Preserve SRC also feels that financial objectives of the Project Applicant, while worthy of consideration elsewhere, should not be considered in an Environmental Impact Report. Inclusion of these comments in the DEIR is inappropriate.

If the financial is considered, we have done a detailed analysis based on square footage costs for both apartment and for skilled nursing facilities. After including the interest (or penalty) for no income during the construction of the new skilled nursing building, we still came out with a figure very comparable to the PRS plan of 4 building square footage cost. However, PRS has refused repeatedly to give any cost estimate nor has justified their building the 52 apartment units for renovating the 52 private room and upgrading the current Health Care Center. Our Saratoga Retirement Community does NOT need the 52 new apartments to support our 18-year history of healthy finances.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objective.

3.2.3 Comment Letter FORM-3

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- JACKSON-J-4
- MANIES-M-9 and MANIES-M-16

- SCHMIDEK-J&V-4
- TALTY-C-12

FORM-3.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Bullet points for Skilled Nursing issues:

- *Fails to address the requirement for a health center while the current one is remodeled.*
- *Not to mention completely ignoring the residents plan for building a new one while continuing to use the old one before replacing it with a residential building.*
- *No mention in the details of renovating Skilled Nursing, where is the schedule and how they will do it while the patients are in the nursing home.*
- *What is the environmental impact on noise, vibration, dust during construction?*
- *The length is said to be 2 years, are these rooms renovated in sequential or in parallel? We had very bad experience while the management was doing the balconies repair in 2018-2021. It took 9 months to repair each balcony while residents had no natural light, no fresh air and cannot use the terrace. The repair was done as one block at a time so the whole block of balconies were under this kind of situation for 9 months.*

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Center Renovations.

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts to Existing Health Center Patients.

3.2.4 Comment Letter FORM-4

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- ABRUZZINI-H-2
- BRITTAIN-J-19
- CAPUTO-J-5
- CAPUTO-R-2
- GRIFFIN-M-7
- JOE-V-2
- LEWIS-P&D-3
- MCGLYNN-P-14

FORM-4.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Here is a very important issue which has not been studied thoroughly. The consequence is significant.

Emergency Evacuation needs more study

- *Emergency Evacuation on SRC campus, which also involves our neighbors on Chester Ave. San Marcos Lane and the Fellowship Plaza, needs more study. It is a basic health and safety issue.*
- *How to evacuate the Skilled Nursing patients during emergency evacuation, when at least 40 ambulance has to come to campus. How can the independent Living senior residents driving themselves out in this case? They are all expected to evacuate using their own vehicles according to the management per instruction from our administration (June 21 2023)*
- *The gates on Chester Ave. for the 80 additional Fellowship plaza apartment and the additional 52 SRC apartments are inadequate for emergency evacuation. These gates will not be able to handle the ambulances, the fire trucks and the additional cars. Even now before the constructions, it is already a real threat of safety and health. The report does not have any detailed study and do not have plans to mitigate the danger.*
- *regular cars are unable to exit the bump at the Chester exit.*
 - *Impact TRA-4 Project-related Interference with Emergency Access*
 - *The Project could result in inadequate emergency access. Mitigation MM-TRA-3a: Construction Traffic Control Plan*
 - *The project could result in in adequate emergency access. It has significant impact, not mitigated in the DEIR studies. Referring to Mitigation MM-TRA-3a: Construction Traffic Control Plan*

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

3.2.5 Comment Letter FORM-5

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- BRITTAIN-C-3
- BRITTAIN-J-21
- DARLENE-2
- PARKER-R-2
- STRATMAN-T-5
- UMBACH-L-1

FORM-5.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Every single tree you see (including the huge pine at the far right & the 2 sycamores on this side of the street) will be destroyed to build 1 room next to the Manor.

This is needless destruction of our beautiful gentle giants.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

3.2.6 Comment Letter FORM-6

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- BRITTAIN-C-7
- BRITTAIN-J-15 and BRITTAIN-J-28
- MCGLYNN-P-8
- MEYERCORD-P-4
- TALTY-C-9
- UMBACH-L-4

FORM-6.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I came to live at SRC because it was by far the most beautiful senior living place around. As I look out my front window, I see beautiful greenery—large evergreens, a smoke tree, sycamore trees, crepe myrtle trees & more—many of them many years old.

If the expansion plan of PRS is approved, I will see none of these beauties. And I mean NONE. Every single one is destined to be hacked down. EVERY SINGLE ONE.

This is an unbearable loss. I (& the entire community) will lose the beauty the shade, the oxygen, and the serenity that these lovely trees afford.

Please do not let this happen. Thank you for listening.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

3.2.7 Comment Letter FORM-7

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- ABRUZZINI-H-6
- BARDIN-T-22
- BRITTAIN-J-12 and BRITTAIN-J-17
- GRIFFIN-M-8
- HOWELL-C-1

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

- JACKSON-J-2 and JACKSON-J-3
- MCGLYNN-P-1
- SORENSON-D-4
- TALTY-C-3, TALTY-C-4, TALTY-C-11, and TALTY-C-16
- WALLACE-B-3

FORM-7.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Support for the Alternate 1 Plan at Saratoga Retirement Community

I implore you to stop the devastation planned by PSR to our beautiful Saratoga Retirement Community

I understand that improvements are needed—and the Alternative 1 plan addresses all those needs. But it does not have the devastating environment impact that the PSR plan has.

We love our trees. We love our Historic Park. We love our paths thru the serene campus.

Please don't make our last years a living hell. Alternative 1 makes the necessary improvements without the devastating impact.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

3.2.8 Comment Letter FORM-8

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- ANDERSON-U-1
- BRITTAIN-C-8 and BRITTAIN-C-12
- BRITTAIN-J-9 and BRITTAIN-J-25
- CAPUTO-J-6
- CAPUTO-R-7
- DARLENE-3
- HOWELL-C-4

- JACKSON-J-6
- KING-A-1
- KING-C-1
- LIU-M-1
- MCGLYNN-P-3
- NIEMAND-B-4
- OFLAHERTY-M-2
- OMURA-J-1
- PARKER-R-1
- ROSIER-M-10
- SHEW-R-3 and SHEW-R-4
- SORENSON-D-2
- STRATMAN-T-2
- TALTY-C-10

FORM-8.1:

Comment (verbatim)

We residents here at Saratoga just love our bocce ball court. That & our putting green are our only outdoor games on campus. We also enjoy the chairs & picnic tables set up in that same park. The large oak tree there was lost in a storm last year & it has not been replaced with anything—not even grass or ground cover. Why? Because the PRS Expansion project plans to eliminate this park entirely (our only park) to make way for more buildings.

If we wanted a campus full of buildings we would have moved to any number of more financially reasonable ones in the Bay Area. Please help us save our green space.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

3.2.9 Comment Letter FORM-9

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- ABRUZZINI-H-3
- BARDIN-T-21
- NIEMAND-B-3

FORM-9.1:

Comment (verbatim)

The proposal to attach a Meeting Room building to the historic Manor building on the SRC campus is a wrong-headed plan. This iconic Mission Revival-style structure represents the heart of this community, whose purpose is to provide housing for the elderly. Its solidity and its classic design have set the style and provided the visual anchor to the community for more than 100 years. It has been recognized for its historic merit by the City of Saratoga. Of course, the setting of a historic building deserves as much protection as the building itself, since a building cannot be perceived without it.

The Manor's prominent setting confirmed the importance of its original purpose: the housing of elderly residents. In 1912, before social security and other social services, retirement homes were a new concept and filled a critical need. The Odd Fellows took seriously the care of their elderly members; this building replaced an earlier structure at a different location.

This handsome Mission Revival-style building is impressive for several reasons. First, its size and bulk fit the site, which was doubtless the premier spot on the property when it was built: the crown of a knoll that dominates its surroundings. The classical design of the building is achieved through its symmetry; adding a wing to its west side will forever destroy that.

Besides intruding on the Manor's setting, the current proposal to site the proposed Meeting Room on the down sloping west side of the Manor would also eliminate one of the few spaces left on campus where there is greenery shaded by trees, an area that has no purpose but to please the eye and refresh the soul. Many mature trees will be sacrificed, at a time when the importance of the tree canopy is increasingly appreciated as a hedge against global warming.

The iconic building itself will not undergo significant changes under this plan (though one exterior wall will be pierced), but the proposed addition of the Meeting Room, dangling offhandedly from its west side, will forever ruin the aspect of a beautiful building, perfectly sited. Viewers will never again see its original perfection, try as they might. And when they drive up to SRC, their initial view of the Manor will include the large Meeting Room, obstructing the handsome white structure on the knoll.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

3.2.10 Comment Letter FORM-10

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- ABRUZZINI-H-1
- ACKUNAS-L-1
- BARDIN-T-7, BARDIN-T-25, and BARDIN-T-29
- BRITTAIN-J-27

- CAPUTO-J-3 and CAPUTO-R-5
- CONNELLY-H-1
- JACKSON-J-5
- KING-A-2
- LEWIS-P&D-2
- MCGLYNN-P-5
- PARKER-R-6
- SHEW-R-2
- SORENSON-D-5
- TALTY-C-8
- WESSLING-A-1

FORM-10.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Among the many concerns we residents have about the PRS Expansion plan, one is more esthetic, less rational, and difficult to quantify: the threat to our historically and architecturally significant central building, known as the Manor. This iconic white stucco-clad building is a glory to behold--graceful and inviting in spite of its bulk, proud with its two bell towers and arched colonnades. The building itself will not undergo significant changes under this plan (though one exterior wall will be pierced), but the proposed addition of the Meeting Room, dangling offhandedly from its west side, will detract from the Manor's classic beauty. It will ruin the aspect of a beautiful building, perfectly sited on its plot.

This handsome Mission Revival style building is impressive. Its size and bulk fit the site, which was doubtless the premier spot on the property when it was built in 1912: on the crown of a knoll that dominates its surroundings. The building's prominent setting confirmed the importance of its purpose: the housing of elderly residents, which the Odd Fellows took seriously.

When the Odd Fellows developed this property in the early 2000s to create today's continuous care community, they took pains to respect and preserve the Manor and the style it set. Changes to the interior were made with care, and exterior alterations were minimal. Importantly, the purpose and use of all the new facilities continued to fulfill the Odd Fellows' original commitment to house the elderly.

Besides intruding on the Manor's setting, the Meeting Room's building site would eliminate one of the few spaces left on campus where there is greenery shaded by mature trees, which will be sacrificed.

Even if the new Meeting Room were to be sensitively designed to compliment the Manor, it will inevitably diminish the visual impact of that grand structure. A classical building is a style defined by symmetry, which will be forever abrogated. Future visitors and historians will never be able to see the Manor as we do; they will look and wonder why anyone was allowed to tack on such an appendage. Their only option will be to crop it out of their photos!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

3.2.11 Comment Letter FORM-11

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- BARDIN-T-6 and BARDIN-T-15
- BASHAM-M-1 and BASHAM-M-2
- BRITTAIN-J-1 and BRITTAIN-J-6
- CAPUTO-R-1
- CONNELLY-H-3
- GRIFFIN-M-4
- HOWELL-C-2
- JACKSON-J-1
- LIN-L-3
- LUNG-C-3
- MANIES-M-13
- MEYERCORD-P-2
- MEYERCORD-W-2
- NIEMAND-B-5
- PARKER-R-4
- PELTA-E-3
- SORENSON-D-3
- STRATMAN-T-6
- TALTY-C-1
- UMBACH-L-2
- WESSLING-A-2

FORM-11.1:

Comment (verbatim)

The question is not when will the next Pandemic hit, but what are we doing to prepare for it?

As a lay person when it comes to very technical details, I reviewed the DEIR for the proposed expansion of the Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC) as best as I could. I found a huge void in the details for the Health Care Center (HCC) remodel other than reducing the 99 beds to 54 and converting all the rooms to private including private toilet

and shower. It was disappointing since this seems the opportune time to learn from the all the studies done post covid and to design SRC HCC with details to mitigate the next pandemic.

The conversion of the semi-private bedrooms and baths to private is a good start but the vague construction schedule shows that as phase four. With recent studies showing that shared bedrooms and bathrooms helped enable the spread of the Covid pathogen, the priority for this conversion should be Project #1. (See article in AARP, 1/3/2023 by Emily Paulin).

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Center Renovations.

FORM-11.2:

Comment (verbatim)

The following are other details that were missing in the SRC DEIR for the HCC:

Emergency Response: after reading all the possible road closures and road re-alignments and the fact that Emergency Medical Response (EMR) vehicles are very frequently on the campus day and night, it seems urgent that the Emergency Access Road be built first! This is the access from Chester Ave with a wide sweep to accommodate fire trucks onto Odd Fellows Drive. For years, residents have begged for this as San Marcos/Odd Fellows drive in the only way in and out of the campus. With all the daytime truck congestion and debris removal during the proposed construction, there needs to be a safe way for fire and emergency vehicles to access the campus.

Response to Comment

As stated in Section 3.16.3 of the Draft EIR, SCCFD requires that the new emergency access must be constructed and completed prior to the commencement of any other construction activities at the site, and this requirement is reflected in the project plans submitted to the City. Therefore, the new secondary access point would be fully functional and available for emergency vehicles to access the SRC campus and Fellowship Plaza property throughout construction and operation of the project, in the event that Odd Fellows Drive were temporarily blocked.

See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation for additional discussion in relation to emergency access to the project site during construction and operation of the project.

FORM-11.3:

Comment (verbatim)

Air Quality, Noise, and vibration analysis were all missing for the interior environment that in-patients in the HCC would be subjected to during the remodel. While the DEIR concerns itself with the exterior environment, no one has examined what the in-patients must endure trapped in their beds during this construction. In an important study done in Cleveland Clinic and reported in The Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine, October 1, 2019, Amjad Kanj MD et al reported in article, "What are the Risks to Inpatients During Hospital Construction or Renovation", found that "Hospital construction ultimately will serve the interests of patients but it also can put in-patients at risk of mold disease, Legionnaires Disease, sleep deprivation, and exacerbation of lung disease."

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

FORM-11.4:

Comment (verbatim)

Solar panels and Water Saving standards were also missing for the HCC remodel plans. There were plans for solar panels for other buildings as well as “Build it Green” ideas but nothing for the HCC.

Response to Comment

As described in Section 2.3.2 of the Draft EIR, the proposed changes to the existing Health Center would involve internal reconfiguration and renovation only—no changes to the building exterior, such as new or replacement landscaping or installation of solar panels, would be undertaken. The reconfiguration would primarily involve the replacement of the existing toilets and sinks in each room with a full accessible bathroom with showers, with some minor interior upgrades to common spaces. The renovations would result in a decreased patient capacity due to the conversion of double rooms to single rooms, which would decrease demand for water and energy associated with the building.

This comment does not raise significant environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response or edits to the Draft EIR is required under CEQA.

FORM-11.5:

Comment (verbatim)

Impact MF-S-3 Direct adverse effects on human beings inside a HCC that is being remodeled. There is a lot of analysis on the outside air, water, noise and vibration but nothing for “Sensitive Receptors” who are unable to move or relocate, trapped as such in their beds and bedrooms in a HCC that is being remodeled. An abled bodied resident can request a change of location if overwhelmed with noise, dust and vibration but no such options are available to the in-patient recovering in a HCC that is undergoing a remodel.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

FORM-11.6:

Comment (verbatim)

In Summary: Build the access road appropriate for fire trucks from Chester to Odd Fellows Road first.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.2 above.

See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

FORM-11.7:

Comment (verbatim)

If a new state of the art HCC is out of the question, then current in-patients at HCC must be re-located and the HCC must be remodeled with latest Covid regulations. This is the next in priority for the health and safety of SRC residents.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Center Renovation.

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

3.2.12 Comment Letter FORM-12

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- BARDIN-T-27
- BRITTAIN-C-10
- BRITTAIN-J-4
- CAPUTO-J-2
- CAPUTO-R-3
- MCGLYNN-P-10
- OMURA-J-2
- PELTA E&D-1

FORM-12.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I am a resident in the Manor building of the Saratoga Retirement Community.

I oppose the building of the proposed Meeting Room. It will have a very significant impact on the Manor residents during construction.

The noise level is beyond the acceptable level as you noted in the DEIR report Table 4.5-6. Construction zone would generate noise levels of up to 95 dBA for the four west-facing units within the western wing of the Manor Building. 95 dBA is like fire alarms in our hallways!! This would exceed the FTA's recommended construction noise criteria of 80 dBA. Such loud noise is very disturbing and causes mental health issues. Particularly for long duration, not just a few minutes but many hours during the day and for many months.

The mitigation suggested that the noise is only during day time, so it will be quiet during after work hours. This report does not consider the seniors at all. We take naps and stay indoors most of the time during the day. These loud noise will be intolerable.

We come here to enjoy our last years peacefully and quietly and we paid an enormous amount of our savings to retire at this lovely place. Please do not build this Meeting room which is directly attached to the Manor.

We do NOT need it!

Response to Comment

The predicted construction noise levels shown in Table 4.5-6 of the Draft EIR (as well as in Tables 3.12-6, 4.4-6, and 4.6-6) are the predicted construction noise levels WITHOUT accounting for any mitigation. As described in Section 3.12.3 of the Draft EIR, mitigation measure MM-NOI-1a requires that the preliminary construction noise mitigation plan be updated to include a suite of mitigation measures, which together would serve to reduce the level of construction noise at nearby receptors, including for those in the western wing of the Manor Building, to below the threshold of significance.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise, for additional discussion of construction noise impacts and the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures.

See also response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See also response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

3.2.13 Comment Letter FORM-13

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- BARDIN-T-24
- BRITTAIN-C-16
- BRITTAIN-J-10
- JACKSON-J-10
- NEIMAND-B-1

FORM-13.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Open space has value beyond its use for recreation, socializing, or refreshing one's soul. It contributes importantly to how we perceive a structure or space intellectually and physically-whether it reads as gracious and inviting or cramped and mean, whether we want to pause in it or keep moving. It enhances the setting for whatever structure it frames, creating a pleasant showcase for man's handiwork. Open space around a town stimulates a rural feel; a tiny park in a busy city becomes a cherished refuge; a "good building site" provides space around a structure that enhances it, allows it to breathe. Thus, the slope before the Manor is critical to its perfect setting and is therefore valuable open space. Not by any stretch would that slope be described as a "good building site," just as the Odd Fellows Park would never be a choice setting for an apartment building. In either case, those proposed structures, with no open space, will appear hemmed in, shoehorned into their sites, which are too small for the structures designed for them. At the same time, their former value as open space has been squandered.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

3.2.14 Comment Letter FORM-14

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- CAPUTO-J-1
- CAPUTO-R-8
- PELTA-E-5

FORM-14.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I am a resident in the Manor building of the Saratoga Retirement Community.

I oppose the building of the proposed Meeting Room. It will have a very significant impact on the Manor residents during construction.

The vibration level during construction is expected to be substantially exceeding the applicable building damage threshold for masonry buildings such as the Manor according the Table 3.12-10 in the DEIR report. Vibration from heavy construction equipment and soil compaction from the weight of the new Meeting Room Addition on recently excavated ground could cause irreparable damage to the foundation of the historic Manor.

The suggested mitigation to minimize the damage to the Manor foundation is to use smaller equipment which might generate lower levels of vibration, yet the impact on human lives inside the Manor right where the Meeting room is constructed is totally ignored. Notification of such vibration activities as suggested in the mitigation will not reduce the impact on our lives. Where do we escape to? This is our home, we do not have other places to go; we live here and we would have to suffer through during the construction of Meeting Room.

If the said 3 months of grading/foundation work lasted more than 3 months, do the residents have any leverage on this time line? Similarly the 7 total months of construction seems to be unrealistic. What can the seniors residents do when the noise and vibration levels are insufferable and last so long? Please be humane, we did not move to a loud and disturbing construction zone.

We come here to enjoy our last years peacefully and quietly and we paid an enormous amount of our savings to retire at this lovely place. Please do not build this Meeting room which is NOT needed.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See response to MASTER-12: Impacts of Construction Vibration on the Historic Manor Building.

See response to MASTER-15: Construction Vibration.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

3.2.15 Comment Letter FORM-15

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- BARDIN-T-18
- BARDIN-T-26
- BRITTAIN-C-11
- BRITTAIN-J-18
- LIU-M-2
- PELTA-E-6
- SCHMIDEK-J&V-1

FORM-15.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Where is the parking tabulation? It should be included in the DEIR as it talked about parking many times, but there is NO clear comparison of parking spaces. Parking is listed as #10 In project objectives. How many parking spaces in Alt. 2 compared with the current parking spaces? How many surface and underground parking spaces? Where are they?

Response to Comment

Information regarding the proposed number of parking spaces for the proposed project is provided in Section 2.3.4 of the Draft EIR, where it states that a total of 569 parking spaces would be provided on campus, an increase of 109 spaces over existing (and 6 more spaces that required by City standards). Additional detail regarding the number of parking spaces within each of the proposed buildings is provided in Section 2.3.1.

Section 4.5.1 of the Draft EIR contains information regarding the number of parking spaces associated with Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative). As discussed in that section, it is assumed that the underground parking garages of either Building A and/or Building C and/or the Meeting Room would be reconfigured to accommodate additional parking spaces so that the total number of parking spaces on site under Alternative 2 would be the same as the proposed project. This reconfiguration could be achieved through additional excavation to expand the size of the underground garages and/or through the use of “parking lifts” that would allow more vehicles to be parked in the same footprint. Note that 30 existing surface parking spaces would be retained if Building B were not constructed, therefore not all 64 of the parking spaces proposed within the Project’s Building B would need to be accommodated in the other buildings.

This comment does not present any new information regarding potential environmental impacts arising from the proposed provision of parking associated with the proposed project or Alternative 2 that would affect the conclusions of the Draft EIR, and no edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

FORM-15.2:

Comment (verbatim)

No mention in the details of renovating Skilled Nursing, even though it is the Project objectives #4. Where is the schedule and how will the renovation carry on while the patients are in the nursing home? What is the environmental impact on noise, vibration, dust during construction? The length is said to be 2 years, are these rooms renovated in sequential or in parallel? We had very bad experience while the management was doing the balconies repair in 2018-2021. It took 9 months to repair each balcony while residents had no natural light, no fresh air and cannot use the terrace. The repair was done as one block at a time so the whole block of balconies were under this kind of situation for 9 months at least. No compensation for the residents during the entire repair period. Is there any assurance that the renovation will be finished in 2 years? How do you enforce the schedule and the length of renovation? It should be clearly stated in the EIR. If the renovation is lengthened the environmental impact will be bigger.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

See response to MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Center Renovations.

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

3.2.16 Comment Letter FORM-16

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- ABRUZZINI-H-4
- BRITTAIN-J-6
- CAPUTO-R-4
- CURRY-B-2
- JOHNSON-G-3
- MERRILL-B-1

FORM-16.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I am strongly against building these apartment building right in the center of our campus. For SRC, the Odd Fellows park is equivalent to the "Central Park." In New York City. It is a safe outdoor area for us to stroll, for us and our neighbors to walk their dogs. It is a safe and outdoor path for us to stroll. We can come out of our apartment walk around to get sunshine and fresh air.

These paths are very accessible even for residents with walkers. We come out of our apartment and walk around to get sunshine and fresh air.

In contrast, the DEIR suggests that these campus walking paths can be substituted by the nearby San Marcos Open space (p.3-260 DEIR). Can you imagine residents taking

their walkers along the Odd Fellows Lane easement, walking along the roads without pedestrian paths, going up the hill to the San Marcos Open Space? Yes, it is only 300 feet to the southeast of the Project Site, but that is “as the crow flies” distance. One has to climb up a steep embankment—inaccessible except by a 2.5-mile round trip along the road or by helicopter. This shows complete lack of understanding of the Seniors’ needs nor respect for seniors’ quality of life.

Please do NOT allow the apartment building to be built on this open space.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

3.2.17 Comment Letter FORM-17

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- BRITTAIN-J-5
- CAPUTO-J-7
- CHU-S-5
- DARLENE-1
- DUNBRIDGE-R-3
- JOE-V-1
- REDIG-J-1
- SNOWBRIDGE-S-1

FORM-17.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Please do NOT destroy our Full-Size Bocce Ball court. The replacement proposed is only 2/3 of the current size. We do NOT want or need a 2-story apartment building on this site.

Over 60 residents regularly enjoy the games. We have many teams, for women, for men, mixed and some with staff and residents. It is a fun and healthy outdoor game.

This is our only outdoor recreation site. We, seniors need it for our mental and physical health.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

3.2.18 Comment Letter FORM-18

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- BRITTAIN-C-14
- BRITTAIN-J-8
- CHAN-R-1
- CLAYDON-R-1
- DIXSON-J-2
- DUBRIDGE-P-3
- JACKSON-J-8
- JOE-V-4
- LIU-M-3
- TALTY-C-13

FORM-18.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I am a resident at the Saratoga Retirement Community.

I enjoy playing Bocce with my neighbors every week, sometimes twice a week. It is a healthy and fun outdoor activity.

I am very upset that the Pacific Retirement Services has proposed a master plan to build a two-story apartment at the site of our Odd Fellows Historical Memorial park with its FULL- size Bocce ball court. The proposed replacement court would only be 2/3 of the current court.

Please do NOT build these apartments. The Bocce ball court is the most important outdoors facility. Over 60 residents regularly enjoy the games. Some of our senior citizens come to play even using walkers!

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to Project.

3.2.19 Comment Letter FORM-19

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- CHU-S-2
- JOE-V-5
- JOHNSON-G-4

- MCGLYNN-P-2
- PERATA-U&D-2

FORM-19.1:

Comment (verbatim)

One of the reasons that I chose Saratoga Retirement Community is the attractive outdoor green space. The bucolic campus is one of the assets of the entire Saratoga City. Here seniors can relax and have fresh air.

I am against Pacific Retirement Service's building the two story high apartment which will occupy all the green space we have. Please do NOT build these apartments. This green space is an irreplaceable jewel.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to Project.

3.2.20 Comment Letter FORM-20

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- BARDIN-T-13
- MANIES-M-2

FORM-20.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Today I asking you to please block any proposal involving construction of the proposed meeting room appendage to the Manor Building and Building A.

The DEIR failed to address the environmental impacts on the local residents. Too often, the impact on nonresidents is given priority over the effect on those of us actually, daily, affected by this project.

Response to Comment

Environmental impacts of the project, including those on local residents, are addressed within Section 3 of the Draft EIR, to the extent required by CEQA and are compared to the thresholds of significance established by the City based on guidance within Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

The comment does not provide any new information regarding potential environmental impacts to local residents that would affect the conclusions of the Draft EIR, and no edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to Project.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

FORM-20.2:

Comment (verbatim)

Here are the reasons:

1. *Obliteration of Odd Fellows Historical Park.*

Construction of Building A would cover up most of the green space currently designated as Odd Fellows Home of California Historical Park, dedicated with a plaque on the site in August, 2008. The proposed meeting room addition to the Saratoga City Heritage landmark Manor building, also a part of the Historical Park, would permanently destroy the architectural symmetry of the beautiful Manor. Together, the new buildings would completely wipe out these important historic resources. The DEIR needs to include the cultural and historic impact of the development covering over the entire Historical Park.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

FORM-20.3:

Comment (verbatim)

2. *Loss of Mature Trees and Green Vista.*

Construction of Building A and the meeting room would require the removal of every protected, mature tree in the Historical Park. The expansive green space would be replaced by a huge two-story apartment building. The DEIR states that although “new buildings may alter the views for individual residents within the campus or on neighboring properties, they would not substantially affect views of scenic vistas from public vantage points or for a substantial number of City residents.” The priority here seems to be people living in other areas of Saratoga and people looking in that direction from vantage points miles away. As one of those “individual residents,” I can tell you this doesn’t sit well. I’ve heard the same from residents of “neighboring properties.”

The DEIR also mentions that removal of trees and the subsequent noise generated by their removal would have a significant impact on the habitats and lifecycles of local bats. While I agree that this is an important consideration (and argument against tree removal), the DEIR makes no mention of the impact of these losses on the elderly residents who are not able to easily relocate their residences to a nearby open area and must endure the noise and disruption in their homes.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Quality.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

FORM-20.4:

Comment (verbatim)

3. Loss of Green Space and Outdoor Recreation Facilities

The proposed Building A and meeting room addition to the Manor building would remove all of the current green space and outdoor recreation facilities at SRC. The DEIR says that this will have “no impact on open space and recreation facilities for City residents.” This statement seems to relegate SRC residents and many of our neighbors to nonresident status and completely dismisses the impact of the loss of outdoor facilities on these people. SRC residents and our neighbors shop and pay taxes in Saratoga—and we vote.

This green space, the Odd Fellows Historical Park, currently sports paved pathways with many benches and tables. A large number of SRC residents (average age 85) have mobility issues requiring canes, walkers, wheelchairs, or motorized assistance to get around. For them and others with physical disabilities, this park is the only accessible outdoor recreation available. The DEIR states that there are other paths and trails within a short driving distance, and even one trail accessible from SRC by a 300-ft path up a steep incline, but these are in no way accessible to residents whose disabilities prevent them from driving or using unpaved trails. The DEIR seems to overgeneralize the population they are assessing and therefore fails to accurately determine the impact on them.

In addition to SRC residents, many neighbors visit the Historical Park regularly to walk their dogs or bicycle in the safe, quiet area. Removing the park means that everyone in the area would have to travel elsewhere to find a similar quiet green space.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

4. “Replacement” Bocce Ball Court Not a Usable Replacement

The current 91-foot, regulation size bocce ball court and other outdoor recreation facilities such as a putting green would be removed if Building A is constructed. The DEIR states that smaller replacements would be built in a tiny area west of Building A, and these smaller facilities would be enough for SRC residents and not impact most Saratoga residents.

The “replacements” are not fine with us. At present, more than 60 residents regularly play bocce ball here. Bocce ball is also a popular spectator sport for many more residents, especially those with limited mobility, for whom it is easily accessible by the paved paths through the Historic Park.

The “replacement” bocce ball court would be only 60 feet in length, 2/3 of regulation size. Some of the SRC teams compete with outside teams on regulation 91-foot courts. Losing our 91-foot court means that those residents would have to find another court, who knows where, to practice for competition. The proposed 60-foot “replacement” is unacceptable and indicates another example of the devaluation of the impact of this project on residents.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

FORM-20.5:

Comment (verbatim)

In summary, there are many reasons why constructing Building A and the meeting room addition to the Manor building would have a negative effect on the historic, environmental, and human aspects of the Saratoga Retirement Community and its neighbors. Here I have listed only a few of the most important reasons for me. There are other options for development that can meet all goals without either of those buildings. We accept a project with limited buildings or the Residents' alternative which gives minimal impact on the residents' environment.

At the very least, please insure [sic] that the entire impact of constructing those buildings is evaluated in the environmental impact study. As it is now, the DEIR seems to have overlooked or undervalued many impacts on those of us most affected.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Resident's Alternative (Alternative 1).

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

3.2.21 Comment Letter FORM-21

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- CAPUTO-1
- CHAN-R-2
- CHU-S-1
- MCGLYNN-P-13
- REDIG-J-2
- SORENSON-D-1

FORM-21.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Just look at these photos. Can you see why we treasure our campus? If you allow PRS to build these monstrous apartment buildings, we will lose our outdoors recreation, our green open space, our views, our protected mature trees and the fresh air.

We strongly against building these apartment building right in the center of our campus.

Current View: Odd Fellows Park from West Cottages Lane

- *Redwood and oak trees will be eliminated*
- *All green space replaced with massive Building A*
- *All recreational sites are eliminated by Building A*

[NOTE: comment included images, see Appendix A for details.]

Same view if PRS plan is approved

- *Building A occupies entire open space of Odd Fellows Park*
- *View from street becomes of balconies and buildings, instead of trees and green open space*
- *Bocce Ball Court reduced from 91 feet to 60 feet, and shade eliminated*

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

3.2.22 Comment Letter FORM-22

A copy, or partial copy, of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- BARDIN-T-9
- BARDIN-T-20 (first page only)
- BRITTAIN-J-13 (first page only)
- CAPUTO-J&R-1
- CAPUTO-R-6 (first page only)

FORM-22.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I am a resident at the Saratoga Retirement Community. I am concerned about the SRC expansion proposed by the out-of-state management company.

I understand the EIR consultants have concluded that the apartment building in front of the Manor and the building on the employee parking lot site to the west of the Manor along the Odd Fellows Lane have significant impact on the historical resources. Because they would obscure the historical Manor. But the Meeting Room tacked onto the west wall of the Manor building is acceptable.

Response to Comment

The commenter correctly states that the Draft EIR concluded that the “apartment building in front of the Manor” (i.e., Building B of the proposed project) would have a significant and unavoidable impact on historical resources.

However, the commenter also states that Draft EIR concludes that the “building on the employee parking lot site to the west of the Manor along Odd Fellows Lane” would also have a significant impact to historical resources. This second statement, if the commenter is referring to Building D of Alternative 3 (the Applicant’s Alternative), is incorrect. As discussed in Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR and summarized in Table 4.6-4, Building D of Alternative 3 would not conflict with any of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, and therefore would not cause a significant impact to the Manor Building. Alternative 3 (the Applicant’s Alternative) would have a potentially significant impact to the Manor Building due to the construction of the Meeting Room addition and new parking lot between the Manor Building and Odd Fellows Drive, but this potentially significant impact would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures MM-CUL-1a through MM-CUL-1c.

See also response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

FORM-22.2:

Comment (verbatim)

We do not agree with the DEIR statement that the mitigation is less than significant as stated in Impact MM-CUL-1: Adverse Change to Historical Resources When you drive into the Odd Fellows Lane, immediately you see the beautiful open space with trees and the west wall of the Manor building. It is quite an impressive view. If you put the two level structure such as the proposed Meeting room attached to the Manor, it would be in the direct sightline of the Manor, it would reduce the magnificent view of the Manor.

[NOTE: comment included images, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building. As discussed in that response and in Section 3.5.3 of the Draft EIR, considerations to the setting of the Manor Building, including views of the building from Odd Fellows Drive, were considered in the analysis.

FORM-22.3:

Comment (verbatim)

In addition, the Meeting room would completely offset the original symmetrical design of the Manor. Manor is a historical building over 100 years old and is one of the two significant buildings in Saratoga. It is on the Saratoga historical inventory list. It should not be altered.

The red zone on the left (West) to the Manor indicates the Meeting Room site. The proposed 2-level Meeting Room completely destroys the original symmetry of the historical Manor. And it occupies the green open space and eliminates the existing beautiful mature trees.

[NOTE: comment included images, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

FORM-22.4:

Comment (verbatim)

In addition to the above aesthetic and cultural issues of the Meeting Room, here are some serious issues of the proposed Meeting Room:

1) The proposed building site of the Meeting Room Addition requires the elimination of 14 mature trees, including Chinese pistache, liquidambar, crepe myrtle, and protected redwoods. Shown here the white Manor West view is to the left. The Meeting room is going to occupy where the trees and the lawn area. All the trees, including the protected mature redwood trees are to be removed. The Project will replace these majestic mature trees with some young small trees or bushes. This is NOT acceptable.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space

FORM-22.5:

Comment (verbatim)

2) Daytime noise during construction of the proposed Meeting Room Addition is estimated to reach 95 decibels, which exceeds the FTA [Federal Transit Administration] recommendations. The sound of the fire alarms in residence hallways is equivalent to 95 decibels. Retired seniors do not work outside of their apartments, they use their apartment during daytime, the constant many months of loud noise is harmful to their mental health. Where is study of the human impact? What can the seniors do when the noise level is insufferable and last so long? Please be humane, we did not move to a loud and disturbing construction zone. The impact is significant.

3) We disagree with the less than significant impact in (MN-NOI-1a) 3) Vibration from heavy construction equipment and soil compaction from the weight of the new Meeting Room Addition on recently excavated ground, shown in Table 3.12-10 could cause irreparable damage to the foundation of the historic Manor. The impacts on Humans living or working in the Manor are not evaluated. How can you enforce the suggested minimization measures which are both impractical and inefficient. How does notification of vibration level help the residents? They cannot move out during this period when the project uses vibratory rollers, or drill rigs or large bulldozers etc. The impact is significant. We disagree with NMNOI-2.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-15: Construction Vibration.

See response to MASTER-12: Impacts of Construction Vibration to the Historic Manor Building.

FORM-22.6:

Comment (verbatim)

4) *The construction length is unrealistic. Table 4.5-6 listed that 3 months of 95 dBA noise and 7 month total. How do you guarantee for this projected length? Do the residents have any leverage if the construction length is violated? The Construction period is unrealistic. Construction duration has never been proven to be within schedule at SRC. The said 3 months grading/foundation, 7 months total seems to be unreal. Judging by the last major repair work on campus, it took 9 months to repair the balconies for the apartment buildings. During the 9 months, residents had no natural light and no fresh air. In spite of the complaints, Management never paid any attention. So we definitely do not trust in this unrealistic timeline. All these issues have significant impacts to the residents and the environment. PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THE MEETING ROOM!*

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

3.2.23 Comment Letter FORM-23

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- ACKUNAS-L-2
- BRITTAIN-C-5
- BRITTAIN-J-20
- HOWELL-C-3
- SCHMDEK-J&V-3

FORM-23.1:

Comment (verbatim)

The Project Description in the Executive Summary includes the following statement:

"the number of skilled nursing beds within the Health Center would be reduced from 94 to 52 (ie., a reduction of 42 skilled nursing beds)" The number of memory care and skilled nursing beds is proposed to be reduced due to conversion of semi-private double-occupancy rooms to private single occupancy rooms each with their own fully-accessible bathroom."

The Project Objectives #4 states:

"Provide upgrades to the existing Health Center, which would include converting existing semiprivate rooms to private rooms with private baths."

That seems to be where references to the Renovation of the Health Center stops.

There are no references to the construction work that will proceed in stages in the Health Center, nor are there any references to the impact on the 50 to 60 vulnerable senior patients housed in the Health Center during this 2 year construction:

Reference MFS-3 (Direct or indirect Adverse Effects on Human Beings).

Additionally, there are no references to the noise, vibrations, dirt and dust or displacing these senior patients to make way for construction while raising significant hazards to their health. Reference HAZ-1, HAZ-5, LUP-1, NOI-1, NOI-2, POP-2, UTI-1, UTI-3, WF-3 and MFS-3.

The only Alternative which avoids this problem is the Residents' Alternative 1. The DEIR needs substantial revisions to recognize this issue.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Center Renovations.

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

3.2.24 Comment Letter FORM-24

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- ACKUNAS-L-3
- BARDIN-T-17
- BARDIN-T-23
- BERGLUND-R-2
- BRITTAIN-C-4
- BRITTAIN-C-9
- BRITTAIN-J-16
- LEWIS-P&D-6
- PARKER-R-5
- STRATMAN-T-4

FORM-24.1:

Comment (verbatim)

The DEIR has reviewed the Project plans for a building B in front of the Historical Manor Building and the proposed Meeting room attached to the side of the same Manor Building with astonishing different standards.

In the case of Building B the EIR found a conflict with the Historical Manor that could not be mitigated (See Table 3.5-1- Item 9 and 10 of the Summary of Project Adherence to Secretary of Interior's Standard for Rehabilitation)

In that same table, 3.5-1 The finding for item #9 found a potential conflict with the meeting room. The next page ,3-94, item 2 states

"The proposed construction of the Meeting Room and its attachment to the West elevation the Manor building thru a building hyphen would also remove and/or alter character defining features represented in the west (secondary) elevation."

On page 3-101 the EIR further states “The proposed construction of the Meeting Room Addition as part of the Project could potentially result in the substantial adverse change in the Manor Building due to the potential for damage during construction” The symmetry of the Manor Building is forever lost with the Meeting Room attached to its western wall of the Manor.

The Meeting Room needs a specific evaluation under CUL-1.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

FORM-24.2

Comment (verbatim)

Additionally, there has been no evaluation of the environmental impact of the current Residents living in Apartments 1101, 1202 and 1203 during construction or after wards with their apartment windows on the western manor wall being mostly blocked out by the new Meeting Room.

Response to Comment

With respect to construction-related impacts, Section 3.12.3 of the Draft EIR analyzes noise and vibration impacts during construction, and specifically discusses impacts to west-facing units in the west wing of the Manor Building during construction of the Meeting Room. For noise, discussed under Impact NOI-1 in the Draft EIR, Table 3.12-6 of the Draft EIR identifies these units as the nearest receptor for the Meeting Room construction zone, and identifies a predicted noise level at these receptors of up to 95 dBA. This impact exceeds the FTA threshold of 80 dBA and is therefore identified as a potentially significant impact, with mitigation measure MM-NOI-1a identified to reduce the impacts to less than significant with mitigation. See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

Similarly, for impact NOI-2 in Section 3.12.3 of the Draft EIR, Table 3.12-10 identifies the Manor Building as the closest receptor for vibration generated during construction of the Meeting Room, and identifies that impacts would exceed both the thresholds for potential building damage and for human annoyance. Mitigation measures MM-NOI-1a, MM-NOI-2, and MM-CUL-1a are recommended to reduce the impacts to less than significant with mitigation. See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Vibration.

With respect to the blocking of windows in these units from the Meeting Room itself, the new building would be constructed in accordance with applicable building codes and City standards, which include consideration of appropriate access to light and shade from habitable structures. As discussed in response to MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Quality, while the proposed project would alter the views from the windows of private residences (substantially, in the case these particular apartments) such changes are not considered to be significant environmental impacts under CEQA.

FORM-24.3

Comment (verbatim)

At a minimum EIR evaluations and mitigations should be reviewed for AES-1 Scenic Vista, HAZ-1 hazardous emissions, NOI-1 increased noise levels, NOI-2 vibrations & dust, POP-2 displacement of people, and MFS-3 adverse impact on human beings.

Response to Comment:

The commenter appears to disagree with the analysis and conclusions of the Draft EIR with respect to the listed impacts but does not provide any specific reasons for disagreement or details of inaccuracies in the analysis. Each of the above-mentioned impacts have been analyzed for the proposed project and compared to the thresholds of significance utilized by the City, which are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Further information regarding the reasons for the conclusions with respect to each of the impacts is contained within Sections 3.2.3 (Impact AES-1), Section 3.9.3 (Impact HAZ-1), Section 3.12.3 (Impacts NOI-1 and NOI-2), Section 3.13.3 (Impact POP-2), and Section 3.21 (Impact MFS-3).

See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See also response to MASTER-15: Construction Vibration.

3.2.25 Comment Letter FORM-25

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- BRITTAIN-C-6
- BRITTAIN-J-14
- LEWIS-P-1
- MCGLYNN-P-12
- STRATMAN-T-3

FORM-25.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Emergency access routes within the campus would be maintained throughout construction. Colfax Lane and West Cottages Lane would be temporarily rerouted for approximately 3 months (!!!) during Phases 2 and 3; however, at least two of the three access roads would be open for emergency vehicle access at all times.

This rerouting of just 3 months is illusory, and does not address how residents of the cottages will be able to enter their garages etc.

This is real double talk. In one section it is said that analysis and resolution of the traffic within the SRC campus during construction is an SRC issue, and that the ERI does not address such. It just Promises that emergency routes will be open – but what about normal inhabitants??

In another section it is stated that the Park would be used for staging During the whole XX [sic] years of construction. This is really a grand! Effort to destroy, endanger and encumber the lives of residents for who knows how many years.

The last stated duration was announced on July 20, 2023 by the PRS hired Consultant and Project Leader, that it would take 7 (seven) years to complete the construction of plan 3, so for all these years we would be looking at dirt trucks, etc.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See response to MASTER-17: Construction Staging.

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

3.2.26 Comment Letter FORM-26

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- ABRUZZINI-H-5
- CAPUTO-J-8
- GRIFFIN-M-3
- JACKSON-J-9
- JOHNSON-G-2
- LEWIS-P&D-4
- MANIES-M-12
- MANIES-M-3
- MCGLYNN-P-9
- SORENSON-D-6
- WESSLING-A-5

FORM-26.1:

Saratoga has been named Tree City USA every year since 2006 and has won several national awards for its trees like America in Bloom's Best Tree Canopy, Best Urban Forest and Best Tree Heritage Program from 2015-2017.

However, after recent winter storms, Saratoga's tree canopy faced several threats from extreme rainfall and strong winds. At least 13 large trees and 15 limbs had to be removed from Saratoga roads. Others fell on private property.

At a time when trees are being lost due to weather, it is sad to think that the City would allow perfectly healthy trees to be chopped down for the sake of building housing. Such is the plans before the City Council and Planning Commission when a developer is proposing several buildings be built at Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC) that would take down 124 trees, 65 of which are protected by the City's code. Some of these large trees are over 100 feet tall and six feet in diameter, They provide shade, habitat for birds another animals and contribute to the beauty of the SRC campus. They buffer noise, cool the environment at a time of record breaking heat and help to remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere.

SRC does not need the proposed buildings at the sake of losing one of the things that makes it so special to the residents ... tall, majestic, healthy trees. I urge the City

Council and the Planning Commission to reject this plan in favor of “no plan” or at the very least the resident’s alternative plan.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to Project.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents’ Alternative (Alternative 1).

3.2.27 Comment Letter FORM-27

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- BRITTAIN-C-13
- BRITTAIN-J-26
- GRIFFIN-M-6
- JOE-V-3
- MANIES-M-8
- MERRILL-B-2
- WALLACE-B-1

FORM-27.1:

Comment (verbatim)

We here at SRC have moved here to spend our remaining years in the lovely verdant town that is Saratoga. Our senior community is a vibrant part of this town. Many of us have lived for years in our Saratoga homes before moving to the Retirement Community.

You can imagine our dismay & distress when we learned that PRS has plans to destroy our greenery to make way for more buildings & apartments. The residents have presented a plan that would not have nearly the ugly environment impact as the PRS plan.

We hope the city of Saratoga will seriously consider this alternate plan – one that would establish both the new residences and the needed improvements of other buildings, but would not have the disastrous impact on our campus.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents’ Alternative (Alternative 1).

3.2.28 Comment Letter FORM-28

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- BARDIN-T-12 (partial)
- BRITTAIN-J-7
- JOE-V-6
- LUNG-C-2
- MANIES-M-15
- WAGGONER-J-1

FORM-28.1:

Comment (verbatim)

When I read the DEIR, I found the report ignoring the environment and the lives of our 200 Independent Living residents on campus. There are issues which cannot be mitigated to less than significant as suggested in the DEIR.

The full size 91-foot long Bocce ball court cannot be replaced by the shorter 2/3 length court. DEIR 3-260 stated, "These facilities would be reconstructed elsewhere on campus, although some of the reconstructed facilities may be of a smaller size than the existing facilities." Please note The facility has to be full size. The reconstructed elsewhere is vague and Needs more specifics. We have over 60 regular players with many different competitive teams on campus. This is the most popular outdoor activity for the SRC senior population, even residents with walkers strive to play. We do not agree with the conclusion in Impact REC-2. The impact is Significant. This facility would be demolished to create space for proposed Building A. We object building A.

The new building A and meeting room would remove ALL the remaining outdoor recreation green space. The space is currently not on any previously disturbed areas. The residents depend on this space to have fresh air, to have outdoor recreation, to relax and to enjoy the natural vista. The wide range indoor recreation activities cannot replace the outdoor recreation activities. We disagree with the Impact REC-2 analysis. The Impact analysis for REC-1 concludes "the Project is not anticipated to cause a substantial increase demand for public open space and recreational facilities within the city." But there is no analysis of the impact on the residents and the neighbors. There are over 200 Independent Living residents who use this space daily, the daily demand is large. The environmental impact is significant when you eliminate this space.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

3.2.29 Comment Letter FORM-29

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- ANDERSON-U-2
- BARDIN-T-12 (partial)
- BRITTAIN-J-23

- JOHNSONMARSHALL-1
- LIN-L-2
- LUNG-C-1
- MCGLYNN-P-7
- PELTA-E-4
- WESSLING-A-3

FORM-29.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I am a resident at the Saratoga Retirement Community.

When I read the DEIR, I found the report ignoring the environment and the lives of our 200 Independent Living residents on campus. There are issues which cannot be mitigated to less than significant as suggested in the DEIR.

Here are a few examples on Recreation and Open Space:

1) We lose our Odd Fellows historical park if Building A is allowed. The EIR section 3.15.1 listed 28 acres of existing public park facilities within one mile of project site. SRC expansion will have no impact on a single existing public recreate facility.” Let me ask, “Where is the study for the impact on the SRC residents? Even though there are 28 acres nearby. Would you ask your elderly parents to take Uber to one of these parks with their walkers. At present, the park on campus is accessible any time and day, residents take their walkers to the park, sit on the chair and enjoy fresh air. Neighbors come with their dogs or bike around the campus in the evenings or weekends. This park serves many citizens. To eliminate this park has a very significant environmental impact. But The DEIR REC-1 never studies the impact if you eliminate the park.

2) Loss of the open space on SRC

Building A and Meeting room take away the remaining 6% of our accessible open green space. EIR 3.15.1 environmental setting listed that the new trail connects the Project to the San Marcos Open Space approx. 300 feet SE of the Project site. Please note The 300 feet is “as the crow flies “distance. One has to climb up a steep embankment— inaccessible except by a 2.5-mile round trip along the road or by helicopter! While on campus, we currently have safe and smooth paths for the seniors to enjoy the open space. Many senior residents here have mobility issues, poor eye sight, hard at hearing and limited physical strength, they are not able to go on any of the suggested open space or hiking trails. DEIR never considers the special needs of the Seniors on campus. The analyses are inappropriate and irrelevant.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

3.2.30 Comment Letter FORM-30

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- DUBRIDGE-R-1
- DUBRIDGE-D&P-1
- GRIFFIN-M-5

FORM-30.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Why did you come to Saratoga to live and retire?

What was it about the environment that was so appealing that you spent 25 or 50 or more years of your life here?

What do you mean when you use the word environment?

We now have a 650 page DEIR document that is supposed to define the Saratoga environment and how it will be affected by the expansion.

Is that how you would define our environment here in Saratoga? Or would you use words like beautiful, relaxing, stimulating, peaceful, rural, close to nature with natural historic trees, a central park for relaxation and activities in foothills of the Santa Cruz mountains?

Would you include the beautiful views and vistas from your apartment or cottage?

Would you include playing bocce ball under the redwoods within easy walking with your walker from your home?

Would you include facilities that are non-institutional and low population density?

Would you include large lots, open spaces and privacy?

Would you include the beauty of being in the foothills of the Santa Cruz Mountains?

The DEIR is a bureaucratic writeup that misses the key environmental factors that are the basis for our wanting to live here in Saratoga. The authors never asked Saratoga residents what in the Saratoga environment they value the most. This is a fatal flaw in their methodology and renders the document useless and totally misleading.

According to that report, vistas are only for outsiders and not for SRC residents who love looking out of their windows through the redwoods to the eastern foothills or the Santa Cruz Mountains. Outdoor recreational areas are for outsiders, not for SRC residents who cannot drive or walk without aid and cannot travel to outside recreational areas. The Odd Fellows Historical Park can be eliminated even though it is SRC's only outside recreational area analogous to Central Park in New York city. Even prisons have outdoor recreation areas. Bats are more important than residents.

This island of apartments that would be packed so close together that there is no room for even a bocce ball court may belong in Cupertino or Sunnyvale or San Jose which

are replete with high density apartment house complexes, but it does not belong in Saratoga.

I urge you to use your brains and hearts and realize this expansion project will do irreparable and un-mitigable damage to Saratoga and the Saratoga Retirement Community's environment.

Response to Comment

The CEQA statute (PRC Section 21060.5) defines “environment” as the physical conditions that exist within the area which will be affected by a proposed project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, noise, or objects of historic or aesthetic significance. The analysis of environmental impacts within the Draft EIR was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, which requires the Lead Agency to establish thresholds of significance for each environmental topic. The thresholds of significance utilized by the City are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. To the extent that the commenters disagree with the thresholds of significance utilized by the City and/or with the conclusions of the Draft EIR, no specific inaccuracies or suggestions for more appropriate thresholds are identified.

See also response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See also response to MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Quality.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See also response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

3.2.31 Comment Letter FORM-31

A copy of this form letter was received by the following commenters:

- BRITTAIN-C-15
- BRITTAIN-J-22
- BRITTAIN-J-3
- CONNELLY-H-2
- JOHNSON-G-1
- JOHNSON-S&E-1
- LIN-L-1
- MCGLYNN-P-6
- MEYERCORD-W-3
- OFLAHERTY-M-1
- PARKER-R-3
- STRATMAN-T-1
- TALTY-C-14
- UMBACH-L-3

FORM-31.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Saratoga Retirement Community is widely known for it's beautiful green campus – full of trees, bushes, walking paths, & lovely landscaping.

The new PRS Expansion Plan plans to eliminate most of this beauty by packing it with more housing & mor buildings. There are 124 beautiful large trees (& much more greenery) scheduled for destruction.

Our park & outdoor recreation area will be taken from us. Our trees & birds will be gone. It will be incredibly sad & depressing for those of us in the last years of our lives.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreation/Open Space.

Page left blank to facilitate double-sided printing.

3.3 Responses to Comments from Agencies and Organizations

Written comments were received from one agency and three organizations during the public review period for the Draft EIR, each of whom were assigned a Commenter Code (typically the agency or organization's acronym). A list of all written comments received (and their associated Commenter Code) is presented in Table 2-A in Section 2.

Each written comment letter was reviewed and individual comments within each letter (each containing a single theme, issue, or concern) were assigned a number. Copies of each comment letter/email received are contained in Appendix A and are marked up in red to indicate the individual comments within. For example, the first topic raised in a comment letter from Valley Water (Commenter Code: VW) would be coded as VW-1.1, the second topic in the same letter would be coded as VW-1.2. If Valley Water had submitted a second letter, the first topic raised in the second letter would be coded as VW-2.1.

The full text or a summary of each comment topic is reproduced below, followed by the City's response to that comment topic, in turn. Note that minor spelling and/or grammatical errors have been corrected within "verbatim" comments and introductory text not pertinent to the issues being raised may not have been reproduced for brevity.

3.3.1 Commenter: Valley Water (VW)

Comment VW-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

References to "District" and "SCVWD" should be updated to "Valley Water" for consistency with our new name.

Response to Comment

Revisions are proposed within Sections 3.10.1, 3.10.3, 3.10.4, 3.18.1, 4.4.3, 4.5.3, and 4.6.3 to update the references to Valley Water, as requested.

Comment VW-1.2:

Comment (verbatim)

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) 06085C0219H, effective on May 18, 2009, the project site is located in Zone X, an area with a 0.2% annual chance flood hazard. The description of the Flood Zone X on pages 3-179 and 3-180 should be updated to only include this definition and should reference the FEMA FIRM.

Response to Comment

Revisions are proposed within Section 3.10.1 (under subheading "Federal Emergency Management Agency Special Flood Hazard Areas") to update the description of the flood zone and to reference the FEMA FIRM.

Comment VW-1.3:

Comment (verbatim)

On page 3-183, in the Groundwater discussion, references to Valley Water's Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP) should be updated to reference the most recent GWMP, published in 2021. It should also note that the 2021 GWMP was submitted to the Department of Water Resources to fulfill the requirements of periodic evaluation of the Alternative Groundwater Sustainability Plan.

Response to Comment

Revisions are proposed within Sections 3.10.1 (under subheading Environmental Setting), 3.10.4 (under subheading Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation), and 6 (under subheading Hydrology and Water Quality) to reference the updated 2021 GWMP. Throughout the Draft EIR, references to Valley Water's "Alternative GSP" have also been revised to refer to Valley Water's "GWMP". These minor revisions do not change the analysis or conclusions relating to hydrology and water quality impacts within Section 3.10 of the Draft EIR.

Comment VW-1.4:

Comment (verbatim)

According to Valley Water's 2021 Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP) the general depth to groundwater within the project boundary is 30-50 feet. The project should incorporate measures for waterproofing the below grade parking garages if groundwater is encountered during construction.

Response to Comment

The commenter provides information related to the general depth to groundwater within the project boundary. As discussed in Section 3.7.1 of the Draft EIR (under subheading "Groundwater" on page 3-127) groundwater was not encountered during geotechnical explorations at the site to a depth of 30 feet and the California Geological Survey estimates depth to historically high ground water levels in the site vicinity to be greater than 30 feet below the ground surface, which is consistent with the information provided by the commenter.

As described in Section 2.4.3, Site Preparation and Earthworks, the maximum depth of excavation for the proposed project would be for Building C, at approximately 25 feet below the ground surface. Because this maximum depth of excavation is shallower than the anticipated depth to groundwater, groundwater is not anticipated to be encountered during construction; therefore, measures requiring waterproofing for below grade parking garages are not necessary to reduce potential environmental impacts of the project. Nonetheless, the City intends to include a condition of approval requiring that if groundwater is encountered during construction then waterproofing measures for below-grade components must be incorporated.

No changes to the EIR are required in response to this comment.

Comment VW-1.5:

Comment (verbatim)

According to Valley Water records, there are no active wells within the project boundary. While Valley Water has records for most wells located in the county, it is always possible that a well exists that is not in Valley Water's records. If previously unknown wells are found on the subject property during development, they must be properly destroyed under permit from Valley Water or registered with Valley Water and protected from damage.

Response to Comment

The commenter provides confirmation that there are no known wells on the project site. Because there are no known wells on the project site, no potential environmental impacts relating to disturbance or destruction of wells are identified in the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the City intends to include a condition of approval requiring that if a previously unknown well were to be encountered during project implementation it would be properly destroyed under permit from Valley Water or registered with Valley Water and protected from damage.

No changes to the EIR are required in response to this comment.

Comment VW-1.6:

Comment (verbatim)

Valley Water does not have any right of way or facilities within the project boundary; therefore, in accordance with Valley Water's Water Resources Protection Ordinance, a Valley Water encroachment permit is not required for the project.

Response to Comment

The commenter provides confirmation that a Valley Water encroachment permit is not required for the project. No changes to the EIR are required in response to this comment.

3.3.2 Commenter: Preserve SRC (PRESERVE)

PRESERVE-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

Although our primary recommendation is "No Project" to the proposed expansion, we realize this isn't a possible option because of the pressure on Saratoga to approve such proposals to meet the state's housing requirement and the justification of "No Project" has to be based on Health and Safety.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-2: Support for No Project Alternative. It is unclear what the commenter means regarding justifications based on Health and Safety. The Lead Agency's decision-making process takes multiple factors into consideration, including the environmental impacts of the project (as analyzed in the EIR) as well as potential benefits of the project, conflicts with City policies, and other factors.

No changes to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

PRESERVE-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

However, we support the need to add housing units to our SRC campus and we thereby agree with either of the below alternatives:

A modified Alternative 2 (Alternative 2 was recommended by the DEIR) –Building A and Meeting Room should both be eliminated from the alternative because of environmental concerns that are expressed in the resident’s feedback to the DEIR. Although Building C is still part of the alternative, it should be limited in height so it doesn’t interfere with the view either of or from the historical manor. And with conditions that Emergency evacuation route be built and have scheduled renovation for the Health Care Center.

Response to Comment

In accordance with Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. The City as lead agency is responsible for determining the range of reasonable project alternatives for further consideration, and the alternatives selected for consideration in Section 4 of the Draft EIR represent a reasonable range of alternatives, pursuant to Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines. Alternative 1 (Residents’ Alternative), Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative) and Alternative 3 (Applicant’s Alternative) were selected for further analysis based on their ability to feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives as well as reduce the significant impacts of the project, particularly the significant and unavoidable impact to historical resources. The commenter’s suggested modifications to Alternative 2, i.e., elimination of the Meeting Room and Building A, would not achieve the basic objectives of the project, as it would only provide 20 new residential units (in Building C), less than half that of the proposed project.

No changes to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

PRESERVE-1.3

Comment (verbatim)

Alternative 1 (Alternative 1 is the recommended solution by the SRC residents) – This solution provides for a new Health Care Center to be built at the same location as the building C in alternative 2. It also provides for a 52-unit building (not the 35 stated in the DEIR) where the current Health Care Center is located. Alternative 1 is incorrectly described in the DEIR; please refer to the resident’s DEIR input correcting this description or details of the Residents’ alternative as documented on the PreserveSRCCampus.org website.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents Alternative (Alternative 1)

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents Alternative (Alternative 1)

PRESERVE-1.4

Comment (summary)

This section includes details of various aspects of the SRC resident’s response, including omissions and errors in Draft EIR.

1. Mischaracterization of resident population
2. Misrepresentation of the Residents' Alternative Plan (Alternative 1)
3. Remove Financial Objective from Environmental Impact Report
4. Meeting Room Addition to Manor Building Needs More Study
5. Impact of Construction Noise on Residents
6. Loss of Green Space and Outdoor Recreation Facilities
7. Traffic and Emergency Evacuation
8. Impact of Health Center Renovations Omitted from Draft EIR
9. Air Pollution
10. Incorrect Assessment of Public Benefits

Response to Comment

This comment is introductory in nature and refers to later comments which provide more detail. See Responses to Comments PRESERVE-1.5 through PRESERVE-1.23, below.

PRESERVE-1.5

Comment (verbatim)

Mischaracterization of resident population.

The consultants fail to understand that the population of the Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC) is elderly, with an average age of 85. Many have physical disabilities affecting mobility, sight, and hearing, and others have cognitive disabilities affecting decision making, reaction times, and ability to adapt to change. Most are retired and spend a significant amount of their time in their homes or at other sites within the confines of the community. Some require assistance in daily living tasks and cannot leave the community easily. Around 50-60 residents are bedridden patients at the Health Center.

When the impact on human beings is taken into account in the DEIR, the people mentioned are the general population of the City of Saratoga, or even unidentified visitors to vista points miles away from SRC. In one case, priority is given to bats over people! When the impact on actual SRC residents is even mentioned, it is usually dismissed as negligible or not enough to warrant consideration. Substandard mitigation is considered good enough for the residents in the form of smaller or fewer recreation facilities or enough notice that noise or vibration beyond endurance is about to occur so they'd better be prepared.

Consultants need to investigate the true impact on the real-life human population of SRC, and mitigation must actually meet the needs of this population and no other. Anything less is an outrage.

Response to Comment

Environmental impacts of the project, including those on SRC residents, are addressed within Section 3 of the Draft EIR, to the extent required by CEQA and are compared to

the thresholds of significance established by the City based on guidance within Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-15: Construction Vibration.

PRESERVE-1.6

Comment (verbatim)

Misrepresentation of the Residents' Alternative Plan (Alternative 1).

In DEIR Section 4.1 Alternative 1, the EIR consultants used the Ankrom Moisan architecture firm for the interior design of proposed Building D (Table 4.4-2). Although Ankrom Moisan was the designer for the Health Care Center in 1999, and they have the exact drawings of the footprints etc., yet their design used a completely different footprint from the one proposed in the Residents' Alternative Plan (the original footprint of the Health Center building, Table 4.4-1). This change was done without ever consulting or even notifying the residents, who would never have consented and very much object to the change. Instead, they chose to ask for clarification from the applicant, who is totally against the Residents' Alternative Plan.

Ankrom Moisan also misrepresented other features in Alternative 1, such as the size and shape of the proposed new Health Center, Building C (should be 40 beds rather than 52 beds), the number of parking spaces in the underground garage of Building D (only 50 spaces vs. 90 submitted under Alternative 1), and incorrect values in Table 4.4-2 for the excavate volume and maximum depth of excavation for the original design in Alternative 1 for Building D.

The final EIR must correct these major errors and unsanctioned changes to the Residents' Alternative Plan.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents Alternative.

PRESERVE-1.7

Comment (verbatim)

Remove Financial Objective from Environmental Impact Report.

Although the objective to "generate an additional income stream" and "maintain a strong financial position" is a valid consideration for a development project, it is inappropriate to include it for assessment of environmental impact. The DEIR includes data regarding staffing costs and income generation for the various alternative plans but offers no indication of who came up with these numbers or how they were determined.

The statement that Residents' Alternative 1 would not provide enough income and would require more staffing than other alternatives cannot be supported by the "data" included in the DEIR. In fact, SRC has a sustained performance over the last 10 years

of positive operational performance, and there is no basis for a change in this performance while accumulating capital expenditures during the expansion.

Even if there was actual financial information available, it has nothing to do with the impact of any development on the natural, cultural, or human environment and should not be included in this study.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

PRESERVE-1.8

Comment (verbatim)

Meeting Room Addition to Manor Building Needs More Study

On page 3-94, item 2, the DEIR states “The proposed construction of the Meeting Room Addition and its attachment to the west elevation of the Manor Building through a building hyphen would also remove and/or alter character-defining features represented in the west (secondary) elevation ... ” On page 3-101 the EIR further states “The proposed construction of the Meeting Room Addition as part of the Project could potentially result in the substantial adverse change in the Manor Building due to the potential for damage during construction.” The symmetry of the Manor Building is forever lost with the Meeting Room attached to the western wall of the Manor Building. The Meeting Room needs a specific evaluation under CUL-1.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

PRESERVE-1.9

Comment (verbatim)

On page 3-235, the DEIR states “Project construction could generate vibration levels that exceed the applicable thresholds for potential building damage at the Manor Building and that substantially exceed the threshold for human annoyance at several nearby residential receptors, the impact would be potentially significant.” And on page 3-237, “ ...it is anticipated that some use of heavy equipment within the buffers would be required to achieve the necessary soil compaction required to support the proposed building foundations (particularly for the Meeting Room Addition) and, therefore, that vibration levels at the Manor Building could still exceed the threshold for building damage at certain times. Knowing that there is a real possibility of damaging the historical Manor Building, why risk it?

Mitigation suggested is that the contractor try to limit the use of smaller heavy equipment and notify nearby residents within 14 days when vibrations will be heavier. What? This neither reduces the impact of vibration on the Manor Building or provides relief to residents who would have to leave their homes for extended periods to avoid physical and mental damage. This is unacceptable.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-12: Impacts of Construction Vibration to Historic Manor Building.

PRESERVE-1.10

Comment (verbatim)

Residents living in apartments 1101, 1202 and 1203 of the Manor Building will have the view from their apartment windows on the western manor wall almost entirely blocked by the new Meeting Room, during construction and forever afterward.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-24.2, as well as response to MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Quality.

PRESERVE-1.11

Comment (verbatim)

Impact of Construction Noise on Residents.

The noise level is beyond the acceptable level, as noted in the DEIR report Table 4.5-6. Construction would generate noise levels of up to 95 decibels for the four west-facing units within the western wing of the Manor Building (apartments 1101, 1202 and 1203). Noise at 95 decibels is like that of hallway fire alarms and exceeds the FTA recommended construction noise criteria of 80 decibels! Such loud noise for many hours during the day over many months can cause physical and mental health issues, especially for an already vulnerable elderly population.

Even noise at 80 decibels is excessive for the elderly population of SRC. This is the FTA standard for highway construction, not for construction in very close proximity to residences. Why is this standard used and not the standard for sensitive construction in hospital zones and near senior facilities?

This noise is expected to continue during the estimated 24 months of construction. Even if this estimate is accurate, and such estimates are historically not even close, the toll of that noise level for that length of time, particularly for construction of proposed Building A and the meeting room, is intolerable.

The mitigation suggested that the noise will occur only during day time, so it will be quiet during after work hours. This report does not consider that senior residents are home most of the day and need naps. Why was no study done on the physical and mental health impact of noise on our specific population? Once again, the DEIR seems to dismiss the very real impact this project would have on very real people.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

PRESERVE-1.12

Comment (verbatim)

Loss of Green Space and Outdoor Recreation Facilities.

The Odd Fellows Historical Park is the only large green space on the SRC campus. A large number of SRC residents (average age 85) have mobility issues requiring canes, walkers, wheelchairs, or motorized assistance to get around. For them and others with physical disabilities, this park is the only accessible outdoor recreation available.

Mitigation suggested by the DEIR states that there are other paths and trails within a short driving distance, and even one trail accessible from SRC by a 300-ft path up a steep incline, but these are in no way accessible to residents whose disabilities prevent them from driving or using unpaved trails. To suggest that residents travel to find open, green space when there is no real reason to build over the Historical Park is not a reasonable alternative.

In addition to SRC residents, many neighbors visit the Historical Park regularly to walk their dogs or bicycle in the safe, quiet area. Removing the park means that everyone in the area would have to travel elsewhere to find a similar quiet green space.

The current 90-foot, regulation size bocce ball court and other outdoor recreation facilities such as a putting green would be removed if Building A is constructed. The DEIR states that smaller replacements would be built in a tiny area west of Building A, and these smaller facilities would be enough for SRC residents and not impact most Saratoga residents.

At present, more than 60 residents regularly play bocce ball here. Bocce ball is also a popular spectator sport for many more residents, especially those with limited mobility, for whom it is easily accessible by the paved paths through the Historic Park.

The “replacement” bocce ball court would be only 60 feet in length, 2/3 of regulation size. Some of the SRC teams compete with outside teams on regulation 90-foot courts. Losing our 90-foot court means that those residents would have to find another court, who knows where, to practice for competition. The proposed 60-foot “replacement” is unacceptable and indicates another example of the devaluation of the impact of this project on residents.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

PRESERVE-1.13

Comment (verbatim)

The Historical Park contains over 100 trees, of which 65 are protected mature trees. All of them would be razed to allow for construction of proposed Building A and Meeting Room. Although many replacement trees will be planted elsewhere on campus, replacement trees cannot be compared with the current majestic, towering trees. The City Arborist determined that many trees are under stress after recent years of draught, but they are not near the point where they need to be removed.

The environmental impact of the trees on air quality is hardly evaluated in the DEIR, and the environmental impact of their aesthetic value is also lacking.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

PRESERVE-1.14

Comment (verbatim)

Traffic and Emergency Evacuation

The estimated construction traffic and its analyses based on Table 4.6-8 show the traffic impact to the neighborhood is substantial. No analysis was done on impact during the peak hours of school traffic or traffic during SRC staff shift changes.

Response to Comment

Table 4.6-8 presents estimated construction traffic for Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative). In accordance with Section 15126.6. (d), the Draft EIR includes sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the Project. As described in Section 4.6.3 (page 4-182) the shuttle for transferring construction workers from the staging area to the construction zones on the SRC campus would be concentrated in the morning and afternoon peak hours, and conservatively assumed that a limited number of shuttles would make continuous round trips between the staging area and Project site. This would equate to 22 to 34 peak hour one-way shuttle trips along San Marcos Road and Odd Fellows Drive each morning and afternoon under Alternative 3, compared to the Project's 28 to 42 peak hour one-way trips. Section 4.6.3 (page 4-183) concludes that Alternative 3 would result in less construction-related traffic movements per day than the Project (on both an overall average and during the most intense construction periods) but would still require implementation of mitigation measure MM-TRA-3a (development and implementation of a construction traffic control plan) to reduce potential impacts from construction-related traffic to traffic safety hazards and emergency access.

With respect to the analysis of peak hour traffic, as of July 2020, Senate Bill 743 directs CEQA lead agencies to evaluate transportation impacts based on VMT instead of traffic congestion or LOS. Therefore, traffic congestion is no longer a potential physical effect on the environment requiring analysis under CEQA. Impacts to the Project's consistency with CEQA guidelines relating to VMT is analyzed in Section 3.16, Transportation, of the Draft EIR. Even though LOS is no longer considered under CEQA, an intersection LOS and delay assessment was prepared for the Project so that the City could evaluate other non-CEQA transportation impacts of the Project, such as congestion (see Appendix F of the Draft EIR). However, because LOS is no longer a CEQA impact, comments relating to the peak hour traffic volumes and/or the adequacy of the peak hour times analyzed in the Traffic Study do not require a response under CEQA, as such factors did not influence the analysis of environmental impacts to transportation within the Draft EIR.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

PRESERVE-1.15

Comment (verbatim)

The receiving dock and loading zone areas remain unchanged and are already chaotic. Additional traffic from the nearby proposed Building A garage entrance, increased number of maintenance and delivery trucks, and Pavilion Circle traffic from the existing apartments would make this area constantly congested. DEIR mitigation is to schedule delivery trucks to avoid double parking and blocking traffic, but it is impractical to expect that to work, and who would enforce the schedule anyway? The only answer is to block construction of Building A.

Response to Comment

As discussed in Section 3.16 of the Draft EIR, the existing congestion issues at the receiving dock and loading zone, and potential for the proposed project to exacerbate them, were identified in the Traffic Study prepared for the project (Appendix F of the Draft EIR). Mitigation measure MM-TRA-1b includes measures to address these issues. Responsibilities for implementing mitigation measures during project construction as well as throughout ongoing operations would be defined in the Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program that is required to be prepared and adopted by the City, if the project (or an alternative) is adopted. Ultimately, the City, as Lead Agency, would be responsible for verifying that mitigation measures are implemented.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

PRESERVE-1.16

Comment (verbatim)

Increased traffic during and after construction make it unsafe for SRC seniors to walk or drive at particular intersections and garage exits. Suggested DEIR mitigation is to install new stop signs, but no study included the particular requirements of seniors with slow reaction time, impaired mobility, or poor eye sight and hearing.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

PRESERVE-1.17

Comment (verbatim)

Closing streets for many months at a time means residents along those streets cannot get in and out of their own driveways or even park near their homes. The DEIR must address a plan for this, understanding that the residents are seniors and may have disabilities or mobility issues.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

PRESERVE-1.18

Comment (verbatim)

There is no solid plan for emergency evacuation involving the large number of ambulances needed to evacuate the 60 plus skilled nursing patients. The proposed evacuation entrance along Chester Ave. is only for large fire trucks; not for private vehicles. All 200 plus Independent Living residents and 200 or so employees are expected to evacuate in their own cars using the one-lane Odd Fellows Lane. A realistic, usable plan needed beyond the scheduling and notification of construction traffic. The DEIR must include a realistic review of emergency evacuations and ideas for implementing a usable plan.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

PRESERVE-1.19

Comment (verbatim)

Impact of Health Center Renovations Omitted from DEIR

Project objective 4 is to “Provide upgrades to the existing Health Center, which would include converting existing semiprivate rooms to private rooms with private baths.” All alternative plans include some sort of renovation for the current Health Center, but the DEIR includes no indication that any study of the impact of these upgrades was done.

There are no references to the demolition and construction work that would proceed in stages, nor any references to the impact on the 50 to 60 vulnerable senior patients housed in the Health Center during this 2-year construction period (MFS-3 Direct or indirect Adverse Effects on Human Beings).

Additionally, there are no references to the noise, vibrations, dirt and dust, or displacement of senior patients to make way for demolition and construction, while raising significant hazards to their health. What are the mental and physical health impacts during months of being shut in a room with limited air flow and natural light? (HAZ-1, HAZ-5, LUP-1, NOI-1, NOI-2, POP-2, UTI-1, UTI-3, WF-3 and MFS-3)

The only alternative that avoids this problem is the Residents’ Alternative 1. The DEIR needs substantial revisions to recognize this issue.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

PRESERVE-1.20

Comment (verbatim)

Air Pollution

The DEIR never addresses the cumulative air pollution effects on frail senior residents, who may have already asthma or breathing issues. Recently, during many months of balcony repair, many residents complained of breathing issues due to dust, diesel fumes, etc. All the administration did was to ask residents to purchase their own air purifiers. This project would be much longer and generate much more air pollution, and the EIR needs to address this particular population.

Response to Comment

Section 3.3.4 of the Draft EIR discusses the potential cumulative air quality impacts of the Project, including the contribution to cumulative effects related to net increases of criteria air pollutants and exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutants and other emissions. As described in C-AIR-1 of the Draft EIR, the recommended BAAQMD thresholds of significance represent levels above which a project’s individual emissions would be a cumulatively considerable contribution to the SFBAAB’s existing air quality conditions (BAAQMD 2017a). Construction-related emissions of the Project would not exceed the thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants. In addition, with implementation of MM-AIR-2 (fugitive dust reduction measures), the Project would also not generate any substantial fugitive dust emissions. Therefore, in relation to the potentially significant cumulative impacts on criteria air pollutants, the Project’s incremental contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

As detailed in Impact AIR-3, a health risk assessment (Appendix C of the Draft EIR) was prepared to evaluate the Project's sources of toxic air contaminant emissions and exposure to on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. The health risk assessment considered the demographic of the elderly on-site residents. See Response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors. As described in C-AIR-2 of the Draft EIR, implementation of MM-AIR-3 would be required to reduce health risk impacts and annual PM_{2.5} concentrations. MM-AIR-3 requires the use of Tier 4 Final equipment for all diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50-horsepower which would reduce diesel exhaust emissions, including PM_{2.5}. As described in Section 3.3.4 (pages 3-50 and 3-51 of the Draft EIR), with implementation of MM-AIR-3, the annual PM_{2.5} concentrations would be reduced a less-than-significant level. Therefore, construction-related health impacts to on-site and off-site sensitive receptors would not be cumulatively considerable.

See also Response to MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality.

PRESERVE-1.21

Comment (verbatim)

Incorrect Assessment of Public Benefits

Alternative 2 offers no planned parking for the public when using the Meeting Room. Even at present, parking is difficult for the residents and visitors. The DEIR (2.3.3) states that parking will be available in the lower-level garage at Building B, but Building B and its underground garages are deleted in Alternative 2. Where are the additional parking spaces for the public use of the Meeting Room?

Response to Comment

Alternative 2 (the Reduced Development Alternative) is described in Section 4.5.1 of the Draft EIR. While Building B would not be constructed under Alternative 2, the underground parking garages of either proposed Building A and/or Building C and/or the Meeting Room would be reconfigured to accommodate additional parking spaces so that the total number of parking spaces on site under this alternative would be the same as the proposed Project. This reconfiguration could be achieved through additional excavation to expand the size of the underground garages and/or through the use of "parking lifts" that would allow more vehicles to be parked in the same footprint. Although the Building A and C garages are not as close to the Meeting Room as the project's Building B garage, there are no environmental impacts associated with the proximity of parking. In addition, because Building B would not be constructed and Manor Circle would not be reconfigured to accommodate Building B, the existing surface parking spaces along Manor Circle and Odd Fellows Drive would not be removed and would be available for Meeting Room use.

PRESERVE-1.22

Comment (verbatim)

The DEIR states (REC-2) that "a public trail connection along Odd Fellows Drive, connecting Fruitvale Avenue with the San Marcos Open Space, via Chester Avenue, Gypsy Hill Road, and Via De Marcos" must be created. This public trail is already documented and was approved by the City's Pedestrian, Equestrian & Bicycle Trails (PEBTAC) Advisory committee in October 2020. The PRS proposal does not need to

create this trail connection unless it is destroyed during construction. The above quotation shows that the EIR consultants did not look up the existing document and thereby drew false conclusions. The trails are already in existence without the proposal. It does not have any additional public benefit due to the Project. Please correct this statement.

Response to Comment

Section 2.3.3 of the Draft EIR describes the proposed public trail connection along Odd Fellows Drive, connecting Fruitvale Avenue with the San Marcos Open Space, via Chester Avenue and Gypsy Hill Road. As discussed in Section 3.15.3 (page 3-260 of the Draft EIR), and noted by the commenter, this trail connection has long been planned by the City and is identified as a proposed City trail in the 2007 General Plan Open Space Element. Further, this segment is noted as a proposed trail connection in both the City's October 27, 2020 Pedestrian, Equestrian & Bicycle Trails Advisory Committee Special Meeting Agenda (City of Saratoga 2020) and in the May 2023 Screencheck Draft of the Open Space and Conservation Element (City of Saratoga 2023).

Although the trail connection may already be in use, at present it passes along an easement along the northern side of Odd Fellows Drive where there is no sidewalk, and there is limited signage for users. The proposed project would include dedication of a public easement for pedestrian access over the sidewalk/trail connection on the southern side of Odd Fellows Drive, to ensure it is able to be used by the public in perpetuity, as well as installation of way-finding signage.

Furthermore, the purpose of the Draft EIR is to analyze the environmental impacts of the proposed project, in accordance with CEQA and the thresholds of significance established by the City, as Lead Agency. Information relating to public benefits of the project was included for informational purposes only.

PRESERVE-1.23

Comment (verbatim)

Residents' Direct Responses to the DEIR

The attached box includes over 300 individually signed SRC resident letter/email DEIR and Project responses. Although all of the responses are pertinent several of the more insightful ones are gathered and clipped together at the top of the stack.

Also, an estimate of over 100 letter/email responses by SRC residents were sent directly to Cynthia Richardson, City Project Planner.

The SRC residents have submitted a total of over 400 individually signed responses identifying problems with the flawed DEIR and with the Project itself.

Response to Comment

This comment makes reference to over 300 individually signed letters/emails submitted as hard copies to the City with a hard copy of this submission by the Preserve SRC, as well as to over 100 letters/emails submitted directly to the City by individual SRC residents. Each of those individually signed comment letters/emails have been included within this Final EIR and coded by the last name of the signatory(ies). Responses to any additional issues raised in those comments are provided in response to those comments and/or within the master responses or responses to form letters.

PRESERVE-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a duplicate of comment letter PRESERVE-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

Please refer to response to comments PRESERVE-1.1 through PRESERVE-1.23 above.

3.3.3 Commenter: Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society (SCVAS)

SCVAS-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

The Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society (SCVAS) is one of the largest National Audubon Society chapters in California. Our mission is to promote the enjoyment, understanding, and protection of birds and other wildlife by engaging people of all ages in birding, education, and conservation. We submit this comment letter on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Saratoga Retirement Community Master Plan Update.

The Saratoga Retirement Community Master Plan Update (Project) seeks the City of Saratoga's approval to construct three new residential buildings, a new meeting room addition to the existing Manor building, and an expansion to the existing fitness center. The majority of trees within and around the proposed building footprints (approximately 124 in total) would be removed including 65 trees that are protected under the City's Tree Protection Ordinance.

Response to Comment

This comment provides background information on the mission of the commenter's organization and their understanding of the proposed project. This comment does not raise any specific environmental concerns that require a response under CEQA.

SCVAS-1.2:

Comment (verbatim)

1. Bird collisions with glass.

Bird populations are declining in North America. While there are multiple drivers to this decline, collision with glass is considered one of the primary causes of migratory bird mortality. In North America, it is estimated that hundreds of millions of birds die each year as a result of striking glass walls, doors and windows.

The American Bird Conservancy (ABC) website is a resource to learn about the devastating impacts of bird collisions and to find solutions to incorporate into architectural designs. Recently, ABC updated their website with new recommendations for Bird Friendly Building Design and a clarifying document that establishes what qualifies as Bird Friendly Glass. ABC provides primary elements of bird safe building

design. In addition, ABC provides a Products and Solutions Database to evaluate bird safety glazing treatments.

[The comment includes footnotes not reproduced here. See Appendix A for full details.]

Response to Comment

This comment provides general information related to bird collisions and bird safety. This comment does not raise any specific environmental concerns regarding the proposed project that require a response under CEQA.

See also response to comments SCVAS-1.3 and SCVAS-1.4 for discussion of potential impacts of the proposed project in relation to bird collisions.

SCVAS-1.3:

Comment (verbatim)

2. Artificial light at night

The DEIR analyzes the impacts of lighting as an impact to Aesthetics, and finds the direct project impacts and cumulative impacts of light and glare (Impacts AES-4 and C-AES-4 respectively) to be less than significant, with no mitigation required. This finding is based on existing ambient lighting, and compliance with city code which requires that outdoor lighting fixtures shall be located, aimed, and shielded to prevent excessive glare or direct illumination onto adjacent properties and public street rights of way; notwithstanding the minimum lighting necessary to ensure adequate safety, night vision, and comfort. These requirements help reduce impacts of lighting on aesthetic resources and the dark sky, but additional mitigation is needed to reduce impacts to environmental and human health.

Evidence that Artificial Light At Night (ALAN) causes pervasive harm to human health, our ecosystems and our planet is both substantial and well established. Most birds migrate at night and nocturnally migrating birds are attracted to lighting and suffer changes to migration pattern and higher vulnerability to collision with buildings and other structures. Outdoor lighting has also been implicated in adverse impacts to teen mental health and to human physical health, including thyroid cancer and sleeping disorders.

[The comment includes footnotes not reproduced here. See Appendix A for full details.]

Response to Comment

Section 3.2.3 of the Draft EIR (Impact AES-4) discusses the Project's impacts related to light and glare, and Section 3.4.3 (Impact BIO-11) discusses the project's impacts to migratory and special-status bird species.

With respect to impacts to birds, Section 3.4.3 of the Draft EIR does not specifically analyze the potential impacts of the new buildings and associated new windows and lighting sources on bird species. However, as discussed on page 3-60 of the Draft EIR, nesting birds in the vicinity of the project site and other urban settings are typically habituated to human activity. The proposed Project also does not include buildings that would use highly reflective surfaces such as mirrored glass or include glass-sided buildings; the new buildings would be similar in design and height to the existing buildings on campus, with stucco exterior walls and tile roofs, and a relatively high proportion of stucco to glazing. As discussed in response to comment SCVAS-1.4 below, the applicant has confirmed that specific measures to reduce the potential for

bird strike would be incorporated as part of the project, and **minor edits to Section 3.4.3 of the Draft EIR have been made to reflect this, as detailed in Section 4 of this Final EIR.**

With respect to impacts to humans, as the commenter notes, the analysis of Impact AES-4 in Section 3.2.3 (page 3-18 to 3-19 of the Draft EIR) concluded that the Project would not generate substantial sources of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area and impacts would be less than significant. As discussed, all outdoor lighting would comply with the City's Municipal Code Section 15-80.030, which requires that outdoor lighting fixtures shall be located, aimed, and shielded to prevent excessive glare or direct illumination onto adjacent properties and public street rights of way; notwithstanding the minimum lighting necessary to ensure adequate safety, night vision, and comfort. Because the project would comply with the City's Municipal Code provisions relating to lighting, the new sources of light and glare associated with the new buildings proposed on campus would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, and therefore would not exceed the significance threshold for impact AES-4 (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G, Threshold I.d). Furthermore, the Project site is within a developed area with various sources of existing nighttime lighting such as streetlights and lighting associated with residential dwellings, and views of the proposed new buildings from adjacent properties would be partially screened by existing vegetation, such that the minor increase in nighttime lighting associated with the new buildings would not be substantial. Therefore, the Draft EIR's conclusion of less than significant for Impact AES-4 is considered appropriate and no changes to Section 3.2.3 of the Draft EIR are recommended in response to this comment.

SCVAS-1.4:

Comment (verbatim)

3. Suggested mitigations to reduce the biological impacts of light and glazing

We recommend adding the following mitigations to reduce the impacts of the most harmful aspects of lighting (brightness, color temperatures that include a peak in the blue part of the spectrum) and to reduce the toll of bird collisions. These mitigations are based on the International Dark Sky Association guidelines and policies that focus on Principles for Responsible Outdoor Lighting, and from recommendations by the Audubon Society and the American Bird Conservancy:

- a. The correlated color temperature of lighting should not exceed 2700K. Where light with a larger fractional emission of short wavelengths is needed, it should be carefully controlled through stringent application of the other Lighting Principles, such as lower intensity and reduced operation time.*
- b. All lighting fixtures should be fully shielded, and the use of up-lighting should be prohibited.*
- c. Over-lighting relative to task-related needs should be prevented by maintaining illuminances as close as possible to the minimum levels.*
- d. All outdoor lighting fixtures should be capable of accepting 7-pin controls that can enable use of dimmers, timers, motion sensors, and networking. Lighting should be actively controlled through means such as dimmers and motion-sensing switches so*

as to reduce illuminances or extinguish lighting altogether when the light is not needed.

- e. All glazed surfaces on buildings and other structures should utilize a bird safety measures product with a threat factor rating of no more than 20, as rated by the American Bird Conservancy (referenced in footnote 4 above).*
- f. All windows should have blinds or curtains.*
- e. Avoid highly reflective glazing and highly transparent, see-through glass and other hazardous architectural elements that are known to be extremely hazardous to birds in flight.*

Response to Comment

The project applicant has provided additional information to the City (Ankrom Moison, 2024), confirming that the above measures would be incorporated into the project and included in the construction drawing specifications.

Because the project would incorporate the measures recommended by the commenter, the impact to birds from potential bird strike and/or confusion would be less than significant. **As detailed in Section 4 of this Final EIR, minor edits to Section 3.4.3 of the Draft EIR have been made to acknowledge that these measures would be part of the project.** The conclusions of the Draft EIR, that operation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact to migratory and special-status bird species remains unchanged.

See also response to comment SCVAS-1.3, above.

SCVAS-1.5:

Comment (verbatim)

4. Removal of Oaks

The DEIR identifies Impact MFS-1: Effects to Wildlife or Plant Species or Important Examples of California History or Prehistory as potentially significant. The DEIR suggests that Implementation of MM-BIO-1 and MM-BIO-4 would reduce potential impacts on wildlife and plants to less than significant with mitigation. We disagree because these mitigations do not address the loss of habitat for these species.

The Project seeks permission to remove the majority of trees within and around the proposed building footprints (approximately 124 in total), 65 of which are protected trees under the City's Tree Protection Ordinance (Saratoga Municipal Code Section 15-50). Three protected trees are proposed to be relocated, including a Valley oak and two Coast redwoods. The loss of these trees will impact the many avian species that inhabit the Project area (37 species were identified by local birders and submitted in the Scoping comments). Moreover, the loss of a majestic cork oak, with a diameter of 56 inches, cannot be mitigated. This oak is identified in the Arborist Report in Table 1 (Tree Count and Composition) as tree number 136. This Cork oak tree is home to a community of Acorn Woodpeckers. In their scoping comments, residents highlighted the importance of this specific tree, stating "One particular protected tree slated for removal to make way for a new driveway is a very old cork oak (Quercus suber). This huge tree (trunk diameter 56") is the nesting place for a large number of woodpeckers, who drill

into the soft cork bark to store hundreds of acorns each winter. This natural resource simply cannot be restored if the tree is removed.”

Table 2 in the same Arborist Report erroneously identifies tree #136 as a Coast live oak which is slated for removal.

Table 3 and the map (Figure 2) provide additional information, showing that this tree is not in the footprint of any of the proposed buildings, but stands in the way of a grading, a walkway, and a bioswale.

The statement, “This natural resource simply cannot be restored if the tree is removed” accurately describes a significant, unavoidable impact to biological resources, to aesthetic resources, and to the community.

Birds and nature in our midst contribute to happiness and well being, as well as improved physical and mental health and cognition - all important to residents of retirement homes. It is therefore important to keep birds and nature in this retirement community - especially birds. The Acorn Woodpecker is an iconic species - large, beautiful, vocal, and easy to observe. Acorn Woodpeckers are unusual birds with such complicated social behavior that they have given rise to one of the longest-running behavioral studies of birds. They live in family groups of up to a dozen or more individuals, and they cooperate in raising young and in gathering, storing, and guarding food. They store their acorns and nuts in granaries - trees with sets of individually excavated holes to store acorns in. The cork oak provides a community of acorn woodpeckers with a nesting site and a large granary in its trunk and branches.

*The oaks of the Saratoga Retirement Community provide ample acorns for the woodpeckers, and the Cork oak provides them with a place to nest and to store their acorns for the whole year. Removal of 16 Coast live oaks (*Quercus agrifolia*), and 3 valley oaks (*Quercus lobata*) will impact the Acorn Woodpecker community by reducing acorn availability. Removal of the cork oak will evict them for good and in that, eliminate a natural wonder that is irreplaceable. We believe that harm to this tree imposes a significant, unmitigable aesthetic and biological impact. Furthermore, Section § 3503 of the Fish and Wildlife code prohibits the destruction of nests, and does not limit this law to the nesting season or to the time birds are actively raising their young. In this case, mitigation that focuses on the nesting season yet allows the removal of the tree when the birds are not actively nesting will not reduce the impact to less than significant. This is because the acorn woodpeckers use the same nest year after year, and they depend on the Cork oak year-round. The removal of this tree requires a consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.*

We believe that the removal of the Cork oak (tree #136) is unnecessary, unjustified, and should and can be avoided. This oak is not located within the footprint of a building (Figure 2). The city can require adjustments to the street, allow fewer parking stalls, and change the walkway layout in a way that will save the tree, and allow people and acorn woodpeckers to continue enjoying it. Keeping this tree on the tree-removal list means that Impact MFS-1 remains significant and unavoidable.

Saratoga Tree Protection measures must be implemented during construction (Figure 3). In the long term, an area which is half again as large as the area from the trunk to the dripline of the oak must be set aside and maintained for the protection of the tree’s

health. The tree may require some additional support as well, since the arborist report found it in a medium state of health.

[Comment includes photographs, figures, and footnotes. See Appendix A for details].

Response to Comment

As the commenter correctly points out, the Arborist's Report prepared by Arbor Resources, dated May 27, 2021 (Appendix B-1 of the Draft EIR) incorrectly identified Tree #136 as a coast live oak rather than a cork oak within Table 2. The tree is correctly referred to as a cork oak in all other mentions within the report, and in the City Arborist's approval report (Appendix B-2 of the Draft EIR). The City Arborist issued an updated approval for the project on July 10, 2023 (just after publication of the Draft EIR) to account for the fact that Tree #112 had fallen during the 2023 storm season. The updated report, contained in Appendix D of this Final EIR, supersedes the version that was included as Appendix B-2 to the Draft EIR. The conclusions of the revised report remain unchanged from the previous version and the conditions of approval are almost identical, with only minor revisions to conditions 9 and 10 to reflect the removal of Tree #112 and update the required replacement value for replanting.

With respect to Tree #136 (the cork oak), the arborist identified a decaying hollow at the base of the trunk and identified branch dieback along the canopy's perimeter as evident in photo 136 in Exhibit C of the report. The tree was classified as having an overall condition of poor based on low health and structural integrity rankings. The tree is mature for its location, and appears to show signs of stress, such as branch dieback and an open cavity with visible decay. Although the cork oak is not located within the footprint of a building proposed for the project, the tree's critical root zone currently extends across a substantial portion of West Cottages Lane. Because the proposed project requires regrading and realignment of West Cottage Lane and Manor Circle to accommodate proposed Building B, the Arborist determined that disturbances to the tree's root zone during construction would exacerbate pre-existing stress conditions to the extent that the tree would likely not survive. Redesigning the proposed project to completely avoid grading and excavation within the critical root zone of the tree is unlikely to be feasible, without substantial changes to site layout/project design.

Note that the cork oak would be retained under both Alternative 1 (the Resident's Alternative) and Alternative 2 (the Reduced Development Alternative), as no construction activities would occur in the vicinity of the tree for these alternatives. The project applicant has indicated that it may also be possible to retain the cork oak under Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative) (Ankrom Moisan 2024b). As discussed in Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR (Impact BIO-5), if Alternative 3 were to be approved by the City and implemented by the applicant, a new Arborist Report would need to be prepared reflecting the detailed design for this Alternative, and the City's Arborist would review the report and impose conditions to ensure that any trees proposed for removal or retention meet the City's criteria. Therefore, Alternative 3 would not be anticipated to conflict with the City's Tree Ordinance.

With respect to the commenter's disagreement to the conclusion for Impact MFS-1 and adequacy of mitigations, based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the project may have a significant impact if it would have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or

animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

Acorn woodpeckers are not state listed as threatened or endangered, or species of concern, and their range includes the majority of coastal California and Oregon, as well as parts of Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Mexico (Cornell Lab of Ornithology, 2023a). Acorn woodpeckers live in highly social groups of up to 15 birds that depend on a granary (in this case the cork oak) to support the family with food through the winter, provide nest cavities in the breeding season, and safe nocturnal roosting sites. The granaries are multi-generational and act as an important food source during winter months when insects, the woodpecker's primary food source, are less abundant. Therefore, removal of the granary during the winter months could negatively impact an important winter food source for this particular social group/family of acorn woodpeckers. The removal of 20 additional native oak trees from the SRC campus would also affect food sources within the territory of this group; however, many oak trees on the campus, including all trees within the riparian area/open space easement, would be retained.

Section 3503 of the Fish and Wildlife code states that it "is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation made pursuant thereto." Based on the code, nests even if not active, can only be removed if necessary. As described above, removal of the cork oak is considered necessary due to the substantial disturbance of its root zone that would occur during construction, which could create a safety hazard if the tree were retained. As discussed in Section 3.5.3 of the Draft EIR, Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-1 requires measures be taken to avoid removal of trees during nesting bird season.

Given the preponderance of oak trees within the general vicinity of the project area (including, but not limited to, the riparian corridor and open space easement on the project site) and because the species is not listed as rare, threatened, or endangered, it is likely that other populations of acorn woodpeckers are present in the area. This conclusion is supported by reported sightings of acorn woodpeckers on the Cornell Lab of Ornithology's eBird website (Cornell Lab of Ornithology, 2023b), which shows multiple sightings in the Saratoga foothills, Santa Cruz mountains, and along the Los Gatos Creek and Saratoga Creek corridors, as well as more local sightings near West Valley College and Gardiner Park, and within the riparian corridor on the SRC campus, near South Cottages Lane. Therefore, although the loss of this one cork oak would substantially affect this particular social group/family of acorn woodpeckers, would not have a significant impact on the regional or state-wide population of acorn woodpeckers. Therefore, the conclusion of the Draft EIR that Impact MFS-1 would be less than significant with mitigation is still considered valid.

Although the overall impact for Impact MFS-1 would be less than significant, revisions are proposed to Mitigation Measure MM-BIO-1 to include additional measures to further reduce impacts to the particular social group/family of acorn woodpeckers that utilize the cork oak, including a requirement for the Project Applicant to avoid removal of the cork oak during fall and winter months when the woodpeckers rely on the granary as a key food source, and to consult with the City Arborist to determine if it is possible to retain the downed tree as a "snag" and incorporate it into nearby landscaping to provide

habitat, without creating a safety hazard. **These proposed edits are described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.**

See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

SCVAS-1.6:

Comment (verbatim)

5. Tree removal, tree replacement and landscaping

The EIR provides Objective 11 “Maintain a high level of landscape design, amenities, and plant materials on the campus.”

The DEIR states, “the proposed Project would include 240 replacement trees, which would be planted around the new buildings. The new trees would be a mixture of small, medium, and large evergreen and broad leaf deciduous trees, as well as palm and palmetto trees”. The project plans stipulate: “Landscape Design. The objective of the landscape design and plantings for this project is to create a lush and colorful year-round visual setting of seasonal color and change. The landscape will add visual diversity but will also soften the building mass with ample foundation plantings. Intimate seating areas along paths have been created for passive activities. Active recreation has been addressed with a Bocce court and putting green.”

The DEIR and the plan set, however, provide no information regarding the plant palette. The plant palette should include native plants with high habitat value to local wildlife. This will provide not only color and year-round interest, but interactions with birds, butterflies, and other pollinators which will enhance the social, physical and mental health of the residents.

The Project proposed removal of so many trees, especially Coast Live oak and Valley Oak trees, and the removal of the cork oak tree is inconsistent with the City of Saratoga’s Open Space and Conservation Element policies OSC 11.5: Mature vegetation shall be preserved wherever possible and OSC 12.1: Development Projects should include the preservation of protected trees and other significant trees. Any adverse effect on the health and longevity of native oak trees, protected or other significant trees should be avoided through appropriate design measures and construction practices. When tree preservation is not feasible, individual development Projects shall include appropriate tree replacement as approved by the City. These policies allow some removal of oak trees, but strives to minimize such an outcome. The alternative that was originally proposed by the residents of the Retirement Community will accomplish these policies by substantially reducing the number of trees that the Project seeks to remove, and should be selected as the second-least impactful project alternative (note that we believe that the DEIR Alternative 1 misrepresents the community’s proposed alternative).

We believe that the only way to mitigate the potentially significant impacts of Impact MFS-1: Effects to Wildlife or Plant Species” is to 1) Preserve the cork oak tree; 2) Preserve as many additional oak trees as possible; and 3) create habitat by using a planting palette that comprises local California Native trees and shrubs of high local habitat value. The region is blessed with a wide variety of locally native plants that can provide shade and beauty and at the same time support our native fauna and flora, especially local birds and pollinators.

Preserving the Cork oak tree (and as many additional oak trees as possible) and planting local California native plant material is the best way to achieve Objective 11 and mitigate the impacts related to loss of trees and habitat. Please invite local nature into the campus and plant only California native vegetation. Palmettos belong in Florida.

[The comment includes footnotes not reproduced here. See Appendix A for full details.]

Response to Comment

Landscaping plans for the proposed project are contained on Sheets LA-1.10 through LA-4 of the project plan set, with particular information for the proposed trees, shrubs, ground cover, and biofiltration plants specifically detailed on Sheets LA-2 through LA-4. Although the landscaping plans were not included as appendices to the Draft EIR, they are part of the administrative record considered during preparation of the Draft EIR and the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project under CEQA. Key project plans and drawings are available to view on the same City website that the Draft EIR was published on (<https://www.saratoga.ca.us/461/Proposed-Saratoga-Retirement-Community-P>). As stated on that website, the complete set of proposed project plans can be viewed at City Hall (13777 Fruitvale Avenue, Saratoga). The plant list includes several California native species, including coast live oak, California fuschia, manzanita, ceanothus, juncus patens, carex, Muhlenbergia, yarrow, mahonia, festuca, danthonia, and native bentgrass.

As discussed in response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees, the proposed tree removal has been reviewed by the City's Arborist as meeting the defined criteria for removal in accordance with the City's Tree Ordinance, and the City's Arborist has specified the level of replacement planting considered to be appropriate as part of the conditions of approval, using the method of calculation described in the Ordinance.

See response to comment SCVAS-1.5, above, for further discussion regarding removal of the cork oak tree.

See also response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1) and MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

SCVAS-1.7:

Comment (verbatim)

6. Alternative Analysis

SCVAS is interested primarily in the number and species composition of the trees that will be retained, or removed, under the proposed alternatives. We believe that the impacts to plant and wildlife species remain significant and unavoidable due to loss of habitat, and so the analysis of impact to trees is important to us, and important to fulfill CEQA requirement of providing information to the public and to decision makers. We would like to see an analysis that includes the number and species composition of the trees that will be retained, or removed, for each project alternative. In addition, we would like to see proposed and analyze a new alternative (Tree retention Alternative) that retains the cork oak, and many of the oaks that are currently slated for removal.

Response to Comment

Detailed design plans, including tree removal and replacement plans, for the three alternatives described and analyzed in the Draft EIR have not been created, as CEQA

only requires that the analysis of alternatives be sufficient to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d)].). The impacts of the proposed project with respect to loss of trees and impacts to plant and wildlife species are analyzed in detail within Section 3 of the Draft EIR, and in particular in Section 3.5.3 with respect to biological resources. Additional discussion and analysis relating to tree removal is also provided in response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees and in response to comment SCVAS-1.5, above.

In accordance with Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. The City as lead agency is responsible for determining the range of reasonable project alternatives for further consideration, and the “range of alternatives” is governed by the “rule of reason,” which requires the EIR to describe and consider only those alternatives necessary to permit informed public participation, and an informed and reasoned choice by the decision-making body (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), (f)). Furthermore, because the purpose of the alternatives analysis is to identify ways to avoid the significant impacts of the project, the range of alternatives considered in the Draft EIR focused on those alternatives that could avoid or reduce the significant and unavoidable impact to historical resources, as all other environmental impacts of the project, including those related to tree removal, were determined to be less than significant or could be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of recommended mitigation measures.

No edits are required in response to this comment.

SCVAS-1.8:

Comment (verbatim)

7. Recirculation needed

The Saratoga Retirement Community Master Plan Update provides only high level analysis to many of the issues of interest to SCVAS. As a Project level DEIR, with no subsequent public review expected, the document is inadequate. The public should have clarity on many of the issues we raised in this letter:

- *Standards and guidelines for bird safe design,*
- *outdoor lighting,*
- *tree replacement and*
- *plant palette selection,*
- *landscaping and more.*

The project plans and the DEIR provide only general statements and general reference to city documents and project intent, but with no discernable detail. We believe that the DEIR must be amended to include the above mentioned Standards and Guidelines, a plant palette and tree replacement selections, and an alternative that minimizes the removal of trees. When these elements are available, the DEIR should be recirculated to allow the public the opportunity to comment on the entire project.

Response to Comment

See responses to comments SCVAS-1.1 through SCVAS-1.7 above for detailed discussion in relation to the issues contained in the commenter's bullet points. As discussed in those comments, the Project Applicant has confirmed that the project would include typical measures to reduce the potential for bird collision and confusion from new lighting and glazing associated with the project (SCVAS-1.4), and minor changes to the Draft EIR are recommended to provide additional protective measures to reduce potential impacts to birds from the proposed removal of trees (SCVAS-1.5).

In accordance with Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, recirculation of an EIR is required when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review. Recirculation is not required when new information is added to the EIR that clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modifications.

Because potentially significant impacts to birds resulting from tree removal were identified in the Draft EIR, and mitigation measures were included in the Draft EIR to reduce these impacts to less than significant, the minor edits to the exact content and requirements of the recommended mitigation measures in response to these comments does not constitute "significant new information" that would trigger recirculation of the document pursuant to Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

3.3.4 Commenter: Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC)

SRC-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the City of Saratoga's Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR") for the Saratoga Retirement Community Project ("Project") located at 14500 Fruitvale Avenue. This letter is written on behalf of the Saratoga Retirement Community owned by the Independent Order of Odd Fellows and Rebekahs and operated by Pacific Retirement Services (collectively "SRC").

SRC has a long history of serving others. SRC has been serving seniors in Saratoga since 1912. Starting in 1999 and completing in 2003 (approx. 20+ years ago), SRC expanded the campus, including the complete renovation of the Manor building, the addition of apartment homes and cottages, and the construction of amenities, including but not limited to, the fitness center, pool and bocce ball court. This Project, similar to the last renovation, is intended to make changes to the campus (e.g., single occupancy rooms, more independent living units, expanded fitness center) that will allow SRC to continue serving seniors in Saratoga into the future.

Response to Comment

This comment provides general information about the history of SRC and the applicant's intent of the proposed project. This comment does not raise any specific environmental concerns that require a response under CEQA.

SRC-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

These comments on behalf of SRC on the Draft EIR are focused on the alternatives analysis. The California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA) requires alternatives to meet the basic project objectives and to be potentially feasible. 14 Cal. Code Regs. Section 15126.6(a) and (c). Feasible is defined in Public Resources Code Section 21061.1 as “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors.” Feasible also includes legally feasible. 14 Cal. Code Regs. Section 15364. The details of Alternative 2, the Reduced Development Alternative, reveal that this alternative does not meet the basic project objectives of responding to the changing needs of seniors, providing 52 new independent living units and generating an additional income stream from the new independent living units to financially support the campus. The Reduced Development Alternative is also neither socially nor legally feasible.

For the new independent living units to meet the needs of the changing senior housing market and be attractive to seniors in the Saratoga community, the new independent living units need to be larger units. The Project proposes larger units meeting this need. However, to meet the project objective of 52 new independent living units, the Reduced Development Alternative suggests developing smaller units. Smaller units do not meet the objective of responding to changing needs in the senior housing market. Failing to meet the changing needs of the senior housing market will result in a reduced income stream, which also does not meet the project objective to generate additional income to help the campus maintain a strong financial position. Finally, this alternative essentially results in a 20 percent smaller project with 42 units (10 fewer units) and therefore does not meet the basic project objective to produce 52 more independent living units. For the same reasons the Reduced Project Alternative does not meet the project objectives, it is also not feasible.

The Reduced Development Alternative also proposes parking modifications that make the alternative legally (and practically) infeasible. To locate adequate parking on-site, as required by code, the Reduced Development Alternative requires the use of parking stackers. The use of stackers for a senior community is neither industry standard nor reasonable as seniors tend to have issues using parking stackers/lifts. Because without stackers this alternative would not be legally compliant with the city’s parking requirements, it is not feasible.

The Draft EIR includes a reasonable range of alternatives without the Reduced Development Alternative, and this alternative is not legally required for CEQA compliance. 14 Cal. Code Regs. Section 15126.6(a). As discussed above, the Reduced Development Alternative does not meet basic project objectives and is both socially and legally infeasible. Such an alternative may be excluded from the EIR as it does not meet the threshold test for suitability. 14 Cal. Code Regs. Section 15126.6(c). Therefore, the Final EIR should reject this Reduced Development Alternative.

Response to Comment

In accordance with Section 15126.6(f) of the CEQA Guidelines, the range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. Certain key details

related to the parking configuration options under Alternative 2, Reduced Development Alternative, were assumed as necessary to analyze potential environmental impacts in a meaningful way, given the conceptual nature of the alternatives analysis. As described in Section 4.5.1 of the Draft EIR, the reconfiguration of the underground parking could be achieved through additional excavation to expand the size of the underground garages or with “parking lifts”. As such, the use of “parking lifts” is not assumed to be required or necessary. Regardless, either reconfiguration option would not affect associated environmental impact conclusions.

With respect to the feasibility of Alternative 2, as correctly stated by the commenter, CEQA requires that alternatives be potentially feasible. However, it is not the purpose of the EIR to analyze the feasibility of alternatives in detail. Alternatives that are clearly infeasible should not be included; however, alternatives that appear to be potentially feasible may be included. CEQA does not require a detailed housing market analysis, economic analysis, detailed engineering review, or other specialist studies to determine if a potentially feasible alternative should be considered in the Draft EIR or not. Information regarding actual feasibility of a particular alternative may be presented to the Lead Agency for consideration during their decision-making process on the project (or alternatives).

Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly. Furthermore, the fact that an alternative may be less profitable is not sufficient to show that the alternative is financially infeasible (Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1988) 197 Cal.App.3d 1167).

The comment does not present any new information that would affect the analysis or conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to conclusions regarding the environmental impacts of Alternative 2, and no edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

SRC-1.3

Comment (verbatim)

Then, Alternative 3, the Applicant's Alternative, which reduces the significant historical impact, meets the project objectives and is feasible should be deemed the environmentally superior alternative.

Approval of the Applicant's Alternative would allow SRC to continue serving seniors in Saratoga whose needs have changed in the approximately 20+ years since the last renovation. The Applicant's Alternative would reduce all the impacts to less than significant with mitigation. The Draft EIR shows that even those issues (e.g., trees, construction noise, emergency access) that some SRC residents are concerned about are mitigated to a less than significant level with the Applicant's Alternative.

Response to Comment

As discussed in Section 4.6 of the Draft EIR, the Applicant's Alternative (Alternative 3) would reduce the significant historical impact to the Manor Building, but would require an additional/modified mitigation measure relating to the proposed parking lot between

Manor Circle and Odd Fellows Drive. As stated by the commenter, all other impacts of Alternative 3 would also be less than significant with mitigation, which is the same overall determination for all of the alternatives and the proposed project itself (except for historic resources). As summarized in Table 4.7-1, the Draft EIR concludes that Alternative 3 could have slightly greater impacts than the proposed project with respect to exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutants (Impact AIR-3), archaeological resources (Impact CUL-2), paleontological resources (Impact GEO-6), potential hazards from spills of hazardous materials during construction (Impact HAZ-1), and construction noise and vibration (Impacts NOI-1 and NOI-2), due largely to the slightly larger construction footprint and/or additional areas of ground disturbance and/or closer proximity of buildings to neighboring properties. The Draft EIR ultimately identified Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative) as the environmentally superior alternative due to slightly reduced impacts from the slightly smaller construction footprint and reduced number of construction areas. Nonetheless, none of the alternatives would have a significant and unavoidable impact to historical resources.

No changes to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

See also response to MASTER-6: Support for Applicant's Alternative (Alternative 3).

See also response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.

SRC-1.4

Comment (verbatim)

Notwithstanding, SRC is committed to working to address certain project details, such as providing a new location for a full-size bocce ball court, prior to approval of the Applicant's Alternative.

Response to Comment

This comment does not raise any specific environmental concerns that require a response under CEQA. However, as discussed in response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space, the City has received the applicant's revised design for the area west of Building A, which eliminates the loading area and driveway to make space for a full sized bocce court (see Appendix E). The City has reviewed the revised design and confirmed that it meets City development standards and fire code requirements (SCCFD 2023).

No changes to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

3.4 Responses to Comments from Individuals

Written comments were received from 108 individuals (or families) during the public review period for the Draft EIR, several of whom submitted multiple comment letters and/or emails. Each commenter was assigned a Commenter Code [typically the commenter's last name and first initial(s)], and each letter or email received from that commenter was numbered in sequential order by date received. Each comment letter or email was reviewed and individual comments within each letter/email (each containing a single theme, issue, or concern) were assigned a number.

For example, the first topic raised in a comment letter from John Doe would be coded as DOE-J-1.1, the second topic in the same letter would be coded as DOE-J-1.2. If a second letter was received from John Doe, the first topic raised in that second letter would be coded as DOE-J-2.1.

The name of all individuals that submitted written comments, their associated Commenter Code, and the date(s) of the letters and emails that they each submitted are presented in Table 2-A in Section 2. Copies of each comment are contained in Appendix A and are marked up in red to indicate the Commenter Code and to delineate the individual comments within.

The full text or a summary of each comment topic is reproduced below, followed by the City's response to that comment topic, in turn. Comments and associated responses are organized alphabetically, by Commenter Code. Note that minor spelling and/or grammatical errors have been corrected within "verbatim" comments and introductory text not pertinent to the issues being raised or containing personal information may not have been reproduced for brevity. Excerpts of the Draft EIR and/or images, attachments, or other non-text items that were included with some comments are also not reproduced within this section, but are contained in the full copy of the comment within Appendix A.

3.4.1 Commenter ABRUZZINI-H

ABRUZZINI-H-1.1

Comment (summary)

This comment contains the same text as comment FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

ABRUZZINI-H-2.1

Comment (summary)

This comment contains the same text as comment FORM-4. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-4.1.

ABRUZZINI-H-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-9. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-9.1.

ABRUZZINI-H-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-16. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-16.1.

ABRUZZINI-H-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-26. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-26.1.

ABRUZZINI-H-6.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-7. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-7.1.

ABRUZZINI-H-7.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

3.4.2 Commenter ACKUNAS-L

ACKUNAS-L-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

ACKUNAS-L-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-23. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-23.1.

ACKUNAS-L-H-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-24. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-24.1.

3.4.3 Commenter ANDERSON-U

ANDERSON-U-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

ANDERSON-U-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-29. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-29.1.

3.4.4 Commenter AUSTIN-T&J

AUSTIN-T&J-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

My name is Tom Austin, and my wife, Jean, and I have been residents at the Saratoga Retirement Community for over three years.

We were not properly informed about any expansion plans at the time we moved to SRC from our home in Portola Valley, and would not have chosen SRC had we known of the potential destruction to the campus that was being considered.

One of the reasons that my wife and I chose Saratoga Retirement Community is the attractive outdoor green space. The bucolic campus is no only an asset to the residents of SRC, but an asset of the entire Saratoga City. Here seniors can relax and have fresh air.

I am against Pacific Retirement Service's building the two story high apartment which will occupy and destroy all the green space we have. Please do NOT build these apartments. This green space is an irreplaceable jewel.

In addition, the enormous disruption to our lives should this construction proceed, would be devastating to our lives and health.

Thank you in advance for your support in declining this totally unnecessary project.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-8: Residents Not Informed of Project.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreation/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

AUSTIN-T&J-2.1

Comment (verbatim)

We are strongly opposed to the entire expansion plan proposed by SRC, and in particular the construction of an enormous apartment building right in the center of our campus. For SRC, the Odd Fellows park is equivalent of NYC's Central Park, and is surrounded by safe and outdoor paths for us to stroll.

These paths are very accessible, even for walkers. In contrast, the DEIR suggests that these campus walking paths can be substituted by the nearby San Marcos Open space (p.3-260 DEIR). The DEIR claims that the San Marcos Open Space is only 300 feet to the southeast of the Project site, but that is the direct air distance, and it is up a steep embankment—inaccessible except by a 2.5-mile round trip along a busy road with no sidewalk. This shows complete lack of understanding of the Seniors' needs nor respect for our peaceful quality of life.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreation/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

AUSTIN-T&J-2.2

Comment (verbatim)

Had we known of this totally insensitive expansion plan prior to our moving to SRC several years ago we would have chosen a different facility. The fact is that the plan was then being proposed, but SRC chose to keep any notification of the plan from us as they willingly took our enormous payment deposit.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-8: Residents Not Informed of Project.

3.4.5 Commenter BARDIN-T

BARDIN-T-1.1:

Comment (summary)

The commenter asks several questions related to the CEQA and City Planning process.

Response to Comment

City staff responded directly to the commenter during the public review period regarding the process-related questions. The comment does not raise any specific environmental concerns that require a response under CEQA. Environmental concerns raised in the referenced attachment are addressed in response to comments BARDIN-T-1-2 through BARDIN-T-1-4 below.

BARDIN-T-1.2:

Comment (summary)

The commenter objects to the Draft EIR and requests immediate consideration and a full reassessment of the Preserve SRC the Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1) due to differences between the Alternative 1 presented in the Draft EIR and that proposed in Preserve SRC's submission during the scoping period. Concerns are raised regarding implications of these differences in relation to building height, excavation depth, proximity to riparian corridor, parking requirements, tree removal, soil instability, and construction-related traffic.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

BARDIN-T-1.3:

Comment (summary)

The commenter raises additional differences between Alternative 1 (the Residents' Alternative) presented in the Draft EIR and that proposed in Preserve SRC's submission during the scoping period, relating to the design of Building C, rerouting of Colfax Lane, and the removal of trees.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

BARDIN-T-1.4:

Comment (summary)

The commenter states that financial objectives of the applicant should not be included in the EIR.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives

BARDIN-T-2.1:

Comment (summary)

The commenter asks several questions related to the CEQA and City Planning process.

Response to Comment

City staff responded directly to the commenter during the public review period regarding the process-related questions. The comment does not raise any specific environmental concerns that require a response under CEQA. Environmental concerns raised in the referenced attachment are addressed in response to comments BARDIN-T-2-2 through BARDIN-T-2-4 below.

BARDIN-T-2.2:

Comment (verbatim)

A mistake in AECOM DEIR report. There are inconsistencies in their figures. Figure captions in Figure 2.3-2 and Figure 2.3-3 do not match figures and key plan is wrong in one of them.

Response to Comment

As the commenter points out, Figures 2.3-2 and 2.3-3 accidentally had their captions switched in the Draft EIR, and one has the incorrect key plan. In response to this comment, these figures have been revised to include the correct captioning and key plans. **These proposed edits are described in Section 4.4 of this Final EIR, below and copies of the revised figures are included in Appendix C.** These minor revisions to the figures do not change the analysis or conclusions of the Draft EIR.

BARDIN-T-2.3:

Comment (summary)

This comment contains the same text as comment FORM-15.1.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-15.1.

BARDIN-T-2.4:

Comment (summary)

This comment contains the same text as form letter FORM-15.2.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-15.2.

BARDIN-T-3.1:

Comment (summary)

The commenter asks several questions relating to fire and emergency evacuation codes and regulations relating to private roads and private communities of this size.

Response to Comment:

City staff responded directly to the commenter during the public review period regarding these questions. The comment does not raise any specific environmental concerns or requested revisions to the Draft EIR that require a response under CEQA.

See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

BARDIN-T-4.1:

Comment (verbatim)

However, the emergency evacuation plan is for all independent residents to drive in their own private car as stated in our Executive Director's most recent meeting on June 21, 2023.

When in emergency there will be many perhaps as many as 20 ambulances and fire trucks to take care of the Skilled nursing patients and Assisted living residents, will the Independent Living residents be able to drive their own cars to evacuate? This question has never been answered by the administration. The lengthy discussion in our binder never addresses these issues. They address emergency preparedness in case of power outage, emergency kits, shelter in place, where to gather etc. but not the emergency evacuation. This is a concern most of the residents have but we have not seen any real solid plan from the administration.

This is why I was hoping the Fire department may have some guidelines.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation

BARDIN-T-5.1:

Comment (summary)

This comment refers to the resubmittal of an attachment, which was identical to a previous attachment submitted by this commenter (BARDIN-T-1), with the only difference being the addition of a date.

Response to Comment:

See responses to comments BARDIN-T-1.2 through BARDIN-T-1.4.

BARDIN-T-6.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.4.

BARDIN-T-7.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

BARDIN-T-8.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-22. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-22.1 through FORM-22.6.

BARDIN-T-9.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-2. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-2.1 through FORM-2.3.

BARDIN-T-10.1:

Comment (verbatim)

After reading the DEIR biological impact (MM-BIO-4) on the SRC expansion, I have the impression that bats are more important than the human lives. The study devoted many paragraphs of studying the bats' habitats and life cycles etc. and the noise impact on the bats when the trees are removed.

I failed to see similar impact study on MM-NOI-1a, NOI-1b on the residents who live near the construction zone on campus. They have to endure many months of construction noise like chain saw, drill, Jackhammer, bulldozers, construction truck and construction traffic. The mitigation on the report is to notify us when it would happen and it would be during day time. This suggestion is totally impractical, where do you expect the elderly senior residents going to hide from these noise environment which is their home?

To give you an example just this afternoon, we had a backhoe digging some drainage trench to repair the road, the noise at 25 feet away was intolerable! This is only for a couple of hours. Imagine you would have to tolerate this kind of noise for many months during day time! Residents have nowhere to escape during day time when the noise levels are maximum. This is a real torture for the residents. Yet the impact on mental health was not mentioned in the DEIR studies.

Response to Comment:

The analysis of noise on residents living near to the construction zones is contained within Section 3.1.3 of the Draft EIR. Specifically, Table 3.12-6 presents the estimated construction noise levels at the nearest human receptors to each construction zone. The impact of construction noise is identified as potentially significant, and mitigation measures are identified in the Draft EIR. MM-NOI-1a and MM-NOI-1b contain a suite of noise reduction and abatement measures, not only the prior notification and restriction to daytime construction activities mentioned by the commenter. Together, implementation of all of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce the potential noise levels to below the established thresholds of significance.

See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

BARDIN-T-11.1:

Comment (verbatim)

To EIR consultants, Planning Commissioners and City Council,

The DEIR included the financial conditions in the Project Objectives. I failed to see how the financial impact can be counted as environmental impact. Even if it is included in Project Objectives, the EIR should not evaluate it. It simply does not belong there.

If you have to evaluate this financial item, please collect all the data and do it systematically and scientifically based on the data and facts. So far, how do you compare one alternative over the other when there are no solid numbers to compare with? How do you compare the Alt. 1 to be more expensive than Alt. 2 or Alt. 3 or the original proposal when there is no numbers or models to compare with? If DEIR is to be revised, I should like to see this evaluation to be deleted unless there is solid data for backing. Otherwise it discredits the validity of the EIR.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

BARDIN-T-12.1:

Comment (verbatim)

First of all, thank you EIR consultants for your hard work. I am a resident at the Saratoga Retirement Community since 2006 and have enjoyed my life here for the last 17 years.

Response to Comment

This comment is introductory in nature and does not raise any significant environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR. No edits to the Draft EIR or additional response is required.

BARDIN-T-12.2:

Comment (summary)

This comment contains the same text as comment letter FORM-28.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-28.1.

BARDIN-T-12.3:

Comment (summary)

This comment contains the same text as comment letter FORM-29.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-29.1.

BARDIN-T-13.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is nearly identical the form letter FORM-20. While some text is slightly different in the comment letter, the modified and additional text does not raise any specific new topics or concerns that require separate delineation as a new comment.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-20.1 through FORM-20.5.

BARDIN-T-14.1:

Comment (verbatim)

We disagree the mitigation suggestions are practical and enforceable. (Mitigation MM-TRA-3b: Implement Recommendations of Traffic Study page xx (and page 3-285)

“A. The Project Applicant shall implement all recommendations of the Traffic Study prepared for the Project by Hexagon Transportation

iv that the Project Applicant clearly communicate with the delivery vehicles that they need to park in designated areas on site.

B. In addition, the Project Applicant shall develop and implement a delivery schedule for vendors so that the number of simultaneous deliveries to campus does not exceed the available designated loading space.”

[NOTE: comment included images, see Appendix A for details.]

Pictures the right shows the current loading zone, full of garbage and bins and narrow space for loading. Picture on the right: where the white truck parks would be the entrance to the potential Building A garage entrance. Currently delivery trucks, maintenance vehicles and garage bins are all along the Pavilion Cir. Can you imagine how much worse it will be if there is the additional garage entrance for building A? What happens if emergency vehicle has to come through this congestion? Calling the police to enforce is too slow for any emergency. Notifying the emergency vehicle for road blocking is not practical.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

BARDIN-T-14.2:

Comment (verbatim)

We disagree with the Mm-TRA-3a

It is unsafe for this Senior population to walk or drive during and after construction at the particular intersection. The senior have a particular set of requirements because of the slow reaction time, the impaired mobility, poor eye sight and hard at hearing. Much more detailed studies need for this particular population.

Emergency Evacuation for the 600 plus SRC residents and employees and neighbors on San Marcos Lane and the Fellowship Plaza, needs more study. It is a basic health and safety issue.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

BARDIN-T-15.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

BARDIN-T-16.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1, with additional comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment BARDIN-T-16.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

BARDIN-T-16.2

Comment (verbatim)

We do not need the 52 units to renovate 52 private rooms in HCC.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

BARDIN-T-17.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-24, with additional comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment BARDIN-T-17.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-24.1 through FORM-24.3

BARDIN-T-17.2

Comment (verbatim)

Remove the proposed Meeting Room please.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

BARDIN-T-18.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-15. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment Form-15.1 through FORM-15.2.

BARDIN-T-19.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1, with additional comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment BARDIN-T-19.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

BARDIN-T-19.2

Comment (verbatim)

PRS has never justified the need of 52 apartments in order to renovate the HCC from 92 beds to 52 beds. PRS has never given the residents a financial comparison between their Master Plan vs the Residents' Alternative plan, yet they ALWAYS told us the alternative plan is much more expensive. There is no data to support their claim. In addition, they threaten us our rent will be double digit increase, again with no data to back up these threats.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

BARDIN-T-20.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of a portion of form letter FORM-22, with additional comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment BARDIN-T-20.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-22.1 through FORM-22.6

BARDIN-T-20.2

Comment (verbatim)

Please delete the Meeting Room! It is an insult to the majestic historical Manor Building.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

BARDIN-T-21.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-9. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-9.1.

BARDIN-T-22.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-7. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-7.1.

BARDIN-T-23.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-24, with additional comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment BARDIN-T-23.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-24.1 through FORM-24.3.

BARDIN-T-23.2

Comment (verbatim)

Meeting Room does not belong here! It should not be built!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-10: Impact of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

BARDIN-T-24.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-13, with additional comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment BARDIN-T-24.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-13.1.

BARDIN-T-24.2

Comment (verbatim)

Please read the above opinion from a resident who has substantial architectural background!

Response to Comment

This comment does not raise any significant environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR. No further response or edits to the Draft EIR are required.

BARDIN-T-25.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10, with additional comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment BARDIN-T-25.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

BARDIN-T-25.2

Comment (verbatim)

Please delete the Meeting Room!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project

BARDIN-T-26.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-15. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-15.1 through FORM-15.2.

BARDIN-T-27.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-12, with additional comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment BARDIN-T-27.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-12.1.

BARDIN-T-27.2

Comment (verbatim)

Have you ever been bombarded by loud noise for even 30 mins?

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

BARDIN-T-28-1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a duplicate of comment letter BARDIN-T-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment BARDIN-T-10.1.

BARDIN-T-29.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

BARDIN-T-30.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-2. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-2.1 through FORM-2.3.

BARDIN-T-31.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-2. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-2.1 through FORM-2.3.

3.4.6 Commenter BASHAM-M

BASHAM-M-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7

BASHAM-M-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7

3.4.7 Commenter BERG-J

Comment BERG-J-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

After reading the attributes that IOOF cites about their location, which is the lack of the “hustle and bustle” of city life contributing to the peacefulness of their community, this proposed plan directly conflicts with the attributes they cite. Go look at their website and under “location” is where they quote this.

I personally have gone there visiting my mother-in-law and holding bible studies there. It was always very peaceful and quiet as it is today. Adding more buildings will create an atmosphere of the “hustle and bustle” of city life. I would approve of any remodeling of existing buildings without adding space or changing their footprint.

Thank you for your consideration.

Response to Comment

Comments relating to the consistency of the proposed project with the SRC facility’s website do not constitute comments on potential significant environmental issues that would require a response under CEQA.

See also response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

3.4.8 Commenter BERG-M

BERG-M-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I am writing to request that the proposal to add more living spaces to the Saratoga Retirement Community be discontinued. My reasons are many including:

The beautiful oak trees and other natural landscape will be destroyed, leaving more buildings and noise.

More buildings will bring more cars, more people and a busy atmosphere.

My daughter attended West Valley College and trained with the track team, running through the peaceful and safe retirement community. Many residents there enjoy their beautiful surroundings while walking among the peaceful and safe streets.

Our family placed our mother in the full time residence there because we knew she would enjoy the beauty of the open space surroundings. More living spaces/buildings would be a detriment to the peaceful environment Saratoga Retirement Community now provides.

I ask that you please consider keeping this lovely place so many call “home” as is or find another solution to the proposal. Thank you for your consideration.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

3.4.9 Commenter BERGLUND-R

BERGLUND-R-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

The Project Description in the Executive Summary of the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) includes the following statement:

The number of skilled nursing beds within the Health Center would be reduced from 94 to 52. The number of skilled nursing beds is proposed to be reduced due to conversion of double-occupancy rooms to private single-occupancy rooms each with their own fully-accessible bathroom & shower. Later on the Project Objective #4 states essentially the same thing

That seems to be where references to the Renovation of the Health Center stop.

There are no references to the construction work that will proceed in stages in the Health Center, nor are there any references to the impact on the 50 to 60 vulnerable

senior patients housed in the Health Center during this 2 year or longer construction period.

I Refer to table ES-1 Impact area MFS-3 (Direct or indirect Adverse Effects on Human Beings).

Additionally, there are no references to required mitigation of the noise, vibrations, dirt and dust or displacing these senior patients to make way for the demolitions and construction which will raise significant hazards to their health.

I Refer to Table ES-1 numerous Impact areas; such as HAZ-1 and -5, LUP-1, NOI-1 and -2, POP-2, UTI-1 and-3, WF-3 and MFS-3.

By the way the only Alternative which avoids this particular problem is the Residents' Alternative 1.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts to Existing Health Center Patients.

BERGLUND-R-1.2:

Comment (verbatim)

Speaking of Alternative 1 -the Draft Report does not represent Section 4.4, correctly. A number of glaring errors are included in this Section.

Starting with Figure 4.4-1, the Conceptual Site plan for the Residents' Alternative shows the layout of the New 2 story Apartment Building, Building D. The layout of Building D is important as it is the same footprint as the current Health Care Center and would provide for 52 apartments and an auditorium. However Figure 4.4-2 Conceptual Building D Layout, shows a completely different shaped building and claims the building needs 3 stories. This Layout was provided by the architect for the Project Applicant, who changed the design, thereby attempting to discredit the Residents' Alternative.

They also misrepresented other features in Alternative 1, such as the size and shape of the Residents proposed New Health Center, Building C' and they misrepresented the number of Parking spaces in the Residents' Building D underground garage.

Based on these errors and omissions the DEIR needs major corrections.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

BERGLUND-R-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-24. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-24.1 through FORM-24.3.

BERGLUND-R-3.1

Comment (verbatim)

My name is Robert Berglund, I've been a resident of Saratoga since 1969, that's 54 years. 8 years ago my wife and I decided to move to a Retirement community. We looked at a lot of them in this area and other parts of the state. We chose to stay in Saratoga and bought into the Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC) owned by the Odd Fellows. We chose this community as it was compatible with the life style we had grown accustomed to in Saratoga. open spaces, green and rural landscape, lots of mature trees and an organization with a positive history of service in Saratoga toward senior citizens.

Now we are faced with a dramatic change in our retirement years. The proposed expansion of the SRC community by 52 units encompassing 4 new two story buildings, 4 underground garages and elimination of 124 trees, 65 of these trees being in protected status, is an insult to Saratoga, a Tree City USA, and to over 200 resident senior citizens. This expansion will destroy the campus.

The residents are not against change. In fact, the residents proposed an alternative that preserved the rural campus while accomplishing the same number of new units, 52 in two buildings and two underground garages. That alternative also preserved the dignity and perspective of the Historic manor building and the Odd fellows historic park and resident recreation area.

This issue is coming your way.

We trust you'll view it in terms of what's good for Saratoga and the quality of life for your resident senior citizens.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreation/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

BERGLUND-R-4.1:

Comment (verbatim)

The Project Objectives set forth in the Executive Summary includes Project Objective #3:

"Generate an additional income stream from the new independent living units, to help upgrade other parts of the campus including a major renovation of the health Center. Always maintain a strong financial position to insure the future of the campus."

In Section 4.4.2 Ability of Alternative 1 to meet Project Objectives, Alternative 1 is recorded as meeting ALL Project Objectives except #3:

"Alternative 1 would not meet Objective 3, as the proposed new independent living units would not be constructed until after the new skilled nursing facility is constructed and

existing Health Center is demolished, meaning that no additional revenue stream would be generated for several years to offset the costs of the proposed campus expansion.”

Why is a financial/economic objective included in an Environmental Impact Report?

No one has submitted any financial data which says that SRC would not maintain a strong financial position under Alternative 1. In fact, SRC has a sustained performance over the last 12 years of positive operational performance and there is no basis to expect a change in this performance.

Alternative 1 meets all environmental objectives that have been reviewed in this DEIR.

The DEIR should not be judging alternatives on a financial/economic basis and needs correcting.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

3.4.10 Commenter BREWER-C

BREWER-C-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

As a 5-year resident at SRC, I support the needed expansion desired by management, but the current design is heavy-handed. The number of old trees to be removed is astounding, and the promised replacements will take many years to grow to a useful size. For whatever reason, PRS refuses to consider an alternate plan which offers the same benefits with less disruption to the campus.

Many residents are against the current plan, and I am one of them.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

3.4.11 Commenter BREWER-D

BREWER-D-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

I understand the need to make changes at the Saratoga Retirement Community. The current arrangement is based on a level of income from the Health Center which is no longer possible. It seems to me that the changes should be ones that are best for all concerned.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

BREWER-D-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

The proposal from PRS involves new construction throughout the campus. The alternative plan restricts changes to new buildings east of the manor and on the site of the current Health Center. During construction, traffic can be redirected to south, east, and north of the Manor. It will still be messy but the worst of the mess can be avoided. The alternative plan is the one which is best for residents of the community.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

3.4.12 Commenter BRITTAIN-C

BRITTAIN-C-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-2. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-2.1 through FORM-2.3.

BRITTAIN-C-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-2. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-2.1 through FORM-2.3.

BRITTAIN-C-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-5. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-5.1.

BRITTAIN-C-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-24. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-24.1 through FORM-24.3.

BRITAIN-C-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-23. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-23.1.

BRITAIN-C-6.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-25. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-25.1.

BRITAIN-C-7.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-6. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-6.1.

BRITAIN-C-8.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

BRITAIN-C-9.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-24. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-24.1 through FORM-24.3.

BRITAIN-C-10.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-12. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-12.1.

BRITAIN-C-11.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-15. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-15.1 through FORM-15.2.

BRITAIN-C-12.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

BRITAIN-C-13.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-27. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-27.1.

BRITAIN-C-14.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-18. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-18.1.

BRITAIN-C-15.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-31. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-31.1.

BRITAIN-C-16.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-13. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-13.1.

BRITAIN-C-17.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

3.4.13 Commenter BRITAIN-J

BRITAIN-J-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

BRITAIN-J-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-2. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-2.1 through FORM-2.3.

BRITAIN-J-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-31. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-31.1.

BRITAIN-J-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-12. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-12.1.

BRITAIN-J-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-17. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-17.1.

BRITAIN-J-6.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-16. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-16.1.

BRITAIN-J-7.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-28. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-28.1.

BRITAIN-J-8.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-18. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-18.1.

BRITAIN-J-9.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

BRITAIN-J-10.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-13. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-13.1.

BRITAIN-J-11.1

Comment (summary)

This comment contains the same text as comment FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

BRITAIN-J-12.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-7. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-7.1.

BRITAIN-J-13.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-22. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-22.1 through FORM-22.6.

BRITAIN-J-14.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-25. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-25.1.

BRITAIN-J-15.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-6. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-6.1.

BRITAIN-J-16.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-24. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-24.1 through FORM-24.3.

BRITAIN-J-17.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-7. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-7.1.

BRITAIN-J-18.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-15. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-15.1 through FORM-15.2.

BRITAIN-J-19.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-4. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-4.1.

BRITAIN-J-20.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-23. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-23.1.

BRITAIN-J-21.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-5. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-5.1.

BRITAIN-J-22.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-31. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-31.1.

BRITAIN-J-23.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-29. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-29.1.

BRITAIN-J-24.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-2. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-2.1 through FORM-2.3.

BRITAIN-J-25.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

BRITTAIN-J-26.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-27. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-27.1.

BRITTAIN-J-27.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

BRITTAIN-J-28.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-6. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-6.1.

3.4.14 Commenter BRITTAIN-J&C

BRITTAIN-J&C-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

Even though the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) has 680 pages and weighs multiple pounds, it fails to directly address the most important aspect of the environment.

It covers living aspects like trees and animals including bats, birds, etc. It even includes things that are no longer living for example paleontology considerations and buried artifacts. But it doesn't include the direct impact on people, the elderly residents of the Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC). The residents are a special category of people. Their average age is well into their 80s and when compared to the general public, they have more medical, cognitive, and emotional problems.

The DEIR considers noise, dust, traffic and other construction problems and all of these have been mitigated. They have been mitigated concerning the general public; however, they should not be mitigated concerning the elderly population of SRC residents.

The elderly residents just lived through a terrible pandemic. To remain healthy and be safe, they had to stay inside of their apartments or cottages. This was a horrendous ordeal for over two years. With the construction they will have to live through another similar horrendous ordeal. The only way for them to deal with the noise, dust, etc. will

be to stay inside their apartments and cottages. Sadly, to the elderly residents the construction will be quite similar to the ordeal of the pandemic...isolation!

The elderly residents want a simple, peaceful life, but the construction activity will cause considerable confusion. For them adding this confusion to their lives will cause emotional, worry and anxiety problems.

Because of the number of residents and their average age, SRC is the largest user of emergency response teams in Saratoga. On average the Fire Department is called slightly less than one call per day. With the traffic problems caused by the construction, the access of emergency vehicles, in all probability, will at times be delayed. In medical emergencies minutes count and any delay in response times can be the difference between life and death.

It doesn't take a medical doctor or a scientist to realize that the pollution, noise, confusion, etc. problems, during construction, will cause an adverse impact on the health and safety of the elderly residents. Because of these environmental problems, there is an increased likelihood that at least some of the lives of the elderly residents will be shortened.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality.

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

BRITTAIN-J&C-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

PRS has scared the elderly residents by telling them, without the expansion, probably the monthly rates will have to be significantly increased and SRC might not even be able to survive. Although the residents have consistently asked for information supporting these claims, none has ever been provided. From examination of SRC financial condition and history, the expansion is not needed to ensure the viability of SRC. This conclusion is described in detail by Frank Tiernan and his analysis has also been provided as input to the DEIR.

PRS forgets that they are a service organization. They have not seriously considered the environmental impact on the elderly residents they serve. They are mainly concerned about increasing their company's revenue. Their revenue is more important to them than the elderly people they serve.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

BRITTAIN-J&C-1.3

Comment (verbatim)

There are 143 apartments and cottages currently available for independent living residents. 119 or 83% of them surround where Building A is proposed to be erected. All of the elderly residents living in these apartments and cottages will be directly and adversely affected by the environmental conditions as previously described. The environmental impact on the health and safety of the elderly residents will be enormous and therefore Building A must not be built.

The obvious preferred expansion alternative is to not approve the expansion for the health and safety reasons of the elderly residents.

However, if the No Alternative is not a valid option and considering the city's need to add housing units, the only alternatives to be considered should not include Building A.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See response to MASTER-2: Support for No Project Alternative.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

BRITTAIN-J&C-1.4

Comment (verbatim)

The only buildings that should be considered are Building C and the building which is currently the Health Care Center. At least both of these buildings are not in the center of the SRC campus and thereby reduces the impact of the adverse effects of the environmental problems. When considering the current DEIR alternatives, only two of them should be considered. They are:

- *A modified Alternative 2 which would only include the Building C apartments. Building A needs to be eliminated from the alternative. The height of Building C should be limited to not adversely affect the view associated with the Historic Manor.*
- *Alternative 1 which has been proposed by the SRC residents. This alternative includes erecting Building C as a new and modern Health Care Center and replacing the current Health Care Center with a new apartment building. However, Alternative 1 is not correctly described in the DEIR. For the correct description, the DEIR input by Tsing Bardin should be read.*

Response to Comment

CEQA requires that an EIR describe and evaluate a “reasonable range” of alternatives to the proposed Project. The “range of alternatives” is governed by the “rule of reason,” which requires the EIR to describe and consider only those alternatives necessary to permit informed public participation, and an informed and reasoned choice by the decision-making body (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), (f)). The range of alternatives must include alternatives that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project and could avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)-(c)).

The alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR were therefore developed in order to avoid or minimize the significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project to historical resources which would occur if Building B were constructed. As discussed in Section 3.5.3 of the Draft EIR, Building A would not have a significant impact on the historical resource (i.e., the Manor Building). Therefore, an alternative that excluded the construction of Building A was not evaluated within the Draft EIR.

With respect to the height of Building C, as discussed in Section 3.5.3 of the Draft EIR, Building C would not have a significant impact on the historical resource due to the distance between the proposed building and the Manor Building. Therefore, an alternative with a reduced height for Building C was not evaluated within the Draft EIR.

With respect to differences between Alternative 1 (Residents' Alternative) as described and evaluated in the Draft EIR compared to the alternative development plan submitted by Ms. Bardin and the Preserve SRC organization, please see response to comment MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

BRITTAIN-J&C-1.5

Comment (verbatim)

Please add these identified environmental impacts to the DEIR considering the adverse effects on elderly residents at SRC concerning their health and safety. The issues for the elderly resident's concern both the project itself and the environmental impact.

If your parents and/or grandparents lived at SRC, would you want them to live through the expansion construction that will directly and adversely affect their health and safety?

Response to Comment

Table ES-1 in the Draft EIR provides a summary of environmental impacts of the proposed project, their level of significance, and proposed mitigation measures. Neither this comment, nor comments BRITTAIN-J&C-1.1 through BRITTAIN-J&C-1.4 above, raise any additional significant environmental issues that are not addressed within the Draft EIR or that would require modifications to the Draft EIR.

See also Response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

BRITTAIN-J&C-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a duplicate of comment letter BRITTAIN-J&C-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within this letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See responses to comments BRITTAIN-J&C-1.1 through BRITTAIN-J&C-1.5, above.

3.4.15 Commenter CAPUTO

CAPUTO-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-21. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-21.1.

3.4.16 Commenter CAPUTO-J&R

CAPUTO-J&R-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-22. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-22.1 through FORM-22.6.

3.4.17 Commenter CAPUTO-J

CAPUTO-J-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-14. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-14.1.

CAPUTO-J-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-12. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-12.1.

CAPUTO-J-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

CAPUTO-J-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

CAPUTO-J-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-4. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-4.1.

CAPUTO-J-6.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

CAPUTO-J-7.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-17. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-17.1.

CAPUTO-J-8.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-26. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-26.1.

3.4.18 Commenter CAPUTO-R

CAPUTO-R-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

CAPUTO-R-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-4. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-4.1

CAPUTO-R-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-12. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-12.1.

CAPUTO-R-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-16. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-16.1.

CAPUTO-R-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

CAPUTO-R-6.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-22. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-22.1 through FORM-22.6.

CAPUTO-R-7.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

CAPUTO-R-8.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-14. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-14.1.

3.4.19 Commenter CARROL-M

CARROLL-M-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

Elderly retired professors, we have enjoyed living in Saratoga Retirement Community for more than four years.

We strongly object to any proposed development that defaces The Manor. The Manor is the most noteworthy and recognizable building in Saratoga and the surrounding area. Surely any interpretation of the historic and artistic provisions of environmental law that permits a developer to ram a garage/auditorium into its west wing must be an error.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

CARROLL-M-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

Crass and careless, the garage/auditorium would destroy the symmetry and visual integrity of the Manor. It would block the first view of The Manor as a person walked or drove up Odd Fellows Drive from Fruitvale. And from straight on, The Manor would appear unbalanced. In addition, of course, the garage/auditorium would destroy current green space and mature trees create an unsafe traffic situation.

We ask City planners and elected officials to review the portions of the DEIR that condone approval of this jury-rigged proposal and correct the error.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

3.4.20 Commenter CHAN-C

CHAN-C-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

My name is CK Chan, I'm a professional engineer registered in California. I was an engineering professor at UCLA. Today, I came before you as a concerned SRC resident. I wanted to bring up the areas of controversies associated with the expansion project currently under review.

In the environmental report, Ankrom Moisan Architects is listed as the applicant on behalf of SRC and PRS. SRC is a DBA of the owner, Odd Fellows Home of California, a California Nonprofit Corporation. PRS is a Not-for-Profit organization from Oregon, and is the management company for the entire SRC facility in Saratoga. Both organizations have the mission statement: "To Serve the Senior Residents Interests in the Community".

When the DEIR report came out, Ms. Sarah Steele, the Director of the Saratoga facility called an all hands meeting with the residents on Zoom. The meeting was controlled by the project promoter, Mr. Brian McLemore. Mr. McLemore is the President of McLemore Development Advisors in Oregon which is a 'for profit' organization. On the Web, Mr. McLemore indicates that he had a long history of employment with PRS and a strong tie with PRS. Ms. Sarah Steele is the employee of PRS, she has an absolute control of the residents' daily life and the operations of the SRC Facilities. Shouldn't an independent third party such as the Architect be the more appropriate party to address to the Resident?

Response to Comment

These comments do not raise any specific environmental concerns that require a response under CEQA.

CHAN-C-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

The average age of the residents are over 80 years old with severe mobility and health issues. Many don't drive, and must have open space to enjoy fresh air and do daily walks around campus. Some of them are confined to the Campus 24/7 throughout the whole year.

The campus is situated on a hilly lot with narrow driveways and with limited access to the public streets. A lot of residents walk with walkers on the driveway as their daily exercise or as their daily commute to do their daily activities.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

Comment CHAN-C-1.3

Comment (verbatim)

The effects of the project (such as noise, pollution, safety, handicap access, emergency vehicle access on the quality of residents' daily life have not been evaluated.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality.

See response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

Comment CHAN-C-1.4

Comment (verbatim)

There is no written complete disclosure to present nor to future residents about the impact of the project.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-8: Residents Not Informed of Project.

Comment CHAN-C-1.5

Comment (verbatim)

To my knowledge, Ms. Sarah Steele has reprimanded at least two residents when they were exercising their First Amendment Right to protest the project.

Response to Comment

This comment does not raise significant environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response or edits to the Draft EIR is required under CEQA.

Comment CHAN-C-1.6

Comment (verbatim)

Here are the conditions that have to be implemented to the project:

The effects of the project on the residents' daily life have to be thoroughly studied. The applicant has to provide a detailed reasonable workable plan to mitigate all the negative effects by the proposed construction staging. In addition, the timetable have to be strictly enforced with heavy penalties for not compiling. Given the history of SRC in moving the smallest maintenance work in snail's pace, it is highly possible that the project will be delayed and drag on for years.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

See response to MASTER-17: Construction Staging.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

Comment CHAN-C-1.7

Comment (verbatim)

A written signed disclosure to outline the effects of the project on the daily life should be given to present and future potential residents by SRC/PRS.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-8: Residents Not Informed of Project.

Comment CHAN-C-1.8

Comment (verbatim)

All PRS employee who work in the SRC facilities are barred to harass residents or to order their staff members to harass residents regardless whether those residents are supporting or opposing the project.

Response to Comment

This comment does not raise significant environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response or edits to the Draft EIR is required under CEQA.

Comment CHAN-C-1.9

Comment (verbatim)

In view of the overbuilt and the high vacancies rate in the present Assisted Living Building and in the present Health Care Center Building, it is highly questionable about the proposed outcome of the stated financial objective of constructing three separate new Independent Living buildings, and two new Support Buildings. The proposed project has so much negative environmental impact and high cost, that it will not really significantly improve the balance sheet. This may put further financial burden onto the Residents, as all the expenses of the project will be eventually borne by the present and the future residents of SRC.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

3.4.21 Commenter CHAN-M

CHAN-M-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

My name is Marian Chan. I became a resident at SRC about a year ago. I hold a degree in Architecture and graduate degree in Structural Engineering both from UC Berkeley.

My husband and I have been doing commercial real estate developments for nearly 45 years, so we understand clearly the primary objective of the proposed expansion plan.

Let's face it, the primary objective in the application is to generate additional income stream from the new independent living units by constructing three separate new buildings. This thinking is very flawed, because the ratio of independent living units is paled by comparison to the overbuilt and unused units in assisted living and Health Center. Even with increased new independent unit, proposed 195 (note there is a mistake in the summary DEIR, it was listed as 149) versus current 143, there will still be 103 assisted living units and 52 skilled nursing beds. This ratio will not make a profitable operation in the current market. The residents or independent living units will still be supporting the money losing portion of the assisted living and the health center. Note the current vacancy of assisted living units and the health units is so overwhelming that it is dragging down the occupancy rate of the entire facilities down to the 80%, the number that the regulated government has concern. Hence even with the project going ahead, the claim of improved quality of live for independent living residents will not materialize.

Response to Comment

As pointed out by the commenter, there is a minor error in the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR, where the total number of independent living units on campus once the project is completed was incorrectly described in one portion of the text (7th paragraph on page ii) as being 149 units. The correct total of 195 units was included in the first paragraph on the same page). The same error is also present in Section 2.3.2 (page 2-7) of the Draft EIR, but the total number of units was correctly identified within Table 2.3-1. Minor edits to the Draft EIR are proposed to correct these errors. **These proposed edits are described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.** Note that the proposed edits do not affect the analysis or conclusions of the Draft EIR, as pertinent calculations (e.g., traffic generation and/or population changes) were based on the net change in independent living units (52 unit increase), not on the total number of units.

See also response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

See also response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

CHAN-M-1.2:

Comment (verbatim)

Going on to the other objectives stated by the applicants:

Item 7: The current dining service can barely handle the current 143 independent living units residents. There is no plan to add dining facilities. Only exiting rooms that are scattered through out the old Manor building are proposed to be used.

Response to Comment

As described in Section 2.3.3 of the Draft EIR, minor renovations would be made to the interior of the Manor Building to expand the existing dining room services and better utilize the existing auditorium space within the Manor Building (which would no longer be required due to the proposed meeting room addition). Comments relating to the adequacy of the existing or proposed dining facilities to cater to the number of residents do not raise any significant environmental issues requiring a response under CEQA. No changes to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

CHAN-M-1.3:

Comment (verbatim)

Item 10: I don't see any augmentation of parking. It is purely hear say. Currently the staff takes up most of the parking on West Cottage Lane. Residents requesting to use the reserved parking were denied. During construction, and before even more parking can be provided, it will be chaos for the residents, the staff as well as the guests. In addition, with the closing of West Cottage Lane, logjam for emergency vehicles, delivery trucks, service vehicles, construction vehicles, resident vehicles etc., the scene will not be pretty.

Response to Comment

Information regarding the proposed number of parking spaces for the proposed project is provided in Section 2.3.4 of the Draft EIR, where it states that a total of 569 parking spaces would be provided on campus, an increase of 109 spaces over existing. Additional detail regarding the number of parking spaces within each of the proposed buildings is provided in Section 2.3.1.

As discussed in response to comment FORM-15.1, potential parking shortfalls relative to demand are generally not, in and of themselves, considered to be environmental impacts under CEQA unless there are secondary environmental impacts resulting from the parking shortfall.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

CHAN-M-1.4:

Comment (verbatim)

Item 11: Currently the landscape maintenance over the campus has been left in a bad shape. Anyone can see the dead plants and lack of care. Many elderly residents now have to pitch in to help maintain the landscaping. The indication by the management is that they can save money by delayed maintenance while waiting to work towards the expansion. This is a short-sighted approach. The management had deprived the residents years of enjoyment while waiting for a project which by the way may not be materialized. In a sense, the management has not fulfilled their obligation in according to the original Campus Master Plan.

Response to Comment

This comment, which pertains to past and present landscape maintenance activities at the SRC campus and obligations under the original Campus Master Plan, does not raise any specific environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response or edits to the Draft EIR is required under CEQA.

CHAN-M-1.5:

Comment (verbatim)

Item 9: As an architect myself: I think the layout is not well thought out. Toe applicant claims that the new additions will blend with the exiting. How could that be! To put a building B in front of the beautiful Old manor building? Take out the much-needed

parking in front of the manor. To put the Building A on the widely used open space recreational park and at the same time destroying all those oak trees and the redwood trees. Adding a meeting room to the west of the manor destroys the symmetry of the historical manor building. Adding those five (5) new buildings haphazardly is hardly an effort to blend in.

Response to Comment

As discussed in Section 3.5.3 of the Draft EIR, the proposed construction of Building B would have a significant and unavoidable impact on the historic Manor Building, whereas the potentially significant impacts to the Manor Building from the Meeting Room could be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures MM-CUL-1a through MM-CUL-1c. Impacts of Building A on recreational and open space resources and trees are addressed in Sections 3.15 and 3.4, respectively, and were identified as being less than significant.

See also response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room Impacts to Historic Manor Building.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

CHAN-M-1.6:

Comment (verbatim)

Does the DEIR address environment impact on the residents? Did DEIR review the subject of people flow, the very basic in architecture/city planning?

Response to Comment

The Draft EIR completed for the proposed project contains detailed information concerning the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the project. In compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a), the Draft EIR includes an analysis of potential project impacts on the environment, including any significant environmental effects the project might cause to nearby receptors, including residents of the SRC campus. The comment regarding the subject of “people flow” does not raise any specific environmental issues; therefore, no further response or edits to the Draft EIR are required under CEQA.

See also response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

CHAN-M-1.7:

Comment (verbatim)

There is another community at the end of Odd Fellowship Drive. The residents there share same the access road with SRC community. Building B and C along that access road make elderly residents in both communities walking along those roads very hazardous. Has the applicant done a traffic count of all the roads in the campus?

Response to Comment

As described in Section 3.16.1 of the Draft EIR, there is an existing private sidewalk along the southern side of Odd Fellows Drive that provides for pedestrian access along this road. As part of the project, additional sidewalks and crosswalks would also be

installed in various locations within the SRC campus, including crosswalks across Odd Fellows Drive just east of West Cottages Lane and just west of McLaren Lane.

The Traffic Study for the Project (Appendix F of the Draft EIR) assessed the proposed on-site circulation improvements, including analysis of sight distance from new internal driveway intersections and proposed crosswalks, driveway width, intersection geometry and internal circulation and made several recommendations, which have been incorporated into mitigation measure MM-TRA-3b. The Traffic Study included traffic counts at three key intersections of public roadways near the project site.

See also response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

CHAN-M-1.8:

Comment (verbatim)

In conclusion, the current proposal of building five new buildings to generate new income is not well thought out both financially and environmentally. Other possible ways to achieve the financial objective but without such large impact to the environment have never been seriously considered by the applicant.

Response to Comment

Analysis of alternatives to the proposed project that would avoid or reduce the potentially significant impacts of the project is included in Section 4 of the Draft EIR.

See also response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

CHAN-M-2.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a duplicate of comment letter CHAN-M-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within this letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comments CHAN-M-1.1 through CHAN-M-1.8.

3.4.22 Commenter CHAN-R

CHAN-R-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-18. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-18.1.

CHAN-R-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-21. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-21.1.

3.4.23 Commenter CHU-S

CHU-S-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-21. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-21.1.

CHU-S-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-19. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-19.1.

CHU-S-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-17. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-17.1.

3.4.24 Commenter CLAYDON-R

CLAYDON-R-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-18. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-18.1.

3.4.25 Commenter CONNELLY-H

CONNELLY-H-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

CONNELLY-H-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-31, with additional comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment CONNELLY-H-2.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-31.1

CONNELLY-H-2.2

Comment (verbatim)

This campus has added to the prestige of Saratoga for 111 years - any major change as planned would be a huge mistake and irreversible! Please help preserve SRC for future residents and for it's historical value!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

CONNELLY-H-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11, with additional comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment CONNELLY-H-3.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

CONNELLY-H-3.2

Comment (verbatim)

The HCC has needed upgrading since 2005 when SRC opened! It has been our "white elephant" for 18 1/2 years. We need to get our priorities in order!

Response to Comment

This comment does not raise any specific environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response or edits to the Draft EIR are required under CEQA.

CONNELLY-H-4.1

Comment (verbatim)

I have lived for 50 years on the Stanford campus and when my husband and I starting looking for retirement homes, we checked out 20 – between San Mateo + Los Gatos! This beautiful campus in Saratoga was the winner! It has been here since 1912 and the big trees and space were ideal for us plus moving into a brand new apartment in 2005 when it opened. My husband was ill and died after a year here but used all 4 levels of care (CCRC) but I am still here after 18 ½ years at age 96 and this setting has supported my last years. I hope the city of Saratoga appreciates what a treasure SRC is and preserves it as is for future residents.

Response to Comment

This comment does not raise any specific environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response or edits to the Draft EIR are required under CEQA.

See also response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

3.4.26 Commenter COOPER-B

COOPER-B-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Action Requested: Approve Alternative 3 (New Building D) to meet consumer demand for 2-bedroom Independent Living units and maintain the current, approximately 15%/85% ratio of 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom units instead of approximately 40%/60% in Alternative 2.

The project seems to be a choice between Alternatives 2 & 3, which have the same dwelling unit density:

- *Alternative 2 drops the proposed 10-unit building (Building B) but keeps the unit count at 52 by reconfiguring Buildings A & C to include the 10 units.*
- *Alternative 3 includes a 10-unit Independent Living building (Building D) with an additional mitigation measure of a parking lot design review (MM-CUL-1d-ALT3).*

[NOTE: comment included tables, see Appendix A for details.]

The proposed unit sizes are 1,017 SF for the six 1-bedroom units and 1,371 SF–1,832 SF for the forty-six 2-bedroom units:

Moving the ten Building B units to Buildings A & C and maintaining 52 total units, reduces ALL 52 to 1,087 SF, 1- bedroom units.

As the facility has evolved from my IOOF great-grandfather's era to today, retired residential living has evolved from studio, through 1-bedroom, to 2-bedrooms. Contrary to this trend, Alternative 2 would triple the 1-bedroom count and eliminate new 2-bedrooms.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-6: Support for Applicant's Alternative (Alternative 3).

Comments pertaining to unit size, the ratio of 1-bedroom to 2-bedroom units and/or market demand do not raise any specific environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response or edits to the Draft EIR are required under CEQA.

3.4.27 Commenter CORNEY-J

CORNEY-J-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

The new bldg. A and meeting room would remove all remaining outdoor recreation and green space. Residents depend on this space to relax and enjoy the beautiful campus. Indoor utilities cannot replace outdoor fresh air.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

CORNEY-J-2.1

Comment (verbatim)

To the Commission Planning Board and City Council. The gates on Chester Ave for 80 additional Fellowship residents and additional 52 SRC apartments are inadequate for emergency evacuation. They cannot handle the ambulances, fire trucks and additional cars. Emergency access is needed with more details. Important to build the access road first.

Response to Comment

As described in Section 2.3.4 of the Draft EIR, an additional emergency/secondary access point would be provided between Odd Fellows Drive and Chester Avenue (just east of proposed Building C), which would have a sliding, manual gate and fire department Knox Box⁴. This access would meet the width, surface, slope, approach and departure angles, turning radii, and vertical requirements to allow the passage of fire department vehicles, and would be in addition to the existing resident emergency vehicular access just north of proposed Building C, which would be retained as part of the project.

As stated in Section 3.16.3 of the Draft EIR, SCCFD requires that the new emergency access must be constructed and completed prior to the commencement of any other construction activities at the site, and this requirement is reflected in the project plans submitted to the City. Therefore, the new secondary access point would be fully functional and available for emergency vehicles to access the SRC campus and Fellowship Plaza property throughout construction and operation of the project, in the event that Odd Fellows Drive were temporarily blocked.

⁴ A Knox Box is a small, mounted safe that holds building or gate keys for fire departments, emergency medical services, and sometimes police to retrieve and use in emergency situations. Knox Box is a brand name but is also used to refer to such emergency access provisions in general.

See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation for additional discussion in relation to emergency access and evacuation.

CORNEY-J-3.1

Comment (verbatim)

To the Planning Commission and City Council. I came to live at SRS 11 years ago because it was by far the most beautiful Senior Citizen place around. If the expansion plan of PRS is approved, we will lose the beauty of the buildings, trees, shades, and serenity, open spaces. Please don't let this happen!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Quality.

CORNEY-J-4.1

Comment (verbatim)

Emergency Evacuation will be a major problem. When 40 ambulances have to come to campus, how can they be expected to evacuate using their own vehicles, with an additional 52 apartments and Fellowship residents, fire access will be difficult if not impossible.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

CORNEY-J-5.1

Comment (verbatim)

HCC remodel has adverse effects on outside air, water, noise, etc. While the DEIR concerns itself with the exterior environment, what will the patients do to avoid the ill effects of construction, i.e. mold disease, exacerbation of lung disease? Not many details for our HCC – for patients who cannot relocate during remodel.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

3.4.28 Commenter CUMMINS-C

CUMMINS-C-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

The draft EIR (DEIR) for the proposed Saratoga Retirement Community's ("SRC") expansion completely fails to consider the effects on SRC Independent living residents. We live here and it's as if we do not exist. We are part of the environment. In fact, we are the environmental factor most affected by the proposed expansion.

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Consider: This expansion is akin to some outsider proposing to build an additional dwelling unit (ADU) in your backyard. Your E.I.R., if similar to ours, would ignore whether or not you want someone else's ADU in your backyard or how it would affect you.

Most of us independent living residents cannot simply move out of SRC and return to our prior homes or buy another home if we oppose the expansion. Being unemployed, we cannot qualify for a real estate loan. Also, we cannot be considered simply as renters who could move on. We all paid substantial entrance fees to SRC. If we move out, we forfeit 1/3 of the entrance for each of the first 3 years following admission. There is no refund if you move out after 3 years. Entrance fees presently range close to \$1,000,000.

Most of us independent living residents moved to SRC because we wanted to be part of a community of new friends with whom we could live out our remaining years in the ambiance and beauty of the SRC campus. That also was and is the hope and expectation of my children and grandchildren. I expect the same holds true for other residents. Expansion would destroy our beautiful campus. Whether we move out or stay put, expansion ruins these expectations and plans.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

The comment does not raise any specific environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR; therefore, no further response or edits to the Draft EIR are required under CEQA.

CUMMINS-C-1.2:

Comment (verbatim)

Like this DEIR which ignores us, SRC adopted and pushed their unwanted expansion plan with ZERO TRANSPARENCY. SRC did not consult residents before planning the expansion or thereafter. SRC never disclosed any financial data, financial forecasts or demographic data...anything...to justify an expansion. Indeed, this month management again refused to disclose any such financial data. The July 18, 2023 report of our representative to the Odd Fellows Home of California Board (OFHC) states that the management company Pacific Retirement Services (PRS) "declined the major resident request to explain why any expansion is necessary, which would entail comparing financial projections of the status quo and any alternative for perhaps 10 years". There has never been any due diligence regarding the OFHC/PRS proposed expansion. Independent living residents' substantial entrance and additional monthly fees carry SRC financially. To plan an expansion at substantial additional expense to residents without disclosure of any financial due diligence is unconscionable. We residents are the ones who will bear this unknown financial risk.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-8: Residents Not Informed of Project.

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

CUMMINS-C-1.3:

Comment (verbatim)

Residents conducted a survey in 2022 showing substantial opposition to the proposed expansion. In 2022 our board representative was denied access to a board meeting to present the results of that survey.

Residents did not ask for an auditorium, an additional fitness center or more dining rooms. Those and additional parking would be necessary only if the unwanted independent living units are built. We already have the space for and conduct "fitness options like floor exercise, aerobics, yoga, tai chi, dance and more".

The Preserve SRC plan was developed and supported by a majority of independent living residents only in an attempt to ameliorate some of the damage proposed by OFHC/PRS. The Memorial Garden on which SRC's proposed Building A would be constructed is our only usable outside open space. It contains our highly popular regulation length bocce ball court, horseshoe pits, putting green, and picnic area. OFHC and PRS propose scrapping these to make room for Building A and its 22 independent living units.

Expansion is simply a real estate transaction for OFHC and its managers, PRS, to increase the value of the property, but does not have any increase in value for residents. Expansion is not being conducted for the residents' benefit, but is at the residents' expense and risk. Residents also will bear the cost and burden of any mitigation mentioned in the DEIR. And, we are the people who will have to live with the disruption of construction. This is our home, and we residents are being swept along for the ride without oars or a rudder or a voice in the matter. Any expansion will adversely impact our physical, mental and emotional health and our financial stability. These factors are just as important environmental issues as any and all of the other environmental factors addressed by the DEIR.

The DEIR omits these environmental factors. We residents live on this beautiful campus, and expansion will disrupt our lives and degrade our living experience.

Response to Comment:

Section 3 of the Draft EIR contains detailed information concerning the environmental effects associated with implementation of the project, in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a). Where applicable, the analysis of potential significant impacts includes consideration of physical and mental/emotional health. For example, Impact AIR-3 in Section 3.3.3 includes a health risk assessment from air pollutant emissions during project construction and operation. Impact NOI-1 in Section 3.12.3 identifies potential impacts from construction noise, and the potential for noise exposure to cause physical and emotional health impacts such as hearing loss, hypertension, anxiety, and heart disease are acknowledged in Section 3.12.1.

Comments pertaining to the lack of support for the project and/or lack of need for certain components of the project do not raise any specific environmental concerns requiring a response under CEQA.

See also response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See also response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See also response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See also response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

CUMMINS-C-2.1:

Comment (verbatim)

The Odd Fellows Home of California and its manager Pacific Retirement Services (OFHC/PRS) have tried to obscure the impact of their proposed expansion plans from everyone including us (the residents), neighbors and the City. Initially they fought to avoid story poles so that the sight line impact of the proposed buildings on our campus would not be visible. Now they don't want anyone to know the extent of the 124 trees to be cut down, which would look almost like a clear cut.

On 7/27/23 residents marked many of the trees OFHC/PRS plan to cut down with yellow ribbons so that any interested person actually could see which trees would be removed. That evening management instructed residents to promptly remove the ribbons, or management would remove them. I walked the campus to view and photograph the trees proposed to be removed. I was shocked. The extent of destruction is almost unbelievable. You have to see it to believe it. This is unconscionable. It will be impossible to remediate this damage. And, yes, management removed the yellow ribbons on 7/28/23.

As I commented in another email, we residents moved to SRC to live out our final years on our beautiful campus in peace and to leave the same to those who follow us. Foliage constitutes a lot of the beautiful visual aesthetic and peaceful ambience here. Please do not approve any expansion.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Quality.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

CUMMINS-C-3.1:

Comment (verbatim)

My wife Anne and I live near the end of the cul-de-sac at Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC) and would probably be among the last people to evacuate in an emergency. We believe that the restricted ingress and egress from SRC to Fruitvale Avenue and Chester Avenue is inadequate and any expansion will make this situation more dangerous and unacceptable.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

CUMMINS-C-3.2:

Comment (verbatim)

The draft EIR studies the traffic impact on the intersection of Fruitvale Avenue and Allendale, and the intersection of Saratoga Los Gatos Road and San Marcos Road. It does not address the extent or flow of traffic into and out of SRC and Fellowship Plaza in the event of a forest fire or other catastrophe requiring the evacuation of those properties. SRC presently has 249 Independent Living, Assisted Living, Memory Care and Health Care Center (skilled nursing center) units. And we have a substantial number of motor vehicles. DEIR pages 3.177 & 3.178 state that SRC expansion could add 54-89 residents and that Fellowship Plaza has the potential to add up to 136 residents aged 65 and older. Both expansions could add 190-225 additional senior residents, and of course their motor vehicles.

SRC has 3 exits onto Odd Fellows Drive. That is a 2 lane street (single lane in each direction) connecting with the 2 lane San Marcos Road which in turn intersects with Fruitvale Avenue. The other end of Odd Fellows Drive terminates at Fellowship Plaza. They share our exit to Fruitvale Avenue. So, SRC and Fellowship Plaza traffic to and from Fruitvale Avenue travels one lane in and one lane out. There is another emergency exit onto Chester Avenue which has limited and questionable utility.

Response to Comment:

The impact of the proposed project on emergency access is addressed in Sections 3.9 (Impact HAZ-5), 3.16 (Impact TRA-4) and 3.19 (Impact WF-1), and the combined impacts of the proposed project along with potential future development of 80 additional low-income senior residential units on the adjacent Fellowship Plaza property in accordance with the City's Housing Element Update are addressed with the cumulative analysis in Sections 3.9.4 (Impact C-HAZ-2) and 3.16.4 (Impact C-TRA-4).

See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

CUMMINS-C-3.3:

Comment (verbatim)

The DEIR discusses the impact of the proposed project on normal traffic on Fruitvale Avenue. But it does not discuss the traffic impact of an evacuation. I have not seen any study or calculations of the number of people and motor vehicles that would have to enter into and exit from SRC and Fellowship Plaza in the event of a catastrophic emergency. The evacuees would be residents, staff, visitors, vendors and any other outside workers at SRC and Fellowship Plaza, almost all of whom would be moving in motor vehicles.

At the same time these properties are being vacated, emergency personnel, emergency vehicles, buses and ambulances will be attempting to enter the properties. Residents at SRC and Fellowship Plaza are elderly. We presently have 88 Assisted Living and 18 memory Care units at SRC. Most of those residents would have to be evacuated in buses. We presently have 94 units at SRC's skilled nursing facility known as the Health Care Center. Most of those residents/patients would have to be evacuated in ambulances. Ambulances with which I am familiar only hold one patient. THAT IS A LOT OF PEOPLE AND MOTOR VEHICLES moving on a narrow 2 lane road and attempting to exit onto Fruitvale Avenue one vehicle at a time. Some of these vehicles can exit via

Chester Avenue into a residential neighborhood. That neighborhood can be expected to evacuate at the same time which makes the Chester Avenue exit a potential choke point. I cannot conceive of the Chester Avenue exit solving these serious problems.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

CUMMINS-C-3.4:

Comment (verbatim)

Pages 3.175 and 3.176 of the DEIR state that since the proposed expansion project is not located on Fruitvale Avenue, "its operation would not physically interfere with or impair the utilization of Fruitvale as an effective evacuation route." That ignores the problems of (1) getting vehicles and people to the San Marcos Road intersection with Fruitvale Avenue, and then (2) moving one vehicle at a time from San Marcos Road onto Fruitvale Avenue. Also, there is no consideration given to the crush of pedestrians in these various areas trying to evacuate.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

CUMMINS-C-3.5:

Comment (verbatim)

The DEIR states at page 3-287, that since the project would have to comply with Santa Clara County Fire Department (SCCFD) standards in order to obtain a permit, and compliance would be verified during the permitting process, that the impact of the project on emergency response and evacuation would be less than significant. The DEIR also states that since the fire department reviews these matters "to ENSURE adequate emergency ingress and egress", the proposed expansion "WOULD PREVENT a significant cumulative impact to emergency response or evacuation." (emphasis added) This means that the consultants have not studied the emergency response and evacuation issues, and/or have not reached any conclusions of their own. They simply pass that responsibility on to the fire department. That is, the consultants have not taken a position independent from future action by the fire department.

It seems completely irresponsible for a developer to proceed all the way into the permitting process before finding out whether or not its proposed project complies with fire department standards for emergency response and evacuation.

People say: " Hope for the best but plan for the worst". Consider this scenario. A catastrophic earthquake hits our area. Trees, power poles or whatever topple across Odd Fellows Drive. Gas lines rupture and a fire starts in our neighborhood. A tree falls across our Building 4000 or 5000 garage exit. We are doomed. Emergency vehicles cannot rescue us. The best runners/walkers amongst us may get out, but many will not.

In short, the DEIR does not adequately study and address emergency response and evacuation.

Response to Comment:

The Santa Clara County Fire Department (SCCFD) undertook preliminary review of the project in 2020 and their plan review comments were incorporated into the proposed

project (see project plan set, Sheets A1.05 through A1.08). SCCFD approval of the project plans for the secondary access and proposed buildings were granted in May 2021 and July 2021, respectively, as part of the development review process (SCCFD 2021a, 2021b). In addition, during the building permit process, the building plans will be re-reviewed by SCCFD to ensure no changes have been made that would affect compliance with the California Fire Code and California Building Code.

Because compliance with the California Fire Code (and other applicable regulations) is mandatory, environmental impacts arising from potential non-compliance with the requirements of those regulations is not considered an environmental impact of the project under CEQA. Furthermore, adopted building codes and standards can be assumed to minimize environmental impacts, and need not be included as mitigation measures, as long as the environmental benefits of the cited codes and sections are described (Oakland Heritage Alliance v. City of Oakland (2011) 195 Cal.App.4th 884).

See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

CUMMINS-C-4.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a duplicate of comment letter CUMMINS-C-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within this letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment:

See response to comments CUMMINS-C-1.1 through CUMMINS-C-1.3.

3.4.29 Commenter CURRY-B

CURRY-B-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

One of the reasons that I chose Saratoga Retirement Community is the attractive outdoor green space. The bucolic campus is one of the assets of the entire Saratoga City. Here seniors can relax and have fresh air.

I am against Pacific Retirement Service's building the two story high apartment which will occupy all the green space we have. Please do NOT build these apartments. This green space is an irreplaceable jewel.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

CURRY-B-2.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is nearly identical to the form letter FORM-16. No additional environmental topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-16.1.

CURRY-B-3.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I enjoy playing Bocce with my neighbors every week, sometimes twice a week. It is a healthy and fun outdoors activity. I am very upset that the Pacific Retirement Services has proposed a master plan to eliminate the wonderful Bocce ball court by building a two story apartment building. The proposed replacement court is only 2/3 of its current full size. Please do NOT build these apartments. The Bocce ball court is one of our most important outdoor facilities. Over 60 residents regularly enjoy the games. Some of our senior citizens come to play even using walkers!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

CURRY-B-4.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Just look at these photos. Can you see why we treasure our campus? If you allow PRS to build these monstrous apartment buildings, we will lose our outdoor recreation, our green open space and our views and the fresh air that we get from our trees. We are strongly against building these apartment buildings right in the center of our campus.

[NOTE: this comment referenced photographs, but none were included.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

3.4.30 Commenter CURRY-R

CURRY-R-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

I am a resident at the Saratoga Retirement Community since 2015. I enjoy playing Bocce with my neighbors every week, sometimes twice a week. It is a healthy and fun outdoors activity.

I am very upset that the Pacific Retirement Services has proposed a master plan to eliminate the wonderful Bocce ball court by building a two story apartment building. The proposed replacement court is only 2/3 of its current full size.

Please do NOT build these apartments. The Bocce ball court is one of our most important outdoors facility. Over 60 residents regularly enjoy the games. Some of our senior citizens come to play even using walkers!

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

CURRY-R-2.1

Comment (verbatim)

One of the reasons that I chose Saratoga Retirement Community is the attractive outdoor green space. The bucolic campus is one of the assets of the entire Saratoga City. Here seniors can relax and have fresh air.

I am against Pacific Retirement Service's building the two story high apartment which will occupy all the green space we have. Please do NOT build these apartments. This green space is an irreplaceable jewel.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

CURRY-R-3.1

Comment (verbatim)

Just look at these photos. Can you see why we treasure our campus? If you allow PRS to build these monstrous apartment buildings, we will lose our outdoors recreation, our green open space and our views and the fresh air that we get from our trees.

We are strongly against building these apartment building right in the center of our campus.

[NOTE: comment included images, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

CURRY-R-4.1

Comment (verbatim)

My name is Roger Curry. I am a resident at the Saratoga Retirement Community. I am strongly against building these apartment building right in the center of our campus.

For SRC, the Odd Fellows park is equivalent to the "Central Park." In New York City. It is a safe and outdoor path for us to stroll. We can come out of our apartment walk around to get sunshine and fresh air. These paths are very accessible even for walkers. In contrast, the DEIR suggests that these campus walking paths can be substituted by the nearby San Marcos Open space (p.3-260 DEIR). The DEIR claims that the San Marcos Open Space is only 300 feet to the southeast of the Project site, but that is the direct air distance, up a steep embankment—inaccessible except by a 2.5-mile round trip along the road. This shows complete lack of understanding of the Seniors' needs nor respect for seniors' quality of life.

Please do NOT allow the apartment building.

[NOTE: comment included images, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

CURRY-R-5.1

Comment (verbatim)

Comments to the Alternative 2, proposed and deemed to be environmentally superior to all others by EIR consultants

Topic : RECREATION and OPEN SPACE

These following key points are our arguments against the Alternative 2

- 1) Replacement of the full size Bocce ball court by a 2/3-size court at West Cottage Lane is not acceptable.*
- 2) SRC would lose most of our outdoor recreation space*
- 3) Loss of the safe and green space that we all enjoy*
- 4) Loss of our public park*

Response to Comment

As discussed in Section 4.5.3 of the Draft EIR (under subheading “Recreation”), the impact of Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative) on recreational resources would be “less than significant”, which is the same level of impact as the proposed project. Alternative 2 was determined to be the environmentally superior alternative (after the no project alternative) because it would reduce the significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project on historic resources to less than significant with mitigation, and would not introduce any new or more severe environmental impacts when compared to the proposed project.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See also response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.

3.4.31 Commenter DARLENE

DARLENE-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-17. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-17.1.

DARLENE-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-5. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-5.1.

DARLENE-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

3.4.32 Commenter DAY-J

DAY-J-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-2. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-2.1 through FORM-2.3.

DAY-J-2.1

Comment (verbatim)

PRS/OFHC have provided no financial justification for this project which includes depreciation and amortization. They do not plan cost recovery from the investment – it is not a financial plan for continued long term operation. Their motivation is to enhance prospects for the sale of the property – it appears a strategy to exit from senior care. SRC is on a stand alone sound financial condition.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

DAY-J-3.1

Comment (verbatim)

The DEIR fails to reflect the devastation to trees, the destruction of a historical monument, the disruption of neighborhood, traffic on a narrow access road for emergency ambulances, lack of improvement in skilled nursing facility.

This is a negative event with no benefit to the community.

Please disqualify the DEIR.

Response to Comment

Impacts of the proposed project in relation to the topics raised by the commenter are evaluated within Section 3 of the Draft EIR, in particular within Impact BIO-5 in Section 3.4.3 (loss of trees), Impact CUL-1 in Section 3.5.3 (impacts to historic resources), Impacts NOI-1 and NOI-2 in Section 3.12.3 (disruption from noise and vibration), Impacts HAZ-5 in Section 3.9.3, TRA-4 in Section 3.16.3 and WF-1 in Section 3.19.3 (emergency access). Proposed improvements to the existing skilled nursing facility (Health Center) that would occur as part of the project are described in Section 2.3.2 of the Draft EIR. The commenter provides no specific details as to the inadequacy of the Draft EIR to address these impacts and no additional information that would change the conclusions therein.

See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See also response to MASTER-10: Impacts of the Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

DAY-J-4.1

Comment (verbatim)

Emergency access for facility is very limited. SRC is the most frequently visited site for 911 calls in Saratoga. The skilled nursing facility should be moved to the front of facility as it appears in the Resident Alternative Plan.

Not in back of facility after limited access.

This would be especially necessary during years of construction.

Response to Comment

As discussed in Section 2.3.2 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project includes only internal renovations to the existing Health Center (skilled nursing facility) and would result in a decrease in the number of skilled nursing beds within the Health Center, and therefore would be expected to decrease the demand for 911 calls from the Health Center compared to existing conditions. The location of the Health Center would remain in its existing location on campus, and a new secondary emergency access point would be added between Odd Fellows Drive and Chester Avenue to facilitate emergency access. As discussed in Section 3.16.3 of the Draft EIR, temporary impacts to emergency access during construction could be potentially significant but would be mitigated to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measure MM-TRA-3a.

See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

See also response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

DAY-J-5.1

Comment (verbatim)

The Resident Alternative Plan was misrepresented. The consultant never consulted the resident committee for design input – they created a bias against a much better plan – there is no statement about its comparative economic cost or benefit.

The resident plan would have the positive result of creating a new health center state of the art and with better access to ambulances from Fruitvale Ave. The current health care access is limited by winding access.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

3.4.33 Commenter DIXSON-J

DIXSON-J-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

As a resident of the Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC) I am concerned about the proposals for further development of our facility and the environmental impact study of the various proposals. Today I am writing to ask you to please block any proposal involving construction of the proposed meeting room appendage to the Manor building and Building A.

The DEIR (draft environmental impact report) submitted by AECOM addresses some of the residents' concerns, but in many cases the impact on SRC residents is played down or even dismissed as unimportant. Too often, the impact on nonresidents is given priority over those of us currently living here.

The following list shows reasons why I believe Building A and the meeting room addition to the Manor building must be removed from any development plan approved for SRC, and how the DEIR mischaracterizes the impact of these reasons.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See also responses to comments DIXSON-J-1.2 through DIXSON-J-1.7.

DIXSON-J-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

Obliteration of Odd Fellows Historical Park

Construction of Building A would cover up most of the green space currently designated as Odd Fellows Home of California Historical Park, dedicated with a plaque on the site

in August 2008. The proposed meeting room addition to the Saratoga City Heritage landmark Manor building, also a part of the Historical Park, would permanently destroy the architectural symmetry of the beautiful Manor. Together, the new buildings would completely wipe out these important historic resources. The DEIR needs to include the cultural and historic impact of the development covering the entire Historic Park.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

DIXSON-J-1.3

Comment (verbatim)

Loss of Mature Trees and Green Vista

Construction of Building A would require the removal of every protected, mature tree in the Historical Park. The expansive green space would be replaced by a huge two-story apartment building. The DEIR states that although “new buildings may alter the views for individual residents within the campus or on neighboring properties, they would not substantially affect views of scenic vistas from public vantage points or for a substantial number of City residents.” The priority here seems to be the people living in other areas of Saratoga and people looking in that direction from vantage points miles away. As one of those “individual residents,” I am more interested in the views from within the campus.

Besides intruding on the Manor’s setting, the current proposal to use the downslope on the west side of the Manor for the Meeting Room’s building site would also eliminate one of the few spaces on campus where there is greenery shaded by trees, an area that has no purpose but to please the eye and refresh the soul. Moreover, the Meeting Room will necessitate the removal of many mature trees, at a time when the benefit of trees is increasingly appreciated as a hedge against global warming.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Vistas.

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

DIXSON-J-1.4

Comment (verbatim)

The DEIR also mentions that removal of trees and the subsequent noise generated by their removal would have a significant impact on the habitats and lifecycles of local bats. While I agree that this is an important consideration (and argument against tree removal), the DEIR makes no mention of the impact of these losses on us elderly residents who must endure the noise and disruption in our homes during construction.

Response to Comment

The impact of construction noise on nearby residents is analyzed in Section 3.12.3 of the Draft EIR.

See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See also response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

DIXSON-J-1.5

Comment (verbatim)

Loss of Green Space and Outdoor Recreation Facilities

The proposed Building A and the meeting room addition to the Manor building would remove almost all of the current green space and outdoor recreation facilities at SRC. The DEIR says that this will have “no impact on open space and recreation facilities for City residents.” This statement seems to relegate SRC residents to nonresident status and completely dismisses the impact of the loss of outdoor facilities on us.

This green space, the Odd Fellows Historical Park, currently includes paved pathways with many benches and tables. A large number of SRC residents (average age 85) have mobility issues requiring canes, walkers, wheelchairs, or motorized assistance to get around. For them and future residents with physical disabilities, this park is the only accessible outdoor recreation available. The DEIR states that there are other paths and trails within a short driving distance, and even one trail accessible from SRC by a 300-ft path up a steep incline, but these are in no way accessible to residents whose disabilities prevent them from driving or using unpaved trails. The DEIR seems to overgeneralize the population they are assessing and therefore fails to accurately determine the impact on them.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

DIXSON-J-1.6

Comment (verbatim)

“Replacement” Bocce Ball Court Not a Usable Replacement

The current 90-foot, regulation size bocce ball court and other outdoor recreation facilities such as a putting green and horseshoe pit would be removed if Building A is constructed. The DEIR states that smaller replacements would be built in a tiny area west of Building A, and these smaller facilities would be enough for SRC residents and not impact most Saratoga residents. The “replacements” are not fine with us. At present, more than 60 residents regularly play bocce ball here. Bocce ball is also a popular spectator sport for many more residents, especially those with limited mobility, for whom it is easily accessible by the paved paths through the Historic Park.

The “replacement” bocce ball court would only be 60 feet in length, 2/3 of regulation size. Some of the SRC teams compete with outside teams on regulation 90-foot courts. Losing our 90-foot court means that those residents would have to find another court, (location currently unknown) to practice for competition. The proposed 60-foot

“replacement” is unacceptable and indicates another example of the devaluation of the impact of this project on SRC residents.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

DIXSON-J-1.7

Comment (verbatim)

In summary, there are many reasons why constructing Building A and the meeting room addition to the Manor building would have a negative effect on the historic,, environmental, and human aspects of the Saratoga Retirement Community and its neighbors. Here I have listed only a few of the most important reasons for me. There are other options for development that can meet all goals without either of those buildings, and I implore you to consider any of those options instead (including the option of doing nothing).

At the very least, please ensure that the entire impact of constructing those buildings is evaluated in the environmental impact study. As it is now, the DEIR seems to have overlooked or undervalued many impacts on those most affected, the current residents of SRC.

Response to Comment

The environmental impacts of the proposed project, including the impacts of construction activities, are addressed in Section 3 of the Draft EIR. As required by CEQA, a reasonable range of alternatives have also been evaluated within the Draft EIR (Section 4).

See also response to MASTER-2: Support for No Project Alternative.

See also response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See also response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

See also response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

DIXSON-J-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-18. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-18.1.

3.4.34 Commenter DOLUCA-T&I

DOLUCA-T&I-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

ODD FELLOWS PARK. This is the only space residents can access to enjoy the outdoors. The park has trees, vegetation, walkways, benches, a putting green and a bocce ball court. The proposed new building will eliminate all that. The DEIR proposes that there are plenty of parks in Saratoga for residents to use. My mom is 92 and she can't walk or drive to these other parks in Saratoga that are over a mile away.

Resident's Alternative 1 proposal saves this recreation space. If Alternative 1 is a no-go, a larger building C could also save this precious space.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

DOLUCA-T&I-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

HEALTH CARE CENTER (HCC) Remodel. There are considerable gaps in the HCC remodel plan. How will the complete remodel be accomplished while residents are being cared for? The HCC improvements are in the late stage (phase 4) of the project whereas it should be priority #1. During COVID, shared rooms were the main transmission reason in nursing homes around the country. See article in AARP, 1/3/2023 by Emily Paulin.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Center Renovations.

DOLUCA-T&I-1.3

Comment (verbatim)

Emergency Response. After reading all the possible road closures and road re-alignments and the fact that Emergency Medical Response (EMR) vehicles are very frequently on the campus day and night, it seems urgent that the Emergency Access Road be built first! This is the access from Chester Ave with a wide sweep to accommodate fire trucks onto Odd Fellows Drive. For years, residents have begged for this as San Marcos/Odd Fellows drive is the only way in and out of the campus. With all the daytime truck congestion and debris removal during the proposed construction, there needs to be a safe way for fire and emergency vehicles to access the campus.

Response to Comment

As stated in Section 3.16.3 of the Draft EIR, SCCFD requires that the new emergency access must be constructed and completed prior to the commencement of any other construction activities at the site, and this requirement is reflected in the project plans

submitted to the City. Therefore, the new secondary access point would be fully functional and available for emergency vehicles to access the SRC campus and Fellowship Plaza property throughout construction and operation of the project, in the event that Odd Fellows Drive were temporarily blocked.

See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

DOLUCA-T&I-1.4

Comment (verbatim)

Air Quality, Noise, and Vibration. This analysis is missing for the interior environment that in-patients in the HCC would be subjected to during the remodel. While the DEIR concerns itself with the exterior environment, no one has examined what the patients must endure trapped in their beds during this construction. In an important study done in Cleveland Clinic and reported in The Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine, October 1, 2019, Amjad Kanj MD et al reported in article, "What are the Risks to Inpatients During Hospital Construction or Renovation", found that "Hospital construction ultimately will serve the interests of patients but it also can put in-patients at risk of mold disease, Legionnaires Disease, sleep deprivation, and exacerbation of lung disease."

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

DOLUCA-T&I-1.5

Comment (verbatim)

In Summary:

- 1) Build the access road appropriate for fire trucks from Chester to Odd Fellows Road first.*
- 2) Build a new HCC as proposed in Alternative 1 – Residents' Alternative first and then build apartments in place of the current HCC.*
- 3) If a new state-of-the-art HCC is out of the question, then current in-patients at HCC must be relocated and the HCC must be remodeled with latest Covid regulations. This is priority #1 for the health and safety of SRC residents.*

Response to Comment

As discussed in response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation, the SCCFD requires as a condition of approval that the proposed secondary access between Odd Fellows Drive and Chester Avenue must be constructed and completed prior to other construction activities at the site.

See also response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

See also response to MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Healthcare Renovations.

See also response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

DOLUCA-T&I-1.6

Comment (verbatim)

RESIDENTS' ALTERNATIVE 1 PROPOSAL. The Draft Environmental Report does not correctly represent Alternative 1 - Residents' Alternative. Several errors are included in Section 4.4. Starting with Figure 4.4-1, the Conceptual Site plan for submitted by the residents shows the layout of the New Health Center, Building C, and the New 2 story Apartment Building, Building D.

- 1) The layout of Building D is important as it has the same footprint as the current Health Care Center and would provide for 52 apartments and an auditorium. However, Figure 4.4-2 Conceptual Building D Layout- Alternative 1, shows a completely different building layout(shape) and claims the building needs 3 stories.*
- 2) The size and shape of Alternative 1's New Health Center, Building C is incorrect (should be 40 beds rather than the Project's 52 beds)*
- 3) The number of Parking spaces in Building D's underground garage shown as only 50 spaces vs 90 submitted under Alternative 1.*
- 4) The values in Table 4.4-2 for the cut volume and max depth of cut for Alternative 1, Building D are incorrect.*

This layout was provided by Ankron Molsan, the architect for the Project Applicant. For unknown reasons, he did not correctly capture the Residents' Alternative. Based on these errors the DEIR Section 4.1 Alternative 1 needs major corrections.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

3.4.35 Commenter DROBNICH-L

DROBNICH-L-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

As a resident of the Saratoga Retirement Community, I am deeply disturbed by development plans proposed by Pacific Retirement Services. This out-of-state company seems to have no regard for the history and culture of the Saratoga community in general let alone the Saratoga Retirement Community specifically.

I chose to move to Saratoga because of the natural beauty of the redwoods, the green landscape, and the history. I enjoy the quiet campus of the Saratoga Retirement Community and dread the day the redwoods and other heritage trees – over 100 I believe – are cut down to make way for more dense development of the property, including a two-story apartment building and a multi-story meeting hall.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

DROBNICH-L-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

That new two-story apartment building of luxury apartments will replace the Historic Odd Fellows Park, which currently includes a Bocce Ball Court, redwood trees, an old putting green, a horseshoe pit, a paved patio, three picnic tables, and benches. In other words, our central outdoor activity will be gone.

I play Bocce Ball with nine other teams and find it difficult to believe that our 90' court will be replaced with another 2/3rds the size and that no other outdoor recreation facilities are planned. During the COVID pandemic all our indoor activities were cancelled; outdoor activities were the only possibility at that time.

Dense, luxury housing on historic property, and hidden from general view as planned by PRS is not the way to go.

Please help save our trees, our green space, and Saratoga history.

As the song goes "...they saved Paradise..."

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

3.4.36 Commenter DUBRIDGE-D&P

DUBRIDGE-D&P-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-30. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-30.1.

3.4.37 Commenter DUBRIDGE-P

DUBRIDGE-P-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

I am dismayed to read how the "humans" are viewed in the DEIR. There is a considerable amount written about mitigation of nesting birds and about bats but when it mentions the environmental impact of the expansion on humans it is judged to be of no significance. I, along with about 200 other seniors, live in the independent living section of SRC. We will be dreadfully impacted if Bldg. A is built in our Historic Park! Our only outdoor recreation space will be demolished along with dozens of old growth trees and lovely views. Our "Saratoga ambiance" will be gone forever and in its place a mass of

huge apartment blocks resembling an urban ghetto. Our beautiful city of Saratoga does not deserve this environmental desecration. It is stated that we can use nearby parks; many SRC residents no longer drive and many use walkers or canes. They need a recreational park within steps of their home.

Please, please revise your DEIR to reflect this.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

DUBRIDGE-P-2.1

Comment (verbatim)

My name is Pat DuBridge. I moved to Saratoga with my husband and two young children 58 years ago. We chose Saratoga because of the open space, beautiful trees and the semi-rural small town.

We grew to love Saratoga and I spent much of my time working with, and supporting, the schools, Montalvo and the Foothill Club. Because we had such close ties, we moved to Saratoga Retirement Community seven years ago to, hopefully, enjoy many more years in a lovely bucolic setting.

Our historic park is right in the middle of the complex; not large, but on the ONLY FLAT LAND LEFT on our 37 acres. Our cottage is right across the street from the park and I can attest to the fact that it is well used by our 200 Independent Living residents for Bocce, Tai Chi, Golf putting, picnicking and just sitting in the sun with friends.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

DUBRIDGE-P-2.2

Comment (verbatim)

Our out-of-state management company (PRS) is seeking a permit to expand even though we are financially very healthy. If this permit is granted, our park, surrounded by many stately, heritage oaks and redwoods (many 100 years old) will be destroyed so that a very large apartment building can be constructed on the site. We and those who follow us for generations, need a pleasant outdoor recreation space and that special Saratoga ambiance of open vistas and ancient, heritage trees.

Please SPARE OUR PARK and keep SRC green.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

DUBRIDGE-P-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-18. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-18.1.

3.4.38 Commenter DUBRIDGE-R

DUBRIDGE-R-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-30. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-30.1.

DUBRIDGE-R-2.1

Comment (verbatim)

I have edited the to make it less biased. My changes are in BOLD.

Response to Comment

The commenter provided several attachments showing requested edits to various sections of the Draft EIR. These are addressed in turn in responses to comments DUBRIDGE-R-2.2 through DUBRIDGE-R-2.11 below. For succinctness, only the section of the Draft EIR being referred to, and the specific sentences or paragraphs with proposed new text (shown in underline) suggested by the comment are reproduced below. See Appendix A for full copy of the commenter's proposed revisions.

DUBRIDGE-R-2.2

Comment (verbatim)

Suggested edits to Executive Summary, Page ii of DEIR, second paragraph:

Building A would be constructed (within the existing garden/recreation area south of the Manor building and north of the Fitness Center) on the Odd Fellows Home Historical Park, the only outdoor activity space at SRC leaving SRC with no outdoor activity space.

Response to Comment

The paragraph of the Executive Summary proposed for revision by the commenter is within the subsection titled “Project Description”, which describes the proposed project in factual terms. The commenter’s suggested edits, which include the commenter’s opinion regarding potential impacts of Building A on recreational space, are not appropriate within the Project Description. Impacts to Recreational Resources, including acknowledgement that construction of Building A would require demolition of the outdoor activity space between Pavilion Circle and West Cottages Drive, are addressed in Section 3.15.3 of the Draft EIR. No edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

DUBRIDGE-R-2.3

Comment (verbatim)

Suggested edits to Executive Summary, Page ii of DEIR, fourth paragraph:

The height of the building above average grade would be approximately 40.5 feet, and the total building footprint would be 18,509 SF. The construction of these buildings would require clear cutting all 65 historical trees in the center of the campus.

Response to Comment

The Project Description section of the Executive Summary is, by design, a summary of the more detailed information contained within Section 2 of the Draft EIR. As such, detailed information such as the number of trees that would be removed to facilitate construction for each building were not included within the summary. Nonetheless, given the high level of interest from the public regarding the proposed tree removal, minor edits have been made to the last paragraph on page ii of the Executive Summary to discuss the overall number of trees proposed for removal as part of the project.

These proposed edits are described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.

See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

DUBRIDGE-R-2.4

Comment (verbatim)

Suggested edits to Executive Summary, Page iv of DEIR, bullet point addressing Alternative 1:

The Fitness Center Addition would be constructed under Alternative 1, exactly as proposed by the Project. Buildings A and B and the proposed Meeting Room adjacent to the Manor building would not be constructed under this alternative. As a result there would be no building on the Odd Fellows Home Historic Park and the outdoor activity space would be preserved. In addition most of the 65 historic trees on campus would be preserved.

Response to Comment

The paragraph of the Executive Summary proposed for revision by the commenter is within the subsection titled “Summary of Project Alternatives,” which summarizes the proposed project alternatives in factual terms. The commenter’s suggested edits, which include the commenter’s opinion regarding potential impacts of Buildings A and B and

the proposed Meeting Room on trees and recreational space, are not appropriate within the Summary of Project Alternatives. Impacts to trees and recreational resources under Alternative 1 (the Residents' Alternative), including acknowledgement that Alternative 1 would avoid the removal of 70 trees and that Building A would not be constructed within the open space area, are included in Section 4.4.3 of the Draft EIR. No edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

DUBRIDGE-R-2.5

Comment (verbatim)

Suggested edits to Executive Summary, Page iv of DEIR, bullet point addressing Alternative 3:

Alternative 3 would include the construction of Building A, Building C, the Meeting Room Addition, and Fitness Center Addition, exactly as proposed by the project. Since Building A would be built on the Odd Fellows Historical Park, the outdoor activity space would be eliminated and not replaced.

Response to Comment

As discussed above in response to comment DUBRIDGE-R-2.4, the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR is not the appropriate section of the document to discuss the potential impacts of an alternative. Impacts to trees and recreational resources under Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative) are evaluated in Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR. No edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

DUBRIDGE-R-2.6

Comment (verbatim)

Suggested edits to Executive Summary, Page v of DEIR, third paragraph under subheading "Environmentally Superior Alternative":

Alternative 2, the Reduced Development Alternative, would avoid the proposed Project's significant and unavoidable impact to historical resources, but would require the same mitigation measures as the Project (MM-CUL-1a through MM-CUL-1c) in order to reduce the potential impacts to less than significant with mitigation (Impact CUL-1). However, this alternative would still require the construction of Building A on the Odd Fellows Home Historical Park and eliminate the sole outdoor activity space at SRC and the elimination of most of the historic trees on campus.

Response to Comment

The paragraph of the Executive Summary proposed for revision by the commenter already acknowledges that Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative) would reduce the intensity of several impacts compared to the project, including Impact BIO-5 which relates to tree removal. See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

As discussed in response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space, the analysis of impacts to recreational resources under CEQA focuses on impacts to public

recreational facilities, not on impacts to private recreational facilities on private property. Nonetheless, the Draft EIR does acknowledge (in Section 4.5.3, under Impact REC-1) that Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative) would displace the existing private recreational facilities within the proposed Building A construction area, and that the proposed replacement facilities would be smaller than the existing facilities (similar to the proposed project). Because impacts to these private recreational facilities do not constitute an environmental impact under CEQA, their discussion in the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR are not considered necessary.

No edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

DUBRIDGE-R-2.7

Comment (verbatim)

Suggested edits to Executive Summary, Page vi of DEIR (addition of new bullet point):

- *Whether any project should be approved that eliminates the Odd Fellows Historical Park and clear cuts 65 historic trees on the campus.*

Response to Comment

The paragraph of the Executive Summary proposed for revision by the commenter already acknowledges that one of the major issues to be resolved is whether the proposed project, a project alternative, or no project should be approved. Due to the myriad of considerations that the Lead Agency decision makers must take when deciding on the appropriate action with respect to this project, it is not considered appropriate to specifically mention specific potential impacts such as tree removal in this section of the Executive Summary. No edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

DUBRIDGE-R-2.8

Comment (verbatim)

Suggested edits to Section 2.3.1, Page 2-6 of DEIR, first paragraph:

Building A would be constructed (within the existing garden/recreation area south of the Manor and north of the existing fitness center) on the Odd Fellows Home Historical Park eliminating the only outside activity space on the campus (see Figure 2.3-1). It would also eliminate all 65 historical trees.

Response to Comment

The paragraph of the Project Description proposed for revision by the commenter is within the subsection titled “Building Design and Site Layout,” which describes the proposed project design and site layout in factual terms. The commenter’s suggested edits, which include the commenter’s opinion regarding potential impacts of Building A on recreational space and trees, are not appropriate within this section of the Draft EIR. Impacts to Recreational Resources, including acknowledgement that construction of Building A would require demolition of the outdoor activity space between Pavilion Circle

and West Cottages Drive, are addressed in Section 3.15.3 of the Draft EIR. No edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

DUBRIDGE-R-2.9

Comment (verbatim)

Suggested edits to Section 2.3.3, Page 2-8 of DEIR, heading 2.3.3:

2.3.3 Recreational Facilities, Open Space, Landscaping, and Other Improvements and the elimination of Odd Fellows Home Historic park and 65 historic and protected trees

Response to Comment

The subheading proposed for revision by the commenter is within the Project Description section of the Draft EIR, which describes the proposed project in factual terms. The commenter's suggested edits, which include the commenter's opinion regarding the potential impacts to recreational space and trees, are not appropriate within this section. Impacts to recreational resources and tree removal can be found in Section 3.13.3 and Section 3.4.3 of the Draft EIR. No edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

DUBRIDGE-R-2.10

Comment (verbatim)

Suggested edits to Section 2.3.3, Page 2-8 of DEIR, second paragraph under heading 2.3.3:

The proposed fitness center addition would serve existing and future SRC residents. (The existing bocce ball court and putting green would be removed, with new facilities provided to the west of Building A.) Building A would be built on the Odd Fellows Home Historical Park thus eliminating the only outdoor activity space on campus. This includes a Bocce Ball Court, Putting green, picnic tables and open space. There is no other space to replace this park and its facilities.

Response to Comment

As described above in response to comment DUBRIDGE-R-2.9, the commenter's suggested edits regarding the potential impacts of Building A on recreational space, are not appropriate within the Project Description. Impacts to Recreational Resources, including acknowledgement that construction of Building A would require relocation of the existing recreational facilities, are addressed in Section 3.15.3 of the Draft EIR. No edits to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

DUBRIDGE-R-2.11

Comment (verbatim)

Suggested edits to Section 3.2, Page 3-7 of DEIR, (addition of new bullet point):

- Concerns regarding the loss of open space, rural feel, scenic quality and vistas and the Odd Fellows Home Historic Park.

Response to Comment

Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR has been edited to include the new bullet, as suggested by the commenter. **These proposed edits are described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.**

DUBRIDGE-R-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-18. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-18.1.

3.4.39 Commenter FARRIS-M

FARRIS-M-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW the SRC current expansion plan to be approved! Having been a short term resident there, the loss of 70+ trees and community open space would ruin the entire ambiance of the area. The trees and wildlife they support are an integral part of the community. The loss of open space would adversely affect residents' ability to exercise, be in touch with nature. Last but not least, turn the entire community into nothing more than another cookie cutter high density (perhaps even high rise) drab, monotonous concrete/asphalt blot on the environment.

Please deny approval of the proposed development in its current state. We must preserve the trees and maintain a community atmosphere at SRC.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

3.4.40 Commenter GRIFFIN-M

GRIFFIN-M-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

The EIR-Draft states construction noise levels, even when meeting local code, can still be disruptive to normal daytime residential activities. The noise level a multi-year, multi-site, multi-storied construction project in the heart of a densely populated residential setting, far exceeds residential norms. Especially when the work sites are immediately adjacent to the domicile of RETIRED folks, who take naps in the afternoon, who are to be subjected to Noise levels in excess of 80 decibels over a time frame of [supposedly] 24 months. [Reference table 4.5-6]

I question why the Draft report didn't make use of a more rigorous rating standard for noise, that took into consideration the sensitivity of retired occupants living in the middle of a job site over a period of years. The FTA standard is for highway construction, not for hospitals, old folks' homes and other sound sensitive construction.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

GRIFFIN-M-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

I question how the Draft report calculated the time frame of the project. The longer a project takes to complete, the more noise impacts. Was use made of a bid from a building contractor? Or was the duration of construction months based on architectural estimates provided by the applicant? Complex projects of this nature are prone to last far longer than early estimates. Especially in the case of infill developments requiring excavation in proximity to existing structures where soil conditions are problematical and—in the case of the Manor—foundations are 100 years old. Bldg. A requires the excavation of rock in a hillside for a subterranean garage. The report estimates only 5 months for this grading and foundation work. And the Meeting Room with its garage excavation, the time is only 3 months. I'm asking for a timeline based on substantial, real-world data from similar projects with similar geology.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

GRIFFIN-M-1.3

Comment (verbatim)

I question why the Draft didn't suggest the use of noise measurement devices to monitor the noise of heavy equipment, rock drilling machinery as well as trucks off-hauling dirt and rock. Sometimes older tractors and vehicles lacking modern sound deadening features are used. Why were sound meters not recommended.

Response to Comment

As discussed in response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise, the Draft EIR does require that construction noise monitoring/measurements be undertaken. Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1a, item F (page 3-227 of the Draft EIR) requires that weekly noise measurements be taken to verify that noise barriers are performing as intended and that construction noise remains below the significance threshold of 80 dBA at receptors.

GRIFFIN-M-2.1

Comment (verbatim)

The Draft Environmental Report does not represent Alternative 1 – Residents’ Alternative, Section 4.4, correctly. A number of glaring errors are included in this Section 4.4.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents’ Alternative (Alternative 1).

GRIFFIN-M-2.2

Comment (verbatim)

Starting with Figure 4.4-1, the Conceptual Site plan for the Residents’ Alternative submitted by the Residents shows the layout of the New Health Center, Building C’, and the New 2 story Apartment Building, Building D. The layout of Building D is important as it is the same footprint as the current Health Care Center and would provide for 52 apartments and an auditorium. However Figure 4.4-2 Conceptual Building D Layout – Alternative 1, shows a completely different building layout (shape) and claims the building needs 3 stories. This Layout was provided by Ankron Molsan, the architect for the Project Applicant, who changed the Alternative 1 design, thereby attempting to discredit the Residents’ Alternative.

Ankron Moisan also misrepresented other features in Alternative 1, such as the size and shape of Alternative 1’s New Health Center, Building C’ (should be 40 beds rather than the Project’s 52 beds), the number of Parking spaces in Building D’s under ground garage (only 50 spaces vs 90 submitted under Alternative 1), and incorrect values in Table 4.4-2 for the Cut volume and max depth cut for a correct Alternative 1, Building D.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents’ Alternative (Alternative 1).

GRIFFIN-M-2.3

Comment (verbatim)

Based on these errors the DEIR Section 4.1 Alternative 1 needs major corrections.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents’ Alternative (Alternative 1).

GRIFFIN-M-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-26. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-26.1.

GRIFFIN-M-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

GRIFFIN-M-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-30. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-30.1.

GRIFFIN-M-6.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-27, with additional comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment GRIFFIN-M-6.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-27.1.

GRIFFIN-M-6.2

Comment (verbatim)

P.S. Alt-1 was misrepresented in DEIR. Alt-1 is still the best alternative.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

See response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.

GRIFFIN-M-7.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-4. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-4.1.

GRIFFIN-M-8.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-7. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-7.1.

3.4.41 Commenter HOWELL-C

HOWELL-C-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-7. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-7.1.

HOWELL-C-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

HOWELL-C-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-23, with additional comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment HOWELL-C-3.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-23.1.

HOWELL-C-3.2

Comment (verbatim)

This is a real problem for us all!

Response to Comment

This additional comment does not raise any substantial environmental concerns that require a response under CEQA.

HOWELL-C-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8, with additional comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment HOWELL-C-4.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

HOWELL-C-4-2:

Comment (verbatim)

The beauty of our campus was the main reason we moved here. We will spend our last years in a morass of building if this plan is passed!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

3.4.42 Commenter HUNTER-J

HUNTER-J-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

In the late 1990's and early 2000's I was on the HPC and Planning Commission when the Odd Fellows submitted plans to upgrade their facility with many additional buildings. We fought hard to keep the Manor House in all its glory and the city agreed. To think, now, that a parking garage and living units might be built in front of that magnificent structure, along with an unattractive meeting room, is abhorrent to me. Historic buildings were frequently put at the top of hills because of their importance to the community. The city should not allow this awful impingement on this historic building.

Response to Comment

As discussed in Section 3.5.3 of the Draft EIR, the construction of “a parking garage and living units” (i.e., Building B) in front of the Manor Building was identified as having a significant and unavoidable impact on the historic resource. The impact of the proposed Meeting Room, while potentially significant, could be reduced to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures MM-CUL-1a through MM-CUL-1c.

See also response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

HUNTER-J-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

In addition to the buildings planned in the front of the Manor House, the loss of 70 magnificent protected trees on the property including another 50 smaller trees is terrible in this day and age when we should be planting trees and honoring the magnificent ones in our midst. Saratoga has lost over 1000 trees during the last winter storms

(along with the 400 eucalyptus the city allowed to be cut down). To lose protected trees when Saratoga is "Proudly a Tree City USA" is a terrible precedent. When I was Mayor, 10 years ago, we planted over 2000 trees to combat climate change. 10 years later Saratoga seems to be losing its respect for trees and allowing them to be haphazardly cut down. This is not the same city I represented.

As to the EIR I would urge the city to limit the number of new units and place them where they would be unobtrusive. Leave the Manor House and the trees alone.

Response to Comment

As discussed in Section 3.4.3 of the Draft EIR (impact BIO-5) the proposed removal of trees to facilitate construction of the project has been assessed by the City's Arborist and determined to meet the requirements of the City's Tree Protection Ordinance.

See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

3.4.43 Commenter JACKSON-J

JACKSON-J-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

JACKSON-J-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-7. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-7.1.

JACKSON-J-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-7. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-7.1.

JACKSON-J-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-3. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-3.1.

JACKSON-J-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

JACKSON-J-6.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

JACKSON-J-7

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

JACKSON-J-8.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-18. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-18.1.

JACKSON-J-9.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-26. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-26.1.

JACKSON-J-10.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-13. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-13.1.

3.4.44 Commenter JAIN-N

JAIN-N-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

The attached letter that so eloquently addresses the issues of historic nature of Saratoga Manor building and its majestic architectural beauty, the issues with the addition of the meeting room, and cutting of around 120 matured trees – Redwood, Oak many of which are hundreds of years old.

Response to Comment

The “attached letter” referenced in this comment has been delineated as comment JAIN-N-1.3, as detailed below.

See also response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

JAIN-N-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

Additionally, I would like to bring the proposal for Building D which is not on the initial plan. It would be a two-story building to be planned where the current parking lot sits next to the San Marcos Road. I have the following concerns:

Drainage issues caused by the construction of the building, the proposed underground parking due to cutting off the vegetation.

Lack of privacy due to it overlooking into our house, driveway and yard.

Noise due to the construction.

Traffic issues caused by the single lane (San Marcos Road).

I'd appreciate if any new construction by the Odd Fellows is done towards the south site so that it has the minimal impact.

Response to Comment

This comment is assumed to relate to Alternative 3 (Applicant’s Alternative), and in particular to the construction of a new Building D on the existing employee parking lot in the northwest corner of the SRC campus.

Regarding drainage issues, it is unclear what the commenter means by the underground parking “cutting off the vegetation”. Nevertheless, impacts to drainage patterns as a result of Alternative 3 are evaluated in Section 4.6.3 (subheading Hydrology and Water Quality) of the Draft EIR, in particular under Impact HYD-3. The discussion in that section addresses impacts to drainage from construction and excavation activities, as well as from permanent changes in impervious surfaces following project completion. Impacts to hydrology and drainage from Alternative 3 were identified as being less than significant, which is the same level as for the proposed project.

With respect to the commenter’s concerns regarding lack of privacy, Building D under Alternative 3 would be set back approximately 50 feet from the boundary of the commenter’s property line, and there are several large trees and shrubs between Odd Fellows Drive and San Marcos Road that would partially shield views of Building D from the commenter’s property, and vice versa. In any case, privacy objections are properly considered by an agency in the context of a site development permit approval, not under CEQA, because they do not affect the environment of persons generally (Ukiah, *supra*, 2 Cal.App.4th 720).

With respect to construction noise, impacts to nearby sensitive receptors from the demolition of the existing cottage and construction Building D under Alternative 3 were analyzed in Section 4.6.3 (subheading Noise) of the Draft EIR. Predicted noise levels at the closest receptor to these construction activities are shown in Table 4.6-6, and mitigation measures proposed to reduce noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. Because the commenter’s residence is located farther from the acoustic center of these construction zones, predicted noise levels would be less for this commenter than for the closest receptor shown in the table. Therefore, mitigation measures that reduce noise levels at the closest receptor to below the threshold of significance would also serve to reduce noise levels at the commenter’s residence to below the threshold. See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

Regarding the commenter’s concerns about traffic on San Marcos Road, no changes are proposed to San Marcos Road as part of the project or as part of Alternative 3, and construction traffic would not be utilizing the “single lane” portion of San Marcos Road (i.e., that portion east of the Odd Fellows connection. Both the project and all alternatives would include removal of the traffic circle where Odd Fellows Drive meets San Marcos Road, which would improve access and visibility, particularly for larger vehicles. Impacts of Alternative 3 relating to traffic are evaluated in Section 4.6.3 (subheading Transportation) of the Draft EIR and were found to be less than significant with mitigation. See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

No changes to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

JAIN-N-1.3

Comment (summary)

This comment is a copy of form letter FORM-10.

Response to Comment

See response to FORM-10.1.

3.4.45 Commenter JOE-V

JOE-V-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-17. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-17.1.

JOE-V-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-4. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-4.1.

JOE-V-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-27. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-27.1.

JOE-V-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-18. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-18.1.

JOE-V-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-19. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-19.1.

JOE-V-6.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-28. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-28.1.

3.4.46 Commenter JOHNSON-G

JOHNSON-G-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-31. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-31.1.

JOHNSON-G-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-26. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-26.1.

JOHNSON-G-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-16. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-16.1.

JOHNSON-G-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-19. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-19.1.

3.4.47 Commenter JOHNSON-S

JOHNSON-S-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

The most significant environmental impact of the PRS proposal would be to drastically and permanently degrade a unique and iconic part of the city of Saratoga, by scraping mature trees from major portions of the Saratoga Retirement Community (“SRC”)

campus. PRS then would jam SRC full of new buildings, thus converting it from a bucolic campus into downtown San Jose. And to what end? So that PRS can check the box for cramming a square peg into a round hole, by forcing its standard CCRC one-size-fits-all financial structure onto an SRC retirement home that in its current configuration has consistently generated operating profits for its owners. There is no benefit to Saratoga in allowing this to happen. Please require PRS to go back to the drawing board and come up with a less destructive option.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

3.4.48 Commenter JOHNSON-S&E

JOHNSON-S&E-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-31. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-31.1.

3.4.49 Commenter JOHNSON&MARSHALL

JOHNSON&MARSHALL-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-29. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-29.1.

3.4.50 Commenter KING-A

KING-A-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

KING-A-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

3.4.51 Commenter KING-C

KING-C-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

3.4.52 Commenter KLEIN-E

KLEIN-E-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

My husband, Robert B. Klein, and I moved into SRC less than one year ago. We left our home in New York City to afford us quiet, beauty, safety and a caring supportive environment in the CCSC of our first choice. (We visited many others in the Santa Cruz and Santa Clara regions, where our daughter and family live). At the time we were both quite well, but we anticipated a decline as we age from our present 85 (Bob) and 82 (Elaine) years, respectively. We both felt it would be especially important if and when we needed the care offered by SRC's health care facility/center (HCC) and felt confident in what we had been told about SRC.

At the time we were learning about SRC, we were briefly told about the potential expansion plan, but we were assured two things, among many others:

We would not be 'disturbed' in any way by the expansion, should it take place within our lifetimes (which it was suggested it would not – 'way down the road')

The HCC would be of the highest quality and be able to support us as our health needs expanded.

Based on what we saw, what we read, what we heard and were told, we were assured that any expansion would, ultimately, be for the benefit of all SRC residents now and in the future. It was with this knowledge that we signed on as residents.

Almost a year later (we moved in on Sept 21, 2022), the 'expansion campaign' has taken a turn for the worse — much worse — and we write you at this time to PLEASE

consider and honor your commitment to SRC's residents, who will be calling this their 'last home,' as we will.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-8: Residents Not Informed of Project.

KLEIN-E-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

We are very concerned/worried about the many many problems that others have written about (e.g. the loss of much of the natural beauty of our campus, especially the age-old trees that make the landscape so unique, the preservation of the few open spaces we now have and enjoy (e.g. the Odd Fellows Park at the center of campus), the noise and pollution and disruption of construction right in our midst that will be brought to residents, etc, etc. In fact, in reading all of the materials very carefully, we cannot not think of ONE good reason for this particular expansion design to take place, at least where present residents are concerned.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

KLEIN-E-1.3

Comment (verbatim)

*The most outrageous, to us, aspect of the proposal — given what we have written above — is its extremely disappointing attention (or lack thereof) to **the improvement of the HCC**. This facility, we have learned, has long been on the list of SRC's most-needed-improvements and, as a lay person, I see very little in the few details provided that gives me any confidence that this will be the facility that a fine institution like SRC should be offering.*

*In fact, There is a huge **void** in the details for the HCC remodel other than reducing the 99 beds to 54 and converting all the rooms to private including private toilet and shower. Wouldn't this be the opportune time to learn from the all the studies done post covid to design SRC HCC with details to mitigate the next pandemic. In other words, the careful location and design of the HCC **should be #1 on your list of priorities**. (Right now, the vague construction schedule shows it as phase four.*

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Center Renovations.

KLEIN-E-1.4

Comment (summary)

This comment contains text identical to portions of form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within this portion of the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See responses to comments FORM-11.2 through FORM-11.5.

3.4.53 Commenter LAHANN-MG&J

LAHANN-MG&J-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

If I am seeing the Master Plan correctly, it is planned to place a new fitness center right in front of the original Hacienda. If that is the plan, I have to object. The main Hacienda should be preserved and the view of it too. Especially as the relatively recent tree removal has made the Hacienda much more visible, especially from the college grounds. A new fitness center plopped right down on the front lawn is an abomination to the beauty and history of The Odd Fellows Home and the City of Saratoga.

We have lived at the corner of Fruitvale and Douglass since 1971 and have sadly seen so much of Saratoga's natural beauty stained by ill considered development. There must be a better place for a gym than the front lawn, the first thing we see when we enter the grounds.

Response to Comment

Aesthetic impacts of the proposed Project are described in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR, and impacts to the Manor Building (an historical resource) are described in Section 3.5. It is assumed that the “original Hacienda” referred to by the commenter is the “Manor Building”, and that the commenter’s concern is regarding proposed Building B which would be constructed between the Manor Building and Odd Fellows Drive, under the proposed Project. (For reference, the proposed Fitness Center expansion would be behind (south of) the Manor Building, as shown in Figure 2.3-1 of the Draft EIR). Although the commenter mentions recent changes to the visibility of the Manor Building from the grounds of the West Valley College due to tree removal, a site visit undertaken on August 2, 2023 confirmed that visibility of the Manor Building from South College Circle were not substantially different to that shown in Figure 3.2-4 of the Draft EIR (see Figure 1 below) to the extent that views of the campus and Manor Building still maintains “limited visibility from surrounding public streets or other public vantage points due to intervening topography and vegetation”, as described in Section 3.2.1 of the Draft EIR.

See also response to MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Quality.



Exhibit 3-A: Comparison of views from South College Circle toward Manor Building 2021 vs 2023.

Photograph on left is cropped from Figure 3.2-4 of the DEIR (Google Streetview 2021). Photograph on right taken August 2023 from similar position (AECOM 2023). The Manor Building is partially obscured by trees and vegetation in both photographs.

3.4.54 Commenter LANDERGREN-E

LANDERGREN-E-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

Let me ask you a question. If you had a swimming pool in your back yard, & you were told, “We’re taking it away from you & building an apartment house in its place.” How would you feel? If they told you that it would be of minimal impact on you because the YMCA a few miles from you has a very nice pool. How would you feel? And if they said to you: “We’re taking your remaining yard away from you to build even more apartments. No matter. You have plenty of open space just a few miles away.” How would you feel? And what if you couldn’t drive to get to that pool or park or open space? And what if you had limited mobility — and even hiring an Uber would be out of the question?

And what if you currently pay for those lovely resources which were promised to you even before you moved in? And what if you had to continue to pay for these amenities even after they were taken away from you? How would you feel?

Would this be of minimal impact to you? Minimal to your life style, to your comfort, to your well being, to your very health? The DEIR does not even begin to understand or address these issues. These matters not only affect the 200 Independent Residents of SRC, but the 130+ Residents in Assisted Living, the 18 folks in Memory Care, the 60 patients in the Health Center, the families who visit us, and all the outside residents who live in the areas surrounding the SRC campus who use our space for their own enjoyment. Put yourself for a moment in the place of all those folks. And NOW, How do you feel?

We are not against enhancements & modernizations. But please review & adopt the Residents Plan. It addresses & implements the needed improvements but without the devastating impact that the PRS plan would have on our lives.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-8: Residents Not Informed of Project.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

LANDERGREN-E-2.1

Comment (verbatim)

*“Minimal Impact”. That’s what your report says of Building D. If that goes there, my entire house will be demolished + I will have to be relocated. Minimal impact, my a**! I will lose my home – my final home (I thought) + so will my neighbor. And this for only 11 apartments that could be built elsewhere.*

Response to Comment

This comment is assumed to relate to Alternative 3 (Applicant’s Alternative), and in particular to the construction of a new Building D in the northwest corner of the SRC campus, which would require demolition of an existing duplex cottage and the existing employee parking lot.

Within CEQA, the term “impact” refers to environmental impacts, which are analyzed against the thresholds of significance adopted by applicable lead agency, and in which in this case are based on the thresholds within Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Although the demolition of the cottage in which the commenter (and their neighbor) currently reside will obviously affect these residents, such effects are not considered “environmental impacts” under CEQA. No further response is required to this comment.

LANDERGREN-E-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

LANDERGREN-E-4.1

Comment (verbatim)

I have lived at Saratoga Retirement Community for just 2 years, but a couple months ago I was told that my home (and that of my neighbor’s) would be demolished to make room for an 11 unit 2-story apartment building. I’m sure you can imagine my distress.

I later learned that that plan is just one of the suggested “reforms” that have been proposed for our lovely campus.

My daughter lives in Los Altos & I really wanted to love the Terraces of Los Altos. However, I fell in love with the trees and open space here at SRC. So I paid \$750,000 for the privilege of moving into my cottage – none of it refundable.

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Now I find that there are plans to destroy that very open space around the entire campus, along with over 100 lovely, gracious trees and our only small park.

The SRC residents have submitted a plan that minimizes this destruction yet covers the needs of expansion. I hope this plan will be adopted.

I have watched the Saratoga kids come to our campus to take prom pictures. I have met neighbors strolling through our grounds enjoying the shade & walking paths. And all our residents moved here because they fell in love with this place that so far has not become institutionalized.

Please help us preserve our trees, our open space, our treasured homes.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreation/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-8: Residents Not Informed of Project.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1)

LANDERGREN-E-5.1

Comment (verbatim)

Please do not destroy our lovely MANOR building by attaching a Meeting Room, it won't technically be attached, but it might as well be. It will destroy the design of the whole acreage.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

LANDERGREN-E-6.1

Comment (verbatim)

Please do not take away our only park – our only flat space, green space, bocce court.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

LANDERGREN-E-7.1

Comment (verbatim)

Please seriously consider the Residents' Plan if buildings absolutely have to be constructed. The other plans will disrupt the entire campus.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

3.4.55 Commenter LEWIS-P

LEWIS-P-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-25. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-25.1.

3.4.56 Commenter LEWIS-P&D

LEWIS-P&D-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

LEWIS-P&D-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

LEWIS-P&D-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-4. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-4.1.

LEWIS-P&D-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-26. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-26.1.

LEWIS-P&D-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

LEWIS-P&D-6.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-24. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-24.1.

3.4.57 Commenter LIN-L

LIN-L-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-31, with additional comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment LIN-L-1.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-31.1.

LIN-L-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

For many of us, this is one of the reasons, we chose to move to SRC.

Response to Comment

This additional comment did not raise any new environmental concerns beyond those raised in the form letter portion of the letter. See response to comment FORM-31.1

LIN-L-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-29. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-29.1

LIN-L-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

3.4.58 Commenter LIU-M

LIU-M-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

LIU-M-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-15. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-15.1 through FORM-15.2.

LIU-M-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-18. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-18.1.

3.4.59 Commenter LUNG-C

LUNG-C-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-29. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-29.1.

LUNG-C-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-28. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-28.1.

LUNG-C-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

3.4.60 Commenter MANIES-M

MANIES-M-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

I am a resident of SRC and have many objections to the DEIR as I find it full of statements that are just not true. One of them is referencing the increased traffic from workmen, building machines, etc. if the project was to proceed. We have been told we can schedule the vehicles that come onto the campus. This is ludicrous. Do they really think the mailman, food delivery trucks, repairmen and deliveries will bend to the schedule of the others? Just take a look at his photo which shows how Pavilion Circle can look even now without the chaos of construction.

We don't want this expansion, but if we must tolerate it, at least pick the Residents Alternative which places the apartment building in an area that is not in the busiest center of the campus.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.
See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

MANIES-M-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-20. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-20.1 through FORM-20.5.

MANIES-M-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-26. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-26.1.

MANIES-M-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

MANIES-M-5.1

Comment (verbatim)

My name is Marilyn Manies and I have been a Saratoga resident for over 40 years. During that time, I have dealt with the City arborist regarding the removal of a non-native tree in my yard prior to re-landscaping. I learned to appreciate how Saratoga protects its trees and its reputation as a City of Trees.

Currently I live at Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC) and find it unconscionable for the City to approve a project that would remove over 120 trees, 65 of which are protected under the Saratoga Municipal code section 15-50.080.

Yes, the plan is to replace those trees with many more, but can you seriously replace redwoods and oaks over 100 feet tall? These trees enhance the beauty of SRC, provide shade for the residents, homes for birds, buffer noise, and remove carbon from the air.

I implore you to vote down the proposed development that threatens our way of life and the beauty of the place where we live.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

MANIES-M-6.1

Comment (verbatim)

Manor building built in 1912 is on the Heritage Resources Inventory of City of Saratoga and the PRS proposal has to be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of the Historic Properties part 68.3 Standards b.

Rehabilitation – 1.2.&9. – New construction will not destroy historic materials, features and special relationships that characterize the property. See reference:

<https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/36/68.3>

Response to Comment

As discussed in Section 3.5.3 of the Draft EIR, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards referenced by the commenter were considered in the evaluation of impacts to the Manor Building. As discussed on page 3-94 of the Draft EIR, the Manor Building would continue to be used for its historic purpose (senior living), and none of the proposed project components would alter the use or purpose of the Manor Building. Therefore, the project would not conflict with Standard 1. The proposed construction of Building B was found to have an unavoidable conflict with Standards 2, 9, and 10. The proposed Meeting Room would potentially conflict with Standard 9, but could avoid the conflict with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures MM-CUL-1a through MM-CUL-1c. None of the other project components would conflict with the Standards. Due to the un-mitigatable conflict of Building B with Standards 2, 9, and 10, a significant and unavoidable impact to historic resources was identified for the project.

See also response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See also response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

MANIES-M-6.2

Comment (verbatim)

Building B will obscure the front view of the iconic Manor building from the Odd Fellows Lane. PRS proposal will also eliminate the green open space in front of the main Manor entry way, together with the many big trees.

Meeting Room will encroach and over-powering the west side of the Manor building. The open space and the trees surrounding the Manor building will be replaced by the Meeting Room. Meeting room is attached to the Manor through a converted window/door and a 27-foot-long corridor, barely separating it from the Manor.

Odd Fellows Historical park used regularly as outdoors space by residents will be replaced by a 2-story building. The historical oak trees and redwoods will all be removed.

Sixty eight (68) trees, mostly protected trees, such as majestic redwood trees, oak trees and palm trees, some over 100 years old, will all be removed, to make room for Buildings A, B, and Meeting Room.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

MANIES-M-6.3

Comment (verbatim)

There is a better way. Please see the Residents' Alternative plan, which does not add Building A, B and Meeting room, therefore eliminates the above problems completely see website: preserveSRCcampus.org

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

MANIES-M-7.1

Comment (verbatim)

My name is Marilyn Manies and I have been a resident of Saratoga for over 40 years. I respect the amount of work that has gone into writing this very detailed 646 page draft EIR. I have spent many hours reading it and I respectfully reject many items being labeled LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT.

It is MORE THAN SIGNIFICANT to me and the hundreds of other SRC residents that 124 trees will be removed from our campus. No amount of smaller replacement trees can replace the towering oaks and redwoods, some over 100 feet tall.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

MANIES-M-7.2

Comment (verbatim)

It is MORE THAN SIGNIFICANT the our only campus park with bocce court would be destroyed and replaced by a huge apartment building. Suggesting that residents aged 75-102 go to neighboring parks shows how out of touch the writers are. Many of our people do not drive and only get around with canes, walkers and wheelchairs. Having close-by recreation is vital to their health.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

MANIES-M-7.3

Comment (verbatim)

It is MORE THAN SIGNIFICANT that residents would be subjected to extremely loud noise for up to 5 years and suggesting that they would get relief at night is unrealistic. Retired people are home most of the day. All day long they will be subjected to noise from trucks, backhoes, air compressors, drill rigs, bulldozers, excavators, fork lifts, generators and more. To describe this as less than significant is ludicrous.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

MANIES-M-7.4

Comment (verbatim)

Traffic now on San Marcos and Odd Fellows Drive is constant with vehicles going to SRC and Friendship Plaza: daily UPS, Fed Ex, mail trucks, food delivery trucks, workers and residents. We are the #1 destination of fire trucks and ambulances in Saratoga with those vehicles coming almost daily. Add to this large numbers of construction workers and all their equipment. I do not believe this congestion will be LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

MANIES-M-7.5

Comment (verbatim)

Emergency evacuation is questionable even now. What will it be if roads are jammed with trucks and equipment during construction. This problem is MORE THAN SIGNIFICANT.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

MANIES-M-7.6

Comment (verbatim)

These and many other factors lead me to believe that a high number of mitigations suggested in this document are misleading and incorrect. Thank you for listening.

Response to Comment

The Draft EIR includes explanation of whether or not, and how, the recommended mitigation measures would reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed project to a less-than-significant level. These evaluations can be found within the “3.X.3, Project Impacts and Mitigation” subsections of the Draft EIR for each environmental topic where mitigation is proposed, within the text following the description of each mitigation measure. E.g., for construction noise (Impact NOI-1), the efficacy of the recommended mitigation measures is discussed on page 3-228 in Section 3.12.3, immediately following mitigation measure MM-NOI-1.

Except for impacts to historical resources, which were found to be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation, all other potentially significant impacts were determined to be reduced to less than significant with implementation of the identified mitigation measures.

MANIES-M-8.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-27. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-27.1.

MANIES-M-9.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-3. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-3.1.

MANIES-M-10.1

Comment (verbatim)

I have been a resident of Saratoga for over 40 years. Two years ago I moved from my 5 bedroom house with its large lot into a 2 bedroom apartment with a 12 x 5' balcony. I was happy to leave behind the responsibilities of home ownership, not so with leaving the garden. I spent time in the garden every day and it was my "happy place." I need to have outside space ... to walk, to enjoy the view of the mountains, to work in the garden, to enjoy the beautiful trees. It is imperative that I have outdoor space for my mental and physical well being.

Now I am living at Saratoga Retirement Community and I am writing to ask that the city not take away something that is of such value to me and other seniors: trees and open space. The expansion proposed by the PRS would allow the destruction of over 120 trees and put a multi-story building in our Memorial Park. We residents need this bucolic outdoor space and did not move here to be surrounded by buildings. The residents have spent a lot of time and energy coming up with an alternate plan to the one proposed by PRS. It provides the desired housing and still protects our lifestyle. To suggest that seniors aged 70-100 drive to local Saratoga parks is ludicrous. Many do not drive. Many use walkers, canes and wheelchairs and that suggestion was cruel. The DEIR shows complete lack of caring and understanding of the needs of our seniors! I urge you to vote to preserve our lifestyle by not taking away our only park and recreation area and by either voting for no expansion or for the Preserve Alternative.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-2: Support for No Project Alternative.

MANIES-M-11.1

Comment (verbatim)

I appreciate your difficult job on the Planning Commission. We at SRC understand the pressure being placed upon cities to provide more housing. Soon you will be asked to consider a construction proposal which has a daunting 680 page document, the draft Environmental Impact Report. This EIR recommended a proposal, which threatens our way of life, and we feel it does not adequately or impartially present the housing options before you.

In the draft EIR, the out-of-state management company describes a plan to build a two story apartment building and underground garage in the Odd Fellows Historical Park, our only outdoor recreation area.

Response to Comment

The Draft EIR was prepared by an independent CEQA consultant (AECOM) that was retained by the City, not by the “out-of-state management company” referred to by the commenter (inferred to mean Pacific Retirement Services). The CEQA consultant has no relationship to Pacific Retirement Services, the Saratoga Retirement Community, or the Independent Order of Odd Fellows.

The Draft EIR is an informational document for the purposes of informing decision-makers and the public about the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project and to identify and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives that might avoid or substantially lessen any significant environmental issues that the proposed project may have. The Draft EIR does not “recommend a proposal”; but rather analyzes the project as proposed to the City by the project applicant. CEQA Guidelines Section XX requires that an EIR identify an environmentally superior alternative, and this evaluation is contained within Section 4.7 of the Draft EIR. As discussed in that section, the No Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, and Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative) is identified as the next most environmentally superior. Consideration of environmental impacts as described in the EIR is only one of many factors that the Lead Agency decision-makers will consider when deciding whether to approve the proposed project or not (or to approve one of the alternatives).

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See also response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

MANIES-M-11.2

Comment (verbatim)

It removes our bocce ball court, the most popular activity on the campus. It cuts down 124 trees, 65 of which are protected by the City’s Code. We’re talking about massive oaks, towering redwoods, some as tall as 100 feet and 6 feet in diameter. We value Saratoga being awarded the title of Tree City, USA and the city’s history protecting this valuable resource.

The applicant’s plan would build a meeting room attached to the historic manor building thus losing the building’s symmetry and obstructing the view of the manor as you approach it. It also takes away the open green space with its beautiful protected redwood trees.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

MANIES-M-11.3

Comment (verbatim)

When this case comes before you, you will have to make an important decision. The residents of SRC acknowledge the need for increased housing, but we do not support their plan that disturbs the lifestyle we are paying for and expect to enjoy for the rest of our lives. The residents have proposed an alternative plan that provides the same number of housing units (52) and is much less invasive. The Residents Plan requires the removal of only 41 trees (compared to 124), and retains our only park and recreation area. It also restricts the construction to only one area rather than the entire campus. I urge you to seriously consider the Resident's Alternative Plan.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

MANIES-M-12.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-26. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-26.1.

MANIES-M-13.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

MANIES-M-14.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of MANIES-M-5. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to MANIES-M-5.1.

MANIES-M-15.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-28. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-28.1.

MANIES-M-16.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-3. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-3.1.

3.4.61 Commenter MANSBRIDGE-J&V

MANSBRIDGE-J&V-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

We bought into SRC because it had attractive gardens and amenities that we liked, by comparison with similar facilities. If the PRS proposal, were built it would destroy these open spaces, and with the recent expansion of retirement facilities we might well consider other possibilities. The alternative proposed by the residents appears to meet much the same objectives as the PRS proposal but without causing as much disruption to the pleasant and attractive ambiance of the present installation. This includes such features as the impressive facade of the main building, the landscaping, described elsewhere as bucolic, facilities such as the bocce court and other amenities. It appears that the PRS plan would destroy much of that, while the residents' proposal keeps much of it intact. There are highlighted, among the reviews of the project that have been circulated, many deficiencies of the plan, particularly how the job would actually be performed. These would, presumably, be mitigated to some degree by the time the project was initiated, but the lack of thought towards these questions at this stage does not inspire confidence. Others, such as the provision of adequate HEPA filtration in the HVAC system, seem to have been ignored.

We would strongly urge you to consider the proposed expansion in terms of features of the plan put forward by the residents.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreation/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

With respect to the comment regarding adequate high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filtration in the HVAC system, it is unclear if the comments relate to the HVAC system within the proposed new buildings or to the HVAC system within the existing Health Center (which is proposed for internal renovations as part of the project). In either case, detailed information regarding HVAC system filtration is not typically described in CEQA documents, as such level of detail is typically not available at the point in the design

process when CEQA is initiated. Because such building components are required by law to comply with the relevant California Building Code standards (and in the case of the Health Center, with the more rigorous standards of the California Department of Health Care Access and Information), and because such standards have been developed in order to protect the health and safety of building occupants, the type of filtration within building HVAC systems is not anticipated to cause any significant environmental impacts. See also response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

3.4.62 Commenter MAXFIELD-J

MAXFIELD-J-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Save Saratoga Retirement Community from the trauma of unnecessary construction which our elderly population could not survive! The confusion and noise would be far to disruptive for people to survive.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

Comment MAXFIELD-J-2.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Saratoga Retirement Community has been our home and the home of many hundreds of others and we love it the right way it is. Please don't change it and destroy our beautiful home. Thank you.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

Comment MAXFIELD-J-3.1:

Comment (verbatim)

The noise, destruction, lack of parking, complete disruption of the lives of hundreds of senior residents at our beautiful community would be the worst thing that could happen to our home. Please don't let it happen.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

3.4.63 Commenter MAXFIELD-M

Comment MAXFIELD-M-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Save Saratoga Retirement Community from unnecessary expansion!! Our elderly community's many residents could not survive all the disruptions, noise and confusion that this would bring. Please vote against it!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

Comment MAXFIELD-M-2.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Save Saratoga Retirement Community from the terrible trauma of construction! Our elderly population could not survive the disruption and trauma of such a terrible event at our home. Thank you.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

Comment MAXFIELD-M-3.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Please help us save Saratoga Retirement Community as the home for hundreds is seniors. The residents could not tolerate the confusion, noise, destruction of our buildings and campus – we love the way it is right now. Please save it as the home of hundreds is happy seniors.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

Comment MAXFIELD-M-4.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Please help save Saratoga Retirement Community from being torn apart! Hundreds of seniors live here and love it as our home! Please keep the bulldozers away. Thank you very much.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

3.4.64 Commenter MCGLYNN-P

MCGLYNN-P-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-7. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-7.1.

MCGLYNN-P-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-19. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-19.1.

MCGLYNN-P-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

MCGLYNN-P-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

MCGLYNN-P-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

MCGLYNN-P-6.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-31. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-31.1.

MCGLYNN-P-7.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-29. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-29.1.

MCGLYNN-P-8.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-6. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-6.1.

MCGLYNN-P-9.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-26. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-26.1.

MCGLYNN-P-10.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-12. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-12.1.

MCGLYNN-P-11.1

Comment (verbatim)

I oppose the PRS development plan. I don't want to lose 124 trees. Some are over 100 feet tall and 6 feet in diameter. 85 of these trees are protected per City code 15-50-050. These provide clean air, soil stabilization, noise buffering and climate control! Please do not do this to our lovely home!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

MCGLYNN-P-12.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-25. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-25.1.

MCGLYNN-P-13.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-21. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-21.1.

MCGLYNN-P-14.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-4. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-4.1.

3.4.65 Commenter MERRILL-B

MERRILL-B-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-16. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-16.1.

MERRILL-B-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-27. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-27.1.

MERRILL-B-2.2

Comment (verbatim)

Thank you for your time and effort on our behalf. I am a previous member of the BOD of the Senior Center and hope this unfortunate proposal by RPRS will be defeated.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

3.4.66 Commenter MEYERCORD-P

MEYERCORD-P-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

My name is Phyllis Meyercord. My husband and I have lived at Saratoga Retirement Community for a little over a year. Thankfully we are still healthy for our age and enjoy the ability to walk among the beautiful environs of our community. If the area is abuzz with trucks and heavy equipment, this activity will not be possible for us and other seniors who live here.

We ask that you consider the impact that this proposal would make on our lives. Thank you for hearing our side of the story.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

MEYERCORD-P-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.4.

MEYERCORD-P-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

MEYERCORD-P-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-6. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-6.1.

3.4.67 Commenter MEYERCORD-W

MEYERCORD-W-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

My name is Wade Meyercord, a resident at Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC). My wife and I moved here in May of 2022. We were attracted here by the ambience and rolling hills filled with many trees. We now discover that the proposed expansion plan will require removal of 124 trees from the campus.

We have a number of friends who are making their retirement decisions between SRC and competing venues who tell the remaking of the campus with the removal of a huge number of trees is a deciding factor in their decision.

The promise to plant a large number of new trees does not cut the mustard. It will take many years for new trees to grow to a point where a reasonable ambience is created.

I strongly urge you to not allow the construction of the proposed building in the site of the Historic Park in the center of the SRC campus.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-8: Residents Not Informed of Project.

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

MEYERCORD-W-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

MEYERCORD-W-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-31. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-31.1.

3.4.68 Commenter NG-H&B

NG-H&B-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

If we take an overview the the Proposed PRS Expansion Plan for the SRC Campus, We see a congested Concrete Jungle. There is not space for the residents to enjoy the outdoors for playing games, exercise or siting to visit other residents. We are confined to our rooms and view to the outside through our window, we'd only see walls of concrete and windows, not trees or open space. We don't need or want this concrete view. Buildings A and B are bad for the campus. Building A covers our only Open Space for outdoor recreation and Building B blocks the frontal view of the Iconic Manor Building. Only Building C make sense for the Campus. Allow Building C, New Meeting Room and New Fitness Center to be built.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

NG-H&B-2.1

Comment (verbatim)

Traffic will be stopped and DEIR avoids problem - Currently, our roads within SRC Campus are narrow and already difficult to navigate. Even the less traveled South Cottages Lane is currently congested because 3 cottages are being remodeled, this is because many pickup trucks are doubled parked blocking the road, and we must wait at time to drive through in & out. When 18 wheeler trucks are delivering building supplies and many workers trucks crowd our campus, no one can get in or out. But wait, what about emergency vehicle? These emergency vehicles are also large, and they need lots of room to drive through. Emergency Vehicle many daily, hourly trips to SRC Campus whether it be the HCC, AL, apartments or cottages. This could be an life-ending problem for us. Don't let this happen. The DEIR doesn't cover this near impossible problem - Help!

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

Comment NG-H&B-3.1

Comment (verbatim)

The DEIR should not be judging the finances at this time. PRS has changed their operating values towards servicing Senior Retirement Communities over many years. They are in the growth-mode of maximizing the income/profit on CCRC's. Their early focus was on providing good care for senior retired residents, not anymore! PRS purposely reorganized to refocus and attracting very high paid executives (look at their annual salaries) to maximizing Income from SRC's future expansion and future income. They have outlived their compassion for the elderly.

They are unfit to help and understand the elderly living in a CCRC, and who living out their remaining years in a very beautiful camps with limited open space for our enjoyment.

Cancel the entire Expansion Plan.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Needs/Objectives.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

Comment NG-H&B-4.1

Comment (verbatim)

The DEIR doesn't cover all the noise, dust, and heavy equipment ground vibration we will experience for 7 or more years. Why is this? PRS picks and hires the EIR company and directs them what to include in the EIR, so the EIR doesn't discuss this pollution. This pollution will happen for at least 7 years or more, all during the expansion work. We, the residents, did not move here to live through this pollution period and do not want to experience it. We came to SRC to live out our lives with the few years we have left to enjoy them.

Please let us enjoy our passing years and cancel the PRS SRC Expansion Plan.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality.

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts on SRC Residents/Seniors.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

Comment NG-H&B-5.1

Comment (verbatim)

There are 124 trees that are to be removed including 28 Coastal Redwood Trees Redwoods. One of the Coastal Redwood Tree is gigantic with an 81 inches diameter - so sad. Our SRC Campus will really look different without these magnificent trees. When and if the Story Poles are erected, yellow Ribbons must be tied around each tree to be removed. Then everyone will be able to visualize the full impact of these missing trees from our SRC Campus. What about Global Warming and Climate Change? It is well known that Earth's temperature is at its tipping point weather-wise due to Climate Change. Some of our huge Coastal Redwood Trees will be cut down, and it is known that Coastal Redwood Trees are the most efficient in converting CO2 to O2 (oxygen) which the earth badly needs. These 124 trees need to be saved.

Update the EIR to address the impact of removing the 124 trees with respect to Climate Change, and also plan to mark all trees to be removed when the Story Poles are erected.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

Comment NG-H&B-6.1

Comment (verbatim)

During the construction at the SRC Campus of 7 years or more, the DEIR doesn't cover the Noise, Dust and Ground Vibration Pollution from heavy construction equipment. This noise is right next to the current apartment buildings and cottages, and this is where the current residents live their daily lives. During the construction period, it would be safer for all residents to stay indoors to avoid the pollution and avoid any possibility of getting injured from the construction workers and equipment. We came here to live out our lives in a quite environment, and this includes living outdoors exercising and visiting with fellow residents daily. We are sure this Pollution and the possibility of construction accidents will shorten some of our lives.

Address this missing pollution and accident safety in the EIR.

Response to Comment

The analysis of dust emissions from construction equipment is contained within Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR (pages 3-21 through 3-51). In particular, the analysis of fugitive dust emissions (fugitive PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} dust) is discussed under Impact AIR-2 and specifically on pages 3-38 and 3-39. See also response to MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality.

The analysis of noise and vibration impacts is contained within Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR (pages 3-207 through 2-242). In particular, noise impacts from heavy construction equipment are discussed under Impact NOI-1 (pages 3-220 through 3-228) and vibration impacts from construction equipment are described under Impact NOI-2 (pages 3-233 through 3-237). See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise and response to MASTER-15: Construction Vibration.

With respect to the potential for injuries from construction workers and equipment, federal and state Occupational Health and Safety regulations require the construction

contractor to prepare and implement a site-specific health and safety plan. Furthermore, construction and staging areas would be fenced to prevent accidental entry by SRC residents or other unauthorized personnel. In addition, as discussed in Section 3.16.3 of the Draft EIR, MM-TRA-3a requires that a Construction Traffic Management Plan be prepared, approved, and implemented, which would include the location of signs, barricades, codes, etc., to warn, direct, and guide traffic through areas of the campus impacted by construction activities, as well as a process for communicating with SRC residents and other affected neighbors. In response to this comment, minor edits are proposed to MM-TRA-3a to clarify that the Construction Traffic Control Plan should address both vehicular and pedestrian traffic, and shall specifically address pedestrians utilizing mobility devices such as wheelchairs, motorized scooters, and walking frames, for example. See also response to MASTER-21: Impacts on SRC Residents/Seniors and response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

Comment NG-H&B-7.1

Comment (verbatim)

The EIR currently doesn't not address "Going Solar." The are many benefits of having our solar systems' Sun to produce electricity and hot water.

Our entire SRC Campus is void of any use of solar energy. We must use solar to lower the cost of electricity and lower the cost of heating hot water. The major benefit of Going Solar is to save the use of fossil fuel and reduce producing CO2. One other benefit is when we are faced with electric power outage, the installed solar system will be able to supply electricity. Our current emergency electric generators will not have to work so hard and waste fossil fuel. Installing Solar will also benefit the Earth by reducing the use of fossil fuel to generate electricity and the same is true for heating hot water.

Update the EIR to include the use of Solar to benefit the Earth – Save the Earth.

Response to Comment

As described in Section 2.3.5, Utilities and Service Systems of the Draft EIR, each of the proposed buildings constructed as part of the project would be provided with roof mounted solar photovoltaic system and battery storage. Regulations pertaining to the installation of solar panels on new residential buildings are also addressed in Section 3.6, Energy of the Draft EIR.

No changes to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

Comment NG-H&B-8.1

Comment (verbatim)

Areas of the SRC Campus that must NOT be used to build any new buildings.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Area Labeled X1: This is the residents recreational area which has a full sized Bocce Ball Court that must stay. This is the ONLY Open Space area for residents and future residents to be used for fresh air, social gatherings and games. Having a building here impacts the Environment of all of our residents. Building A must be removed due to the negative environment impact.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

Comment NG-H&B-8.2

Comment (verbatim)

Area Labeled X2: This area blocks the frontal view of our Iconic Manor. The Manor's Frontal view represent the City of Saratoga. Most everyone in Saratoga is against having Building B block the Manor's front view. Building B must be removed due to the impact of representing the City of Saratoga and possible building rules of the City of Saratoga.

Response to Comment

As discussed in Section 3.5.3 of the Draft EIR, the construction of Building B would have a significant and unavoidable impact on the historic Manor Building. As required by CEQA, Section 4 of the Draft EIR includes analysis of several alternatives to the project that would avoid or reduce this significant and unavoidable impact. All of the alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIR would avoid the construction of the project's Building B, with Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative) and Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative) having a less than significant with mitigation to historic resources, and Alternative 1 (Residents' Alternative) having a less than significant impact to historic resources (without mitigation).

Comment NG-H&B-8.3

Comment (verbatim)

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Area Labeled X3: Planning to build a new apartment building here will place the new apartment next to the adjacent neighbor's property and house. Placing a 2 story building will disturb and impact the neighbor's privacy. The neighbor does not want a building build immediately next door overlooking and disturbing their daily lives. Do not impact the adjacent neighbor's peaceful environment.

It appears the only Building C is the only building without objection to be built on the SRC Campus.

Response to Comment

This comment is assumed to relate to Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative), and in particular to the construction of a new Building D in the northwest corner of the SRC campus, which would require demolition of an existing duplex cottage and the existing employee parking lot.

With respect to the commenter's concerns regarding lack of privacy for the adjacent private residence, such concerns are properly considered by an agency in the context of a site development permit approval, not under CEQA, because they do not affect the environment of persons generally (Ukiah, supra, 2 Cal.App.4th 720). However, for context, the proposed setback of Building D under Alternative 3 from the property boundary of the adjacent lot would be approximately 25 feet, which is consistent with the required side setbacks for properties zoned as R-1-40,000 (20 feet for the first floor, and 25 feet for the second floor, per Saratoga Code of Ordinances, Section 15-12.090).

Furthermore, Alternative 3 would also include additional tree planting along the property line between Building D and the adjacent property to the west, which would help to reduce the views of the adjacent property from windows within Building D, and vice versa. See also response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.17.

3.4.69 Commenter NIEMAND-B

NIEMAND-B-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-13. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-13.1.

NIEMAND-B-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1, with additional comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment NIEMAND-B-2.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

NIEMAND-B-2.2

Comment (verbatim)

Improvements to the Health Care Center are justified and important, the expansion projects are unnecessary and will destroy the quality of life for all of us residents.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

NIEMAND-B-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-9. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-9.1.

NIEMAND-B-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8, with additional specific comments added by the commenter. Individual comments within the form letter portion have not been

delineated separately. Additional comments are delineated as comment NIEMAND-B-2.2, below.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

NIEMAND-B-4.2:

Comment (verbatim)

Without open space, this campus will lose its charm and character—the reason we chose this place.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

NIEMAND-B-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comments FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

3.4.70 Commenter OFLAHERTY-M

OFLAHERTY-M-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-31. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-31.1.

OFLAHERTY-M-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

3.4.71 Commenter OMURA-J

OMURA-J-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

OMURA-J-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-12. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-12.1.

3.4.72 Commenter ONN-D

ONN-D-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

As a Saratoga Neighborhood Safety Watch Officer I have monitored Pulsepoint and there are many 911 calls with sirens to the Saratoga Retirement Community. Is there a way to not use sirens or overuse 911? Why can't they have their own Ambulance. I think the nurses are overusing 911 and am afraid that the addition of units will increase the calls. The Data shows that they get the most calls in our community. Can we avoid the Fire Truck responding ob [sic] an EMS call ttere [sic] as they have their own team? Can you stop the many sirens in our community going to and from there?

I oppose the expansion until we get the sirens under control as well as the 911 calls.

Response to Comment

Existing noise issues at the SRC Campus are not an environmental impact of the proposed project that require a response under CEQA. As discussed in Section 3.13.3 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would result in approximately 89 additional independent living residents, which would be partially offset by a reduction of 45 skilled nursing and memory care beds, resulting in a net population increase of 44 residents or approximately 13 percent increase over the existing population of 330 residents. Although this net increase in population could be expected to result in a proportional increase in the number of emergency vehicles with sirens called to the campus, noise associated persons and equipment engaged in essential activities necessary to preserve, protect, or save lives or property from imminent danger, loss, or harm (such as emergency vehicle sirens) are exempt from the City's Noise Ordinance and noise from emergency sirens is not considered to be an environmental impact under CEQA.

ONN-D-2.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a duplicate of comment letter ONN-D-1, with correction of typographical error the only difference. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within this letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment ONN-D-1.1.

3.4.73 Commenter PANELL-J

PANELL-J-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

A developer's proposed building plan for the Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC) campus would demolish the full-sized Bocce Ball court that over 60 residents use several times a week for healthy outdoor recreation and socialization. This is the only outdoor recreation site on our campus. In addition to being lots of fun, Bocce Ball provides new residents with a wonderful opportunity to become integrated into the fabric of the SRC community. The game requires only modest skills, and is one that people can enjoy well into their 90s.

Our Bocce Ball court is the crown jewel in the Oddfellows Historic Park. It would be a shame to destroy the Bocce Ball court and the historic site on which it is situated for the sake of the developer's proposed two-story building.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, one which we SRC seniors consider so important to our physical and mental well-being.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

PANELL-J-2.1

Comment (verbatim)

As you are probably aware, there are many continuing care retirement communities in the San Francisco Bay Area. The Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC) is one of them. After touring most of these communities, we decided on the Saratoga Retirement Community because of its beautiful, open, tree-studded campus. This bucolic setting benefits the seniors who live here by providing clean air, shade, and safe walking areas.

Many neighbors from the adjoining neighborhoods also benefit from our lovely grounds, regularly strolling through and around our beautiful campus - mothers with babies in strollers, families going for an evening walk together, young bicyclists learning to bike in a safe place. They, like we, benefit from the traffic-free, open green space that SRC provides.

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

These benefits would all be lost if Pacific Retirement Community's proposed two-story apartment building is allowed. This proposed building would destroy the beautiful green space that we and our neighbors so enjoy and treasure. It would also significantly increase traffic in an area that is currently tranquil and almost traffic-free. SRC's beautiful, open, tree-studded campus is a jewel in the crown of Saratoga, Tree City USA. Please do not allow these apartments to be built.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, which we SRC residents consider to be of vital importance.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

PANELL-J-3.1

Comment (verbatim)

A developer for Pacific Retirement Services has proposed building a two-story apartment building in the center of the Saratoga Retirement Community Campus. Doing so would remove the safe, outdoor paths that currently allow senior residents to exercise in sunshine and fresh air. These paths are quite accessible, even for people using walkers.

By contrast, the DEIR suggests that if the proposed development was to be built, comparable walking paths could be located in the nearby San Marcos Open Space (p. 3 - 260, DEIR). The DEIR claims that the San Marcos Open Space is only 300 feet to the southeast of the proposed project site. However, that measurement is the direct air distance. The only way to access the San Marcos Open Space is by walking up a very steep embankment, which is completely inaccessible except by taking a 2.5 mile round trip walk along the road. Most seniors, especially those using walkers, are not capable of getting to the San Marcos Open Space. The proposed project would thus significantly and negatively impact the quality of life for Saratoga Retirement Community residents and its neighbors. Please do not allow this apartment building to be built.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

PANELL-J-4.1

Comment (verbatim)

Botanist and medical biochemist Diana Beresford-Kroeger has a plan for addressing climate change: preserving and planting trees. Trees play a vital role in supporting human health as well as the health of our planet. Saratoga, known since 2006 as Tree City, USA and nationally recognized for its Best Tree Canopy, Best Urban Forest, and Best Tree Heritage Program, has done a wonderful job of protecting its beautiful trees and, by extension, its citizens.

The Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC) has a plan as well, but it differs significantly from that of botanist Beresford-Kroeger. SRC's plan involves chopping down 124 trees. Sixty-five of these trees are protected by the City's code. Some of these trees are over 100 feet tall and measure six feet in diameter. They offer shade, habitats for birds and other animals, and contribute to the beauty of the SRC campus and the city of Saratoga, and to the health of its residents.

The prolonged California drought and our recent winter storms have already threatened the health of Saratoga's tree canopy; extreme rainfall and strong winds caused at least 13 large trees and 15 limbs to be removed from city roads, while other trees fell on private property. At a time when trees have been lost to extreme weather, and at this time of climate crisis, when the continued health of our planet and its inhabitants requires the preservation and planting of trees, it would be a shame for the City of Saratoga to allow tall, healthy, majestic trees to be removed for the sake of a building project.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

PANELL-J-4.2

Comment (verbatim)

I urge the Saratoga City Council and the Planning Commission to reject SRC's proposed plan in favor of "No Plan", or at the very least, the "Residents' Alternative Plan".

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-2: Support for No Project Alternative.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

PANELL-J-5.1

Comment (verbatim)

Here is an article from the NY Times about how one community is combatting climate change by planting tree. Please help us combat climate change here in Saratoga at the Saratoga Retirement Community by keep our existing trees and refusing to approve PRS's proposed expansion plan. This plan would result in the loss of 124 trees, 65 of which are protected by the City's code. Some of these trees are over 100 feet tall and six feet in diameter. These are heritage trees, whose preservation we owe our children, and our beautiful city. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/08/20/us/trees-heat-wave-new-haven-ct.html>

[See Appendix A for copy of article linked by commenter].

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

3.4.74 Commenter PANELL-P

PANELL-P-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

As a Stanford engineer and long-time supporter of the Sierra Club. I am proud to be living in the City of Saratoga, known since 2006 as Tree City USA and nationally recognized for its Best Tree Canopy, Best Urban Forest, and Best Tree Heritage Program.

Science informs us that trees pay a vital role in protecting the environment and its inhabitants by cooling the air, removing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, and buffering noise. In addition, trees provide shade and habitats for birds and other animals, as well as beautifying the areas in which they grow.

We lost at least 13 large trees in Saratoga last winter, and 15 limbs required removal from Saratoga roadways – this following a years-long drought which was already detrimental to tree survival. A developer for the Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC) has proposed removing even more trees from the City of Saratoga, to make way for a building project on the SRC campus. This plan would require chopping down 124 trees, 65 of which are protected by the City’s code. These are beautiful, mature trees – some over 100 feet tall and measuring six feet in diameter. They are irreplaceable allies in our fight to maintain livable conditions on our planet, and should not be sacrificed for the sake of a building project.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

PANELL-P-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

I urge the Saratoga City Council and the Planning Commission to reject SRC’s proposed plan in favor of “No Plan”, or at the very least, the “Residents’ Alternative Plan”.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-2: Support for No Project Alternative.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents’ Alternative (Alternative 1).

PANELL-P-2.1

Comment (verbatim)

I am currently one of the leaders of the men’s and women’s Bocce Ball League at the Saratoga Retirement Community. Over 60 residents regularly participate in our Bocce Ball games which take place several times each week. As you may know, Bocce Ball is a healthy outdoor activity that many seniors are able to enjoy well into their 90s. It required only a modest amount of skill, is very social in nature, and thus is highly beneficial to the physical and mental health of SRC residents.

Due to a developer's proposed building plan for the SRC campus, we risk losing this invaluable recreational resource. According to this plan, our full-size Bocce Ball court would be demolished to make way for a two-story apartment building on the site. We don't want or need a two-story apartment building, but we do need a regulation size Bocce Ball court to help us maintain our physical and mental well-being.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, which we SRC seniors consider so important.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

3.4.75 Commenter PARKER-R

PARKER-R-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

PARKER-R-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-5. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-5.1.

PARKER-R-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-31. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-31.1.

PARKER-R-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

PARKER-R-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-24. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-24.1.

PARKER-R-6.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

3.4.76 Commenter PEARSONHALL

PEARSONHALL-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

Concerning the DEIR, there was some talk about the emergency evacuation plan, I say to you how would you, if you lived at SRC, evacuate from SRC if there was an emergency?

I understand that the Odd Fellows Drive is a private drive. I understand that the Fire Department has a key to a gate going into Chester Road. What about the exit, where you could the push the gate, the Fire Department does not know about that gate. Do you?

Can you imagine with the expansion plan how much more impossible the evacuation would be?

Please imagine an emergency evacuation. There is no way the people that live and work here could get out. How sad for the people that work for the City of Saratoga and PRS would see the problem and choose not to do anything about it.

Response to Comment

It is unclear which “exit, where you could push the gate” the commenter refers to is and no further details were provided. Nonetheless, as discussed in Section 3.9.3 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would include a new, additional emergency access between Oddfellows Drive and Chester Avenue, and would also retain the existing emergency gate that is present just west of that. See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

3.4.77 Commenter PELTA-E

PELTA-E-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

I have read the Executive Summary of this report and find it comprehensive regarding the global impact of the proposals. I would comment that I think that the noise, vibration, traffic and airborne dirt assumptions are overly conservative and even then will be very difficult to measure and enforce. In addition, I believe that the time span for the project is greatly understated. As a resident of SRC for almost 9 years I have observed that major construction projects here generally take at least twice as long as the original schedule states.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-15: Construction Vibration.

See response to MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality.

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

PELTA-E-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

My main concern is that the EIR deals with the global impact of the project while I, as a resident am more concerned with the closer to home impact. For me and I believe, most other residents, our environment consists of the building and apartment in which I live, The streets where I walk, The space where visitors can park, recreation and meeting facilities, and access to our ancillary facilities such as Health Care and Assisted living.

All of these, with the possible exception of access to Assisted Living, and the health care center will be affected adversely should any part of the expansion plan come to pass.

Response to Comment

CEQA Guidelines Section 15360 defines the term “environment” as the physical conditions which exist within the area which will be affected by a proposed project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historical or aesthetic significance. The area involved shall be the area in which significant effects would occur either directly or indirectly as a result of the project. The “environment” includes both natural and man-made conditions.

The geographic context for the evaluation of environmental impacts within the Draft EIR is dependent on the particular environmental topic being analyzed. The only topic evaluated on a global scale is impacts relating to GHG emissions (Section 3.8.3 of the Draft EIR) which is appropriate because such emissions contribute to global climate change. Where appropriate, and as guided by the thresholds of significance which are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, impacts to other environmental topics are addressed on a more regional and/or localized scale. For example, criteria air pollutant emissions (Section 3.3.3) are evaluated against conditions within the local air basin, while emissions of toxic air contaminants are analyzed in the context of nearby

sensitive receptors. Because noise and vibration attenuate rapidly with distance, impacts relating to these factors are evaluated against conditions in the immediate vicinity of the project site, as discussed in Section 3.12.3 of the Draft EIR. Other impacts (e.g., impacts to public services, utility and service systems, population and housing) are evaluated based on the jurisdiction of relevant agencies.

See also response to MASTER-21: Impacts on SRC Residents/Seniors.

See also response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

PELTA-E-1.3

Comment (verbatim)

With the addition of as many as 52 additional residents, additional dining, kitchen, and meeting spaces must be provided. During the transition of these facilities, we can expect that the services provided to the residents will be disrupted, probably for an extended period.

I for one would like the expansion limited to adding no more additional residents than can be accommodated by a modest reconfiguration of existing dining, food preparation and meeting (Barnes Hall) space. This is probably about 20 residents or about 12 to 15 apartments.

Response to Comment

As presented in Section 2.3.3 of the Draft EIR, minor renovations would be made to the interior of the Manor Building to expand the existing dining room services and better utilize the existing auditorium space (which would no longer be required due to the proposed Meeting Room addition). It is not the purpose of the Draft EIR or the CEQA process to determine the adequacy of the proposed project for meeting the needs of the residents, but rather to identify and evaluate the physical environmental impacts of the project as proposed by the project applicant. A potential shortfall in the capacity of on-site dining services is not an environmental impact under CEQA; therefore, no further response to this comment is required.

See also response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

PELTA-E-1.4

Comment (verbatim)

The massive expansion proposed will do no good for anyone in Saratoga. It will not provide any low income housing, although it will add a substantial number of low income worker who need such housing. It will provide no identified benefit to the existing residents, most of whom are opposed to the expansion and the disruption it will force on their lives.

Incidentally, I considered the proposed reconfiguration of the existing health care facility to be a much needed project. I don't see why it is a part of the expansion plan or why it was not started years ago.

We SRC residents are the residents of Saratoga. Please act to limit this outrageous attack on our living environment.

Response to Comment

As discussed in Section 2.3.6 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project is expected to result in a minor decrease in the number of employees on site; therefore, the commenter's statement that the project "will add a substantial number of low income worker who need such [low income] housing" is incorrect.

With respect to the provision of low-income housing, the original project proposed by the applicant (and analyzed in the Draft EIR) did not contain any such housing, as correctly stated by the commenter. However, the applicant is currently in discussion with City staff regarding potentially deed-restricting ten of the existing assisted living units so that such units would be available for low-income persons (Ankrom Moisan 2024b). Details of such an arrangement are still being developed and would be part of the City's final considerations for the project.

Although details of the now-proposed affordable housing component were not described within the Draft EIR, the provision of affordable housing units as part of the proposed project (or one of the alternatives, if approved) would not result in any physical differences compared to the project (or alternative) described and analyzed in the Draft EIR. Therefore, the physical environmental impacts of the project (or alternative) would be the same as described in the Draft EIR.

See also response to MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Center Renovations.

See also response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

PELTA-E-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a duplicate of comment letter PELTA-E-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment PELTA-E-1.1 through PELTA-E-1.4.

PELTA-E-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

PELTA-E-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-29. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-29.1.

PELTA-E-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-14. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-14.1.

PELTA-E-6.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-15. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-15.1 through FORM-15.2.

3.4.78 Commenter PELTA-E&D

PELTA-E&D-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-12. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-12.1.

3.4.79 Commenter PERATA-D

PERATA-D-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I was born in the area and think the City of Saratoga has done a nice job maintaining many beautiful, historic areas, such as Villa Montalvo. The hidden gem of the Saratoga Retirement Community is one of those. The plan proposed by PRS is using all available green areas and outdoor recreation for the residents of the campus. Many neighbors like to walk and take graduation photos at this campus, around the impressive, unobstructed view of the historical Odd Fellows building.

Why build four buildings towards the front of the campus rather than pursue the plan that builds one new building on the side? (Plus one on the footprint of an existing building.) This is not necessary and would damage one of the few beautiful spots Saratoga has to offer, irreversibly.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Quality.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

3.4.80 Commenter PERATA-U

PERATA-U-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

This area is a pleasure to walk in, with many mature trees and attractive landscaping. The plan proposed by PRS would remove 124 trees from the community, including 26 Live Oak and 28 Redwood Trees. Please help maintain Saratoga's image of the "city of trees".

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

PERATA-U-2.1:

Comment (verbatim)

The eloquent presentation by Ms. Basham has made me aware of the fact that our most needy residents are considered to be the least important. They live in substandard quarters with a remodel at an undefined future time. The primary focus in the EIR is the building of new apartments that can be sold for very high prices to make a profit. Will the remodel of the Health Care Center ever happen? Will the property be sold to another owner at a high price before the Health Care Center is remodeled?

Alternative 1 builds a new up-to-standard Health Care Center first. Residents move in. Then one new apartment building is built on the footprint of the old Health Care Center. Two Buildings instead of 4 PLUS a promised remodel of the Health Care Center.

I ask you to please look at Alternative 1 carefully, even if it needs another EIR. It makes sense.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Center Renovations.

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

3.4.81 Commenter PERATA-U&D

PERATA-U&D-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

The Odd Fellows Home is on the Saratoga Heritage Resources Inventory and is eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources.

Saratoga has only two larger historical buildings: Villa Montalvo and the 1912 Odd Fellows Manor. The Odd Fellows Manor is a strikingly beautiful Mission Revival style building. It is tucked away at the end of a long driveway, and many Saratogans don't know about it. It is one of the most impressive Odd Fellows buildings in California and should be promoted as part of our history.

The out-of-state management company Pacific Retirement Services (PRS) has proposed a plan for 4 new buildings close to the Odd Fellows Manor: one meeting room attached to the Manor, one 2-story apartment building in front of its imposing façade, and another 2-story apartment building on the site of the Historic Odd Fellows Park. The small recreational park is all that is left of the previous, formal gardens. This plan hides or removes part of Saratoga history for good.

Expansion does not have to destroy a historical site. There is another plan mentioned in the EIR (Alternative 1), which keeps the historical Odd Fellows Manor and historical park intact. It proposes 2 buildings rather than 4. One of the two buildings would be on the footprint of an existing building. This is the residents' alternative supported by more than 75% of residents.

Saratoga Retirement Community has been a profitable operation as is. Please help us maintain Saratoga and California history.

Response to Comment

The Draft EIR (Sections 1.3, 3.5.1, and 3.5.3) already acknowledges that Manor Building is listed on the Saratoga Heritage Resources Inventory, as well as its eligibility for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources. Impacts to this historical resource are discussed in Section 3.5.3 (Impact CUL-1) of the Draft EIR.

As discussed in that section, the proposed construction of Building B to the north of Manor Building was determined to have a significant and unavoidable impact on the historic resource, while the proposed construction of the Meeting Room addition would have a potentially significant impact that could be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures MM-CUL-1a through MM-CUL-1c. See also response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

The proposed construction of Buildings A and C were found to have no impact to historical resources due to the physical distance of these proposed buildings from the Manor Building. See also response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

As required by CEQA, Section 4 of the Draft EIR includes analysis of several alternatives to the project that would avoid or reduce this significant and unavoidable impact. All of the alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIR would avoid the construction of the project's Building B, with Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative) and Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative) having a less than significant with mitigation to historic resources, and Alternative 1 (Residents' Alternative) having a less than significant impact to historic resources (without mitigation). See also response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

See also response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

PERATA-U&D-2.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-19. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-19.1.

3.4.82 Commenter PFEIFFER-P

PFEIFFER-P-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

I attended the public meeting on the EIR report on 2 August and came away with some unexpected conclusions. While the comments often strayed beyond the EIR itself, they gave Saratoga city planners and the public a wake-up realization of the monumental impact this proposed construction project will have on the residents of the Saratoga Retirement Community and surrounding neighbors.

Money seems to be central to the issue. One speaker at the public meeting disputed the assertion that SRC needs this expansion to stay solvent. Based on his presentation, it would seem more accurate to claim that Pacific Retirement Services needs this expansion to compensate for financial deficits in its less profitable retirement communities-and incidentally to enhance its own reputation.

While small improvement projects to benefit existing tenants would clearly be justified, the sheer scale of the proposed enlargement is staggering. It cannot even be rationalized on ethical grounds, like creating affordable housing for those on limited income, for example. (I find it supremely ironic that a community founded as a retirement home for indigent day laborers, the Odd Fellows, is now running print and online ads soliciting prospective members from the highest income brackets.).

To compound the irony, now the welfare of current residents--and their significant investment in the Saratoga Retirement Community--has been, not just overlooked, but callously subordinated to the profit motive of the groups that manage it. (How many of us will have the means, or even the energy, to flee a years-long ear-splitting construction zone?)

The conclusion I was forced to draw from all the speakers at the 2 August EIR meeting, as well as from reading the EIR report, is that doing absolutely nothing is far preferable to what is proposed by the applicants.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-2: Support for No Project Alternative.

3.4.83 Commenter PRICE-J

PRICE-J-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

If the PRS Expansion Plan is allowed to proceed, we can expect the following scenario to take place:

In the short term (next four to five years, or more), the single entry/exit road will be clogged with earth moving/demolition/construction vehicles, polluting the air with noise, harmful emissions, dust and dirt. This is in addition to the normal residential traffic and frequent emergency vehicles, and resulting in an environment detrimental to our health and well-being. A “hell-on-earth,” as it has been aptly described, and a sad end for the residents whose lives will expire during this period!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality.

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

PRICE-J-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

In the long term, the new buildings will have crowded out most of our open space, resulting in the loss of our canopy of mature trees, the loss of our outdoor recreational areas, and the loss of native wildlife that used to inhabit or visit the community.

What thoughtful body of people would choose to even consider, let alone approve such a scenario? It is beyond belief. May it never happen!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

3.4.84 Commenter PRICE-R

PRICE-R-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

On December 28, 2004 my husband and I moved into the brand new Saratoga Retirement Community. At the end of this coming December, we will have lived here for 19 years. As such long time residents, we are completely unnerved by the proposed PRS Expansion Plan. We have thrived here through the combination of wonderful staff,

lots of good friends, and the overall beauty of this campus covered in its lush garden environment. As one ages, you grow to realize how important nature is overall to the peace of one's physical needs, and for keeping the inner person thriving as well. There are to be 124 large mature trees along with various areas of general landscaping scheduled to be removed before the PRS project can begin. After this clearing finishes, buildings will rise to cover those sights of nature. Where once winged birds and scurrying squirrels roamed. Our panoramic views of the clouds and blue skies will be lost forever to a "closed in" existence. Gone will be our lovely open spaces to sit and to marvel at the wonders of nature's sunrises and sunsets.

Please reconsider this forever loss of a truly unique "park-like" essence in our Saratoga Retirement Community campus for unbridled profit!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Quality.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

3.4.85 Commenter RAMOS-J

RAMOS-J-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I live nearby in San Jose, and down the road I'm looking at this retirement facility. The Saratoga Retirement Community is a wonderful facility, a real credit to planning in Saratoga. I'm supportive of the expansion program for the local community.

The area around the facility is very nice, and the proposed expansion looks like will be a real credit to the city of Saratoga. With the proposed expansion, the area will not be dominated, there will still be plenty of greenery and trees. I've examined several facilities and found Saratoga to be outstanding.

The City and the retirement community should be completed with the current facility and hopefully the proposed expansion.

Response to Comment

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that a lead agency respond to comments that raise significant environmental issues. Comments concerning general support for the project do not raise significant environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR.

3.4.86 Commenter RAVIKUMAR-R

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

The DEIR is written with a bias towards (1) comparison of various alternatives with the “project” and (2) impacts assessed largely in the periphery of the SRC residential area without fully considering those of the neighboring residential home. It is hard for the planning commission and city council approvers to sufficiently understand the impact to the immediately adjacent residential home on 14622 Granite way unless the impacts for alternative 3, specifically on the neighboring residential home, are discussed.

Response to Comment

As described in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIR, CEQA requires that an EIR describe and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project, or to the location of the proposed project, and evaluate the comparative environmental effects of the alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), (d)). The “range of alternatives” is governed by the “rule of reason,” which requires the EIR to describe and consider only those alternatives necessary to permit informed public participation, and an informed and reasoned choice by the decision-making body (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), (f)). Further, an EIR need not describe or evaluate the environmental effects of alternatives in the same level of detail as the proposed project, but rather must include enough information to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d)).

Section 4 of the Draft EIR describes the reasonable range of alternatives that were identified to the proposed project, which includes Alternative 3 (the Applicant’s Alternative), mentioned by the commenter. The analysis of the environmental impacts of Alternative 3 is contained within Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR. Where appropriate, e.g., in consideration of noise, vibration, and certain air quality impacts (fugitive dust and toxic air contaminants), the impacts of this alternative to nearby sensitive receptors (such as the commenter) are specifically discussed. The alternatives analysis within the Draft EIR therefore meets the requirements of CEQA and no revisions to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

See also responses to comments RAVIKUMAR-R-1.2 through RAVIKUMAR-R-1.32 below.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

For example, there will be huge volumes of dust during construction, in the residential property on 14622 Granite way, in several areas that are being used on a daily basis: the tennis courts, the swimming pool and the master bedroom area. The tennis court, for example, has to be washed daily to make it usable with large volumes of water. Who will be providing such maintenance? Similarly, the beautifully landscaped garden will be full of dust with resulting unhealthy plants and trees. Where is the impact to the landscaping on 14622 Granite way being addressed?

Response to Comment

For clarity, the commenter's concerns relate to the construction of Building D in the northwest corner of the SRC campus, which is a component of Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative) but is not a component of the proposed project.

Impacts relating to fugitive dust from Alternative 3 are addressed in Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR under the subheading "Air Quality" and discussion of Impact AIR-2. As discussed in that section, fugitive dust emissions are considered to be significant unless the BAAQMD's best management practices for fugitive dust control are implemented during construction. Mitigation measure MM-AIR-2 requires that these best management practices be implemented during construction of Alternative 2, which would reduce the impact to less than significant with mitigation.

With respect to the commenter's particular concerns regarding the impacts of dust to their tennis court and landscaping, the required best management practices include a requirement to cover, treat, and/or water exposed surfaces "sufficient to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site" and also requires that a notice be posted with contact details for dust complaints, which must be responded to, and corrective actions applied, within 24-hours. The full text of MM-AIR-2 is contained within Section 3.3.3 of the Draft EIR.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.3

Comment (verbatim)

Further, privacy is a major concern unless the approvers insist on tall clerestory windows instead of balconies and heavy screening between the property lines. The balconies as designed, will be at a lower height relative to the height of the property at 14622 Granite way (which is at a much lower grade level) and will cause significant privacy issues along the entire length of Building D, across the tennis courts, swimming pool and master bedroom areas. The proof is the current single-story buildings which were constructed during the previous phase in 2003, where the height of those buildings is causing significant privacy issues already due to a total disregard for the impact on adjacent residential homes. This cannot be allowed to happen again on a larger footprint. Further, the proposed two story building D will intensify this issue significantly.

Response to Comment

For clarity, the commenter's concerns relate to the construction of Building D in the northwest corner of the SRC campus, which is a component of Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative) but is not a component of the proposed project.

Privacy concerns are properly considered by an agency in the context of a site development permit approval, not under CEQA, because they do not affect the environment of persons generally (Ukiah, supra, 2 Cal.App.4th 720).

Building D under Alternative 3 would be set back approximately 25 feet from the property boundary with the commenter's property. The 2-story building would range in height from approximately 20 feet, 3 inches above grade at the southern end to approximately 30 feet, 8 inches above grade at the northern end. The commenter's home is located toward the southern end of Building D. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would also include additional tree planting along the property line between Building D and the adjacent property to the west, which would help to reduce the views of the

adjacent property from windows within Building D, and vice versa. See also response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.17.

There is no specified height limit for institutional facilities within the R-1-40,000 zone, but structures within such facilities are generally limited to 2 stories, with 3 story buildings only allowed in specific circumstances [Saratoga Code of Ordinances, Section 15-12.100(c)]. For context, single-family homes within the R-1-40,000 zone are permitted to be up to 26 feet in height, with an allowance for structures up to 30 feet in height if specific findings are made [Saratoga Code of Ordinances, Section 15-12.100(a)]. The required setback from side-lot lines for properties zoned as R-1-40,000 are 20 feet for the first floor, and 25 feet for the second floor [Saratoga Code of Ordinances, Section 15-12.090(2)].

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.4

Comment (verbatim)

The adjacent home on 14622 Granite way is largely impacted with the applicant's alternative (Alternative 3) in several areas, therefore the DEIR will have to be re-written to make it a fair assessment including significant impacts on immediately adjacent residential homes.

Response to Comment

As discussed in response to more detailed comments from this commenter on specific aspects of Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative), the Draft EIR meets the requirements of CEQA with respect to the evaluation of alternatives, and in particular the evaluation of environmental impacts from Alternative 3. Per Section 15126.6(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project, but does not need to be analyzed to the same level of detail as the proposed project. None of the comments presented new information that would affect the conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to Alternative 3 and no edits to the Draft EIR are required in response.

See also response to comments RAVIKUMAR-R-1.1 through RAVIKUMAR-R-1.32.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.5

Comment (verbatim)

1. Prior experience cannot be repeated: Section 1.2.1 Notice of Preparation and Scoping Meeting on page 1-2 lists several concerns from the previous construction activities at the SRC campus which were not well managed and that the neighboring landowners are concerned that similar impacts will occur with this project. It is very clear that the approval process then, did not serve the interests of the residents of Saratoga at large. Request for the DEIR to be updated specifically with the impacts to the closest residential homes with appropriate mitigation plans for a more balanced review by the planning commission and the city council members.

Response to Comment

The purpose of CEQA is to analyze and disclose the environmental impacts of a proposed project. Construction-related impacts of the proposed project are addressed in several subsections of the Draft EIR, including but not limited to Section 3.3.3 (Air Quality), Section 3.10.3 (Hydrology and Water Quality), Section 3.12.3 (Noise and

Vibration), and Section 3.16.3 (Transportation). For impacts that were found to be potentially significant, mitigation measures are recommended to reduce the impacts to below the threshold of significance.

With respect to the commenter's request to update the Draft EIR to address "impacts to the closest residential homes", please see responses to comments RAVIKUMAR-R-1.1 through RAVIKUMAR-R-1.32 for more detailed discussion in relation to the specific environmental impacts raised in other portions of this comment letter.

With respect to the commenter's concern that previous construction projects were not well managed, several of the mitigation measures in the Draft EIR, including MM-AIR-2 relating to fugitive dust and MM-NOI-1a relating to noise, include a requirement to provide contact details for a point of contact to address complaints during construction. Responsibilities for implementing mitigation measures during project construction as well as throughout ongoing operations would be defined in the Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program that is required to be prepared and adopted by the City, if the project (or an alternative) is approved. Ultimately, the City, as Lead Agency, would be responsible for verifying that mitigation measures are implemented.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.6

Comment (verbatim)

2. Process for review of project delays and its impact on the neighboring homeowners: Section 1.2.1 Notice of Preparation and Scoping Meeting on page 1-3 identifies a concern from previous project re longer duration than originally planned for construction. Request a process to be defined for a review of impacts including mitigation for delays longer acceptable thresholds on the neighboring property owners.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.7

Comment (verbatim)

3. Item not addressed regarding open space policy: On page 3-14 Open space element policy is stated as: Open Space Element Goal OSC 2: To preserve the City's existing character which includes small town residential, rural/semi-rural areas and open spaces. Policy OSC 2.1: Ensure that all development proposals, public and private, are sensitive to the natural environment and the community's open space resources. Request for a statement in the DEIR regarding the compromise of this fundamental goal/policy as it applies to the neighboring residential home on 14622 Granite way. Building D from the resident's alternative (Alternative 3) will violate the open space principle and one of the main reasons why the property owner purchased the property back in 1999.

Response to Comment

Section 4.6.3 (Impact AES-3) of the Draft EIR addresses impacts of Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative) in relation to potential conflicts with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality, in accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (Threshold I.c). As discussed in that section, Alternative 3 would result in an intensification of existing residential and related land uses at the site; however, with

approval of the requested Planned Combined District overlay, the alternative would not conflict with applicable zoning; therefore, the impact was found to be less than significant.

While General Plan goals and policies, such as Goal OSC 2 and Policy OSC 2.1, provide guidance to City decision makers when considering approval (or not) of a particular project, they do not provide specific standards or requirements that would constitute a “regulation,” such as height limits, setbacks for upper floors that regulate the massing, floor area ratios, or protection of designated scenic view corridors. Furthermore, the construction of a two story senior residential apartment building (Building D of Alternative 3 [Applicant’s Alternative]) on the site of an existing parking lot and existing single-story duplex within an existing retirement community campus is not considered a substantial conflict with Goal OSC 2 or Policy OSC 2.1 with respect to scenic quality impacts under CEQA. Furthermore, as discussed in response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space, the only open space resource (as defined by Government Code 65560) present at the project site is the 10.6-acre open space easement to the east of McLaren Lane and south of Eucalyptus Drive. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 (Applicant’s Alternative) would not involve any construction, vegetation removal, or ground disturbance within or adjacent to this open space resource.

No edits to the Draft EIR are proposed in response to this comment.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.8

Comment (verbatim)

4. Statement not true: Under section 3.2.3 Project impacts and mitigation, on page 3-16 it is stated that Overall, the Project would be consistent in height, size, and scale with the existing buildings at the site and in the surrounding area. While it refers to the “project”, it is certainly not true when you compare the proposed two-story buildings (Alternate 3) to the residential property on 14622 Granite way. Request to modify the statement in the DEIR.

Response to Comment

As stated by the commenter, the statement in Section 3.2.3 relates the proposed project, not to Alternative 3 (the Applicant’s Alternative). The cited statement regarding consistency with existing buildings at the site and in the surrounding area was not intending to suggest that the proposed new buildings were of the scale of single family homes in the area, but rather that they were generally consistent with the scale of other larger buildings on the SRC Campus itself, and on the adjacent Fellowship Plaza property, as demonstrated in Table 3-B below.

As can be seen within this table, the buildings proposed as part of the project are of a similar height/number of stories to the existing buildings on campus and many have a smaller footprint. No edits to the Draft EIR are proposed in response to this comment.

Table 3-B Summary of Existing and Proposed Buildings in Project Area

Building	Number of Stories	Building Height¹	Footprint	Total Area
Existing Buildings on SRC Campus				
Manor Building	2.5 stories	34 feet (excl. dome) 48 feet (with dome)	28,298 SF	60,622 SF
Assisted Living Building	2 stories	21 feet, 2 inches	45,518 SF	106,192 SF
Health Center	1 story	25 feet, 6 inches	39,893 SF	39,893 SF
Apartment 1	2 stories with 1 level below grade parking	49 feet, 6 inches	31,604 SF	62,700 SF
Apartment 2	2 stories with 1 level below grade parking	38 feet, 6 inches	30,232 SF	65,700 SF
Existing Buildings at Adjacent Fellowship Plaza Property				
4x Residential Apartments	3 stories each	unknown	Each approx. 10,000 SF	Each approx. 30,000 SF
New Buildings under Proposed Project				
Building A	2 stories with 1 level below grade parking	36 feet, 11 inches	17,949 SF	35,898 SF
Building B	2 stories with 1 level below grade parking	27 feet, 5 inches	24,659 SF	28,475 SF
Building C	3 stories with 1 level below grade parking	40 feet, 6 inches	18,509 SF	41,715 SF
Meeting Room	1 story with 1 level below grade parking	40 feet, 4 inches	7,043 SF	11,835 SF
Fitness Center	1 story	16 feet	1,065 SF	1,065 SF
New Buildings under Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative)				
<i>Buildings A, C, Meeting Room & Fitness Center as described for proposed project</i>				
Building D	2 stories	25 feet	17,467 SF	34,934 SF
New Cottage ²	1 story	17 feet	2,200 SF	2,200 SF

Acronyms: SF = square feet

Notes:

¹ Building Height is the maximum height above average grade elevation for each building.

² Height of new cottage estimated based on heights of existing cottages, as details not provided by applicant.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.9

Comment (verbatim)

5. Potentially Discriminating standards from CEQA: On page 3-18 it is stated that: "Furthermore, CEQA is typically concerned about impacts on the environment of persons generally, rather than impacts on particular persons." Many of the areas of impacts throughout the DEIR has taken the position in favor of the "persons generally" – however, the impacted party is a property owner at 14622 Granite way who has been a taxpayer and a good citizen of the community for over 25 years. Request to note the concern in your comment's summary for due consideration of the property owner.

Response to Comment

As the commenter correctly points out, CEQA is typically concerned about impacts on the environment of persons in general, rather than impacts to specific individuals⁵, and this approach is supported by case law (Ukiah, supra, 2 Cal.App.4th 720). Furthermore, in urbanized areas, the applicable threshold for significance for impacts to scenic quality in urbanized areas do not include impacts to visual character or the quality of views of the site and its surroundings, but rather as to whether the proposed project conflicts with applicable zoning and regulations governing scenic quality (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G, Threshold I.c). As described in Section 3.2.3 of the Draft EIR (Impact AES-3), with approval of the requested Planned Combined District overlay, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable zoning, therefore the impact of the project on scenic quality would be less than significant.

With respect to the commenter's request for due consideration of the adjacent property owner, environmental impacts of the project with respect to adjacent and nearby properties and nearby sensitive receptors are analyzed within the Draft EIR, such as in Section 3.3, Air Quality and Section 3.12, Noise, for example. See responses to comments RAVIKUMAR-R-1.1 through RAVIKUMAR-R-1.32 for additional discussion of specific concerns raised by the commenter in relation to their property. Note that neither the status of an adjoining property owner as a taxpayer or citizen, nor the length of time that they have lived in the community should be a factor in the analysis of environmental impacts within the EIR.

No edits to the Draft EIR are proposed in response to this comment.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.10

Comment (verbatim)

6. Impact NOI-1: Increase in Ambient Noise Levels - The discussion of noise impact stating substantial increase in noise levels in excess of applicable standards is inadequate because it does not address the impact on the residential home at 14622 Granite way which is right next to the applicant's alternative. Mitigation should include a sound barrier at an appropriate height and effectiveness to protect the neighbor's normal thresholds of sound levels.

Response to Comment

Noise impacts from the proposed project are evaluated in Section 3.12.3, whilst noise impacts from Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative) are evaluated in Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR. For both the project and Alternative 3, impacts from construction-generated noise to the nearest sensitive receptors are specifically identified, and it is stated that noise impacts would attenuate with distance such that receptors further from the noise source would receive lower levels of noise than the closest receptor. The distance at which noise levels would drop below the threshold of significance is also identified for the various construction phases of both the proposed project and the alternative.

For the proposed project, as stated on page 3-223 of the Draft EIR, noise from each of the construction zones would be anticipated to dissipate to below the 80 dBA threshold within approximately 104 feet from the source. The commenter's property (14622

⁵ https://ceqaportal.org/tp/CEQA%20Portal%20Topic%20Paper_Thresholds%20of%20Significance_2020%20Update.pdf

Granite Way) is approximately 230 feet from the center of the Meeting Room construction zone (the closest construction zone for the proposed project); therefore, noise levels at the commenter's property during construction of the Meeting Room would be less than significant. Other construction zones associated with the proposed project are further from the commenter's property, therefore noise levels would be less than for the Meeting Room. The Draft EIR did not specifically calculate predicted noise levels from the movement of construction equipment within and to/from the staging area in the employee parking lot at the northwest corner of the SRC campus, which is immediately adjacent to the commenter's property. The distance between the acoustic center of the staging area and the residence at 14622 Granite Way is approximately 160 feet, and the property boundary is approximately 75 feet from the center of the staging area. Noise levels generated at the staging area are anticipated to be lower than those generated at the building construction zones, because the majority of equipment use within the staging areas would not be at full power – e.g., excavators and dozers would be driven within the staging area but would not be used to excavate or demolish structures in the staging area). But even assuming a “worst case” where the combined predicted noise level at the staging area was the same as for the building construction zones (i.e., 87 dBA at 50 feet), such noise levels would attenuate to less than the 80 dBA threshold within 104 feet; therefore, only a small portion of the commenter's yard would receive noise levels above the threshold of significance. Furthermore, mitigation measure MM-NOI-1a (which would be implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts to other closer receptors) would also serve to further reduce the potential impacts to this receptor, for the same reasons described in Section 3.16.3. See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

For Alternative 3, one of the nearest receptors analyzed for demolition of the cottage and construction of Building D was incorrectly identified as 14622 Burgundy Way (Table 4.6-6 of the Draft EIR) but is in fact the commenter's property at 14622 Granite Way. As shown in that table, predicted noise levels at the 14622 Granite Way/14622 Burgundy Way property could be up to 87 dBA during demolition of the existing cottage, and up to 79 dBA during construction of Building D. As discussed within Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR, because the predicted noise levels would exceed the threshold of significance, mitigation measure MM-NOI-1a would be required, which would reduce impacts to less than significant. Note that this mitigation measure requires that the applicant's preliminary Construction Noise Mitigation Plan be updated by a qualified acoustic consultant to reflect the final design if one of the alternatives is approved (if any).

No additional mitigation or edits to the Draft EIR are proposed in response to this comment.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.11

Comment (verbatim)

7. Impact NOI-2: The discussion of Exposure of People to Ground borne Noise and Vibration Levels resulting in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of applicable standards is inadequate because it does not address the impact on the residential home at 14622 Granite way which is right next to the applicant's alternative. Mitigation should include appropriate vibration reduction mechanisms to neighbor's home.

Response to Comment

Vibration impacts from the proposed project are evaluated in Section 3.12.3, whilst vibration impacts from Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative) are evaluated in Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR. For both the project and Alternative 3, impacts from vibration to the nearest sensitive receptors are specifically identified, with respect to both human receptors as well as nearby buildings that could be impacted by vibration.

For the proposed project, the distance between the commenter's property boundary and the nearest edge of the closest construction zone (Meeting Room) is approximately 175 feet. As indicated in Table 3.12-10 of the Draft EIR, vibration from a heavy roller would dissipate to below the threshold for potential building damage (0.3 in/sec PPV for engineered concrete and masonry buildings) at a distance of approximately 20 feet, and to below the threshold for potential human annoyance (80 VdB) at a distance of 75 feet. Therefore, vibration impacts to the commenter's property from the proposed project would be less than significant. See also response to MASTER-15: Construction Vibration.

Similar to the discussion for noise impacts in response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.10 above, the analysis of vibration impacts from Alternative 3 identified the predicted vibration levels at the nearest receptors, which included the commenter's property (but mis-identified it as 14622 Burgundy Way instead of 14622 Granite Way). As shown in Table 4.6-7 of the Draft EIR, impacts to receptors at 14622 Burgundy Way/14622 Granite Way could exceed the threshold of significance during demolition of the existing cottage and construction of Building D. Implementation of mitigation measure MM-NOI-2 would reduce impacts of Alternative 3 to a less-than-significant level, for the reasons described in Section 4.6.3 (and Section 3.16.3) of the Draft EIR.

No additional mitigation or edits to the Draft EIR are proposed in response to this comment.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.12

Comment (verbatim)

8. Impact AES-1 correction: The discussion on scenic vistas on page 4-136 and their impact on the surrounding area is incorrect. With the applicant's alternative, the project will directly diminish the scenic quality of the vista by introducing new visual elements that are incompatible with the balance of built and open space that substantially alter the landform. Overall, the Project, when considered with the applicant's alternative will not be consistent in height, size and scale with the buildings in the surrounding area such as the home next to the proposed building, at 14622 Granite way.

Response to Comment

As discussed for the proposed project in Section 3.2.3 (under Impact AES-1), factors in determining whether a proposed project would block scenic vistas include the project's proposed height, mass, and location relative to surrounding land uses and travel corridors, as well as to the number of viewers potentially affected and the length of exposure. Such considerations are also applicable to the analysis of Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative). Whilst the construction of a two-story Building D at the northwest corner of the SRC campus, approximately 25 feet from the western property line (as proposed under Alternative 3) could alter the direct views and visual character of the area when viewed from the adjacent property at 14622 Granite Way, it would not

adversely affect views toward Saratoga's low-lying foothills and the Santa Cruz Mountains for a substantial number of viewers. Neither would Building D block such views from this commenter's property at 14622 Granite Way, as views towards the foothills and mountains are toward the south/southwest, whereas Building D would be to the northeast of the adjacent property. No edits to the Draft EIR are proposed in response to this comment.

See also response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.8 regarding consistency with the height, size and scale of other buildings in the surrounding area.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.13

Comment (verbatim)

9. Omission to be addressed with the design for balconies on Building D: On page 4-129, Figure 4.6-2 (3) Building D West elevation is very concerning from two perspectives. The combination of balconies and the relative height of the balconies adjacent to the property on 14622 Granite way raises a great deal of concern for privacy along the tennis court, swimming pool and master bedroom areas. While privacy is not listed as one of the DEIR review areas, the comment to NOT have balconies at all and to ONLY have raised clerestory windows is important to the homeowner adjacent to building D. Please note the homeowner on 14622 Granite way is already suffering from peering doors and windows from the previous development on the SRC site adjacent to the residential home. Pictures will be provided during the study session and further reviews.

Response to Comment

See response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.3 regarding impacts to neighbors' privacy from Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative).

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.14

Comment (verbatim)

10. Omission in the list of Project objectives for Alternative 3 (page 4-134): Section 4.6.2 "Ability of Alternative 3 to Meet Project Objectives" lists several objectives of the proposed project. Request an update to include an objective to not disrupt the quality of life for the neighboring residents of the SRC campus, both during the construction and the ongoing operation of the facilities. The term 'quality of life' simply represents a continuity of existing sound, noise, and dust levels including privacy considerations from windows and balconies of the proposed SRC project and specifically those pertaining to Alternative 3.

Response to Comment

CEQA Section 15123(b) requires that an EIR include a statement of objectives sought by the proposed project. The intent of the objectives is to help the lead agency develop a reasonable range of alternatives to evaluate in the EIR, and to aid the decision makers in preparing findings or a statement of overriding considerations, if necessary. The statement of objectives should include the underlying purpose of the project and may discuss the project benefits. The objectives for the project were provided to the City by the applicant and were included in the Draft EIR (in Sections 2.2 and 4.1.1) as required by the CEQA Guidelines.

See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See also response to MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality.

See also response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See also response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.3.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.15

Comment (verbatim)

11. Impact to privacy for the current residential neighbor at 14622 Granite way: Section 4.6.3 on page 4-136 “Analysis of the Environmental Impacts of Alternative 3” states that the estimated height of Building D would be approximately 30 feet, 8 inches above grade at the north of the building (near Odd Fellows Drive) and approximately 20 feet, 3 inches above grade at the south of the building. Building D would be set back 25 feet from the adjacent residential boundary to the west. Request an update to include the relative height of the proposed Building D relative to the ground level of the adjacent residential property at 14622 Granite way to provide an accurate view of the impact to privacy (despite the proposed 25’ setback). Pls note that the grade level of the residential area at 14622 Granite way is substantially lower than the grade level of the proposed building D. Request an update to include appropriate mitigation such as tall clerestory windows instead of proposed set of balconies for the proposed two-storied building D

Response to Comment

As discussed in response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.3, privacy concerns are properly considered by an agency in the context of a site development permit approval, not under CEQA, because they do not affect the environment of persons generally (Ukiah, supra, 2 Cal.App.4th 720).

The impacts of Alternative 3 are evaluated within Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR, within the context of the threshold of significance described for each environmental topic. The proposed height of Building D relative to the ground level of the adjacent property is not pertinent to the evaluation of those environmental impacts under CEQA and therefore is not necessary to be described within the Draft EIR. As described within Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR, all environmental impacts associated with Alternative 3 would be less than significant, or could be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of the mitigation measures described therein. No additional mitigation measures are required and no changes are proposed to the Draft EIR in response to this comment.

Furthermore, Alternative 3 would also include additional tree planting along the property line between Building D and the adjacent property to the west, which would help to reduce the views of the adjacent property from windows within Building D, and vice versa. See also response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.17.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.16

Comment (verbatim)

12. Incorrect statement to be corrected: Section 4.6.3 on page 4-136 “Analysis of the Environmental Impacts of Alternative 3” states the overall, similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would be generally consistent in height, size, and scale with the existing

buildings at the site and in the surrounding area. This is incorrect. The neighboring home at 14622 Granite way is a single-story home and is located at a much lower grade compared to the proposed building D.

Response to Comment

Similar to the discussion in response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.8, the statement cited by the commenter regarding consistency with existing buildings at the site and in the surrounding area was not intending to suggest that the proposed new buildings were of the scale of single family homes in the area, but rather that they were generally consistent with the scale of other larger buildings on the SRC Campus itself, and on the adjacent Fellowship Plaza property.

As demonstrated in Table 3-B (contained in the response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.8), Building D under Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative) would be a 2-story building similar to the two existing independent living apartment buildings on campus, but with a smaller footprint (approximately 17,500 SF compared to approximately 30,000 SF each for the existing apartment buildings). Therefore, the description as "generally consistent" is considered to be accurate and no changes to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.17

Comment (verbatim)

13. Omission to be corrected: Under the section on impact AES-3: Scenic Quality on page 4-137 it is stated that additional trees would be planted along the residential boundary to the east of Building D to provide screening from the adjacent residence and associated yard. The impact on adjacent residence and associated yard at 14622 Granite way, which is immediately to the north and west of the proposed building D is the largest and there is no mention of screening. Request an update to include appropriate screening with specifics on height and length, along the entire length of building D, adjacent to the property mentioned herein.

Response to Comment

The statement on page 4-137 of the Draft EIR that "additional trees would be planted along the residential boundary to the east of Building D to provide screening from the adjacent residence and associated yard" contains a typographical error and should refer to the residential boundary to the WEST of Building D (i.e., between the new building and the commenter's property at 14622 Granite Way). Minor edits have been made to this sentence to correct the error. **These proposed edits are described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.**

In addition, following the Planning Commission's study session on September 23, 2023, the applicant indicated that it may be possible under Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative) to relocate some of the mature trees removed from the Meeting Room area and replant these along the fence line between Building D and the neighboring property (Ankrom Moisan 2024b). Prior to implementing such a plan, the applicant would need to submit detailed project plans for Alternative 3 and obtain approval from the City Arborist, which would be anticipated to include conditions relating to the maintenance and upkeep of replanted trees to ensure successful transplantation. Under Section 15-50.080(d) of the Saratoga Municipal Code, the City has the right to require posting of a

maintenance bond or security deposit to ensure the long term maintenance of affected or replacement trees.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.18

Comment (verbatim)

14. Clarification needed: Under the section on impact AES-3: Scenic Quality on page 4-137 it is stated that Alternative 3 would include an intensification of the existing senior residential and related uses at the site and would include a request for a Planned Combined District overlay, and with approval of the requested overlay, Alternative 3 would not conflict with applicable zoning. Request for clarification on how the city will consider the rights of adjacent property owners who bought their homes based on the fact that the SRC site is the same zoning as the adjacent properties which are all designated as R1-40,000. The property owners' original criteria of choosing to purchase their primary residence will be invalidated with the City's likely approval of the re zoning request already filed by the PRS group.

Response to Comment

Nursing homes and day care facilities in excess of six persons being cared for at the facility, and other institutional facilities are conditional uses in all R-1 districts within Saratoga (Saratoga Code of Ordinances 15-12-030), including the R-1-40,000 zoning district.

The environmental impacts of Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative), including the requested approval for a Planned Combined District overlay, are analyzed within the Draft EIR within the context of the thresholds of significance for each environmental topic. With respect to scenic quality, the appropriate threshold is whether the project conflicts with applicable zoning or other regulations affecting scenic quality. As discussed within Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR (and repeated by the commenter) with approval of a Planned Combined District overlay, the proposed project would not conflict with the applicable zoning or other regulations affecting scenic quality. Other considerations, such as the motivations of adjacent property owners when purchasing their property, do not relate to the environmental impacts of the proposed project; therefore, it is not appropriate for the Draft EIR to evaluate such considerations.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.19

Comment (verbatim)

15. Mitigation item needed: Under the section on Impact AES-4: Light and Glare on page 4-138, it is stated that that new lighting associated with Building D and the new cottage would be closer to the adjacent residences to the west of the campus than new lighting sources under the project. It is further stated that the additional lighting is not anticipated to cause substantial adverse effects. Based on the possibility that the effects could indeed be substantial, in the absence of any detailed plans, we request the inclusion of mitigation plans prior to final submission.

Response to Comment

For clarity, the commenter's concerns relate to the construction of Building D in the northwest corner of the SRC campus, which is a component of Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative) but is not a component of the proposed project.

As discussed in Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR (Impact AES-4) all outdoor lighting is required to comply with the City's Municipal Code Section 15-80.030, which requires that outdoor lighting fixtures shall be located, aimed, and shielded to prevent excessive glare or direct illumination onto adjacent properties and public street rights of way; notwithstanding the minimum lighting necessary to ensure adequate safety, night vision, and comfort. Therefore, although specific details regarding the proposed lighting for Alternative 3 are not described in the Draft EIR, because compliance with the City's Municipal Code is mandatory, Alternative 3 would not result in excessive glare or direct illumination that spills onto the adjacent properties. Because the impacts of light and glare from Alternative 3 would be less than significant, no mitigation is required.

Furthermore, Alternative 3 would also include additional tree planting along the property line between Building D and the adjacent property to the west, which would help to reduce the views of the adjacent property from windows within Building D, and vice versa. See also response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.17.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.20

Comment (verbatim)

16. Mitigation item needed: Under section Impact AIR-1: Conflict with Applicable Air Quality Plan - Construction, on page 4-139 it is stated that the construction of Alternative 3 would include implementation of the same fugitive dust control measures as described for the Project in Section 3.3.3. Given that Alternative 3's proposed building D is adjacent to the neighboring property on 14622 Granite way, the air quality impact will be substantially higher than the Project. Request to include extra mitigation items concerning the air quality impact on the residential property on 14622 Granite way to the west of Building D.

Response to Comment

The fugitive dust control measures included within mitigation measure MM-AIR-2 are required for the proposed project and all alternatives, including Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative). As discussed within Section 3.3.3, these measures are identical to the BMPs that the BAAQMD recommends for all projects within its jurisdiction, regardless of project size and location. Fugitive dust emissions are considered to be significant unless the project implements the BAAQMD's BMPs for fugitive dust control during construction and are applicable to construction projects of all sizes regardless of the level of average daily emissions and/or distance from nearby receptors. This threshold of significance for fugitive dust emissions was developed through a quantitative examination of the efficacy of BMPs for controlling fugitive dust. One of the key requirements of the BMPs is that all exposed surfaces must be watered, treated, or covered to control dust emissions such that airborne dust is prevented from leaving the site. Additionally, the BMPs require that a sign be posted with a telephone number for complaints, and that corrective action shall be taken within 48 hours of any complaint. Furthermore, construction activities would be subject to BAAQMD Rules and Regulations, including Regulation 6, Rule 1 (General Requirements) and Regulation 6, Rule 6 (Prohibition of Trackout), which require dust generating operations to limit particulate matter emissions. Because the BMPs would require the construction contractor to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site and would also include a requirement that corrective actions be promptly taken in the event of complaints, the environmental impacts associated with fugitive dust generation during construction of

Alternative 3 would be less than less than significant, and no additional mitigation beyond MM-AIR-2 described in the Draft EIR is required to be added in response to this comment.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.21

Comment (verbatim)

17. Mitigation item update needed: Under section Impact AIR-2: Net Increase in Criteria Pollutants on page 4—140 it is stated that construction-related impacts from Alternative 3 would be potentially significant due to fugitive dust. Request MM-AIR-2 to be updated to reflect the impact to the neighboring residence on 14622 Granite way, which is the closest to the west side of the proposed building D from Alternate 3.

Response to Comment

The commenter correctly summarizes the determination made in Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR that construction of Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative) would have a potentially significant impact, prior to mitigation, due to fugitive dust emissions. However, because implementation of BAAQMD's BMPs would reduce the potential impact to less than significant, for the reasons described in Section 4.6.3 (and also in Section 3.3.3) of the Draft EIR, no additional mitigation beyond MM-AIR-2 as described in the Draft EIR is required. See also response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.20.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.22

Comment (verbatim)

18. Mitigation update needed: Under section Impact AIR-3: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Pollutants under Construction is stated as potentially significant, and on page 4-142 under section MM-AIR-3-ALT3: Health Risk Assessment, it is stated that Prior to issuance of grading permits for Alternative 3, the Project Applicant shall conduct a health risk assessment for construction activities to calculate maximum PM_{2.5} annual concentrations, excess cancer risk, and chronic non-cancer risk, associated with Alternative 3 construction emissions, and identify additional measures to be implemented, as necessary, to ensure that sensitive receptors are not exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations. It is further stated that the analysis may include screening level analysis and/or a health risk assessment, consistent with applicable guidance from the BAAQMD. The City of Saratoga shall require the Project Applicant to implement feasible mitigation measures to reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations to levels consistent with thresholds recommended by the BAAQMD (as shown in Table 3.3-7 of this EIR) or as applicable at the time the project is proposed. And that the agreed upon feasible mitigation actions shall be documented as a project condition of approval. Request recommended Health risk assessment, analysis and mitigation items be exclusively spelt out to the immediately adjacent neighboring property at 14622 Granite way.

Response to Comment

The health risk assessment required by mitigation measure MM-AIR-3-ALT3 would analyze health risk impacts to all receptors within proximity of the "project site" for Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative), in a similar manner to the receptors identified in the health risk assessment that was undertaken for the proposed project (Appendix C to the Draft EIR). That health risk assessment for the proposed project, which was

prepared based on guidance and methodologies from local, regional, State, and federal agencies, including the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), and the USEPA, considered construction-related health risk impacts to receptors within 1,000 feet of the project site plus receptors within 500 feet of on-road routes anticipated to be utilized by construction traffic (see Figures 5 and 6 of Appendix C to the Draft EIR), which included the neighboring property at 14622 Granite Way. Results are reported based on the calculated health risk for the “maximally-exposed individual resident” (MEIR) and “maximally-exposed individual worker” (MEIW) within the modeled study area.

The health risk assessment for the proposed project demonstrated that the cancer risk to offsite residents from construction-related emissions would be potentially significant, but would be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of MM-AIR-3. As discussed within Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR, California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) modeling results showed that the construction-related emissions of PM_{2.5} (exhaust) from Alternative 3 would be slightly less than for the proposed project (PM_{2.5} exhaust emissions are used as a surrogate for diesel particulate matter for evaluating health risks); therefore, one might expect that the associated health risks would also be slightly less, and that MM-AIR-3 would likely be sufficient to reduce construction-related health risks from Alternative 3 to a less-than-significant level, as it would for the proposed project. However, due to differences in the location of construction-related emissions sources between the proposed project and Alternative 3 in relation to both on-site and off-site residential receptors and on-site workers, the efficacy of MM-AIR-3 for Alternative 3 cannot be definitively demonstrated without modeling the specifics of Alternative 3 in its own health risk assessment. For this reason, MM-AIR-3-ALT3 is identified as necessary, in addition to MM-AIR-3, if Alternative 3 were to be approved by the City and implemented by the Applicant.

If the results of the health risk assessment undertaken for Alternative 3 were to demonstrate that health risks from construction of Alternative 3 would in fact exceed the thresholds of significance, the Applicant (and/or its construction contractor) would be required to implement additional measures to reduce health risks to below the specific performance standards set out in Table 3.3-7 of the Draft EIR. Although the specific details of such additional measures are not included within MM-AIR-3-ALT3, such “agreed upon feasible mitigation actions” are required to be documented as a condition of approval. Therefore, Alternative 3 could not be approved by the City until such time as the health risk assessment has been prepared and feasible mitigation actions (if necessary) to achieve the specified performance standards have been determined.

No edits to the Draft EIR or additional mitigation measures are required in response to this comment.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.23

Comment (verbatim)

19. Correction for SOI Standard: Table 4.6-4 Summary of adherence to Secretary of the Interior’s standards for Rehabilitation – Alternative 3 lists “no conflict” for Building 3 for item no 2 historic character of the property. Request a correction to be made to identify Conflict for this item. The views of the manor will be obstructed for the neighboring residential home at 14622 Granite way.

Response to Comment

It is assumed that the commenter's reference to "Building 3" is meant to refer to Building D under Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative), similar to previous comments.

Table 4.6-4 in the Draft EIR (Section 4.6.3, subheading Cultural Resources, Impact CUL-1) summarizes whether the various components of Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative) adhere to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, with additional analysis and discussion provided in the text following the table. As detailed in the Draft EIR, demolition of the existing cottage and employee parking lot, and construction of Building D in their place, as proposed under Alternative 3, would not conflict with any of the Standards, as construction of these features would not remove or alter any character-defining features of the Manor Building and would not create any indirect impacts on the Manor Building's setting, due to the distance and oblique angle of the Building D site from the Manor Building. The potential loss of views towards an historical resource from one adjacent, private, property is not considered to "materially impair the significance of the historical resource". Because the Alternative would not conflict with any of the Standards, the impact to the Manor Building as an historic resource would be less than significant, as concluded in the Draft EIR.

No changes to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.24

Comment (verbatim)

20. Evaluation and mitigation requested: Under section Impact AIR-3: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Pollutants under Operation, it is stated that Alternative 3 would include the same number of emergency generators as the Project; however, the emergency generator in Building D would be approximately 75 feet closer to the nearest off-site sensitive receptor than the emergency generator located in Building B under the Project.

The immediately adjacent residence on 14622 Granite way is closer than the receptor. Request an evaluation be done on the potential impact on the adjacent home and appropriate mitigation items be included for review and approval.

Response to Comment

Under the proposed project, the emergency generator for Building B would be on the western side of the building adjacent to West Cottages Lane, which is approximately 200 feet from the nearest off-site receptor (19227 San Marcos Road). Under Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative) the emergency generator would be on the eastern side of the building adjacent to West Cottages Lane, which is approximately 125 feet from the nearest off-site receptor (14622 Granite Way), and approximately 75 feet closer as described in the Draft EIR.

Although the location of this one operational emission source under Alternative 3 would be slightly different to (and closer to an offsite receptor than) the corresponding emissions source for the proposed project, the overall quantity of operational emissions for Alternative 3 would be the same as for the proposed project, as discussed under Impact AIR-2 in Section 4.6.3. Given that the health risk assessment results for off-site residences from the proposed project's operational emissions were substantially below the applicable thresholds of significance (e.g., a maximum modeled excess cancer risk

of 1.93 in a million compared to the threshold of 10 in a million as shown in Table 3.3-15 of the Draft EIR, and a maximum modeled excess chronic non-cancer risk of 0.0021 in a million compared to the threshold of 10 in a million as shown in Table 3.3-16), and the very minor differences in operational emissions source locations between the proposed project and Alternative 3, the Draft EIR concluded that Alternative 3 would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Furthermore, the emergency generators for the new buildings are anticipated to operate for approximately 50 hours per year, and would make up only a tiny fraction of the operational PM_{2.5} emissions associated with the proposed project (or Alternative 3). The detailed modeling results in Appendix C of the Draft EIR show that all three of the new emergency generators for the proposed project would generate only 0.0004 tons per year of PM_{2.5} (exhaust) emissions (per detailed modeling results in Appendix C of the Draft EIR), compared to the total operational PM_{2.5} emissions of 0.05 tons per year (and the BAAQMD threshold of 10 tons/year for PM_{2.5} emissions. Furthermore, new emergency generators are required to obtain an Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate from the BAAQMD. The permitting application for emergency generators requires a separate health risk assessment and screening procedure at the time of permitting through completion of an health risk assessment form which details the site layout, receptor locations, and exact location and stack parameters of the proposed emergency engines. Therefore, the permitting process of the emergency generators, regardless of whether the proposed project or an alternative is selected, would ensure that emissions from the generators do not exceed the BAAQMD screening thresholds for health risks.

Given all of the above, and the analysis within Sections 3.3.3 and 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR and supporting documentation, additional analysis of operational emissions associated with Alternative 3 is not considered necessary and no changes to the Draft EIR are recommended in response to this comment.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.25

Comment (verbatim)

21. Request city to establish noise thresholds for adjacent neighboring homes: Under section Noise Impact NOI-1: Increase in Ambient Noise Levels on 4-168 it is stated: However, similar to the Project, due to the presence of existing on-site residential units in close proximity to the construction zones for Alternative 3, there is potential for construction noise to cause a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels for sensitive receptors within the closest residential units, even though Alternative 3 would comply with the City's noise standards for construction. As discussed for the Project in Section 3.12, because the City has not established any thresholds for the level of acceptable daytime, temporary construction noise for receptors in close proximity to construction zones, the FTA's recommended threshold limit of 80 dBA or less is used to evaluate the impact of construction noise. Request the City to establish noise threshold levels for the neighboring home at 14622 Granite way, which is closest to proposed Building D.

Response to Comment

As discussed in Section 3.12.3 of the Draft EIR for the proposed project, and in Section 4.6.3 for Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative), in lieu of any established thresholds for the level of acceptable daytime, temporary construction noise for receptors in close proximity to construction zones, the City has elected to use the FTA's recommended

threshold limit of 80 dBA or less to evaluate the impact of construction noise within the Draft EIR prepared for this specific proposed project (and its alternatives).

Consideration of whether to establish or adopt a new City-wide threshold for the impacts of construction noise on receptors within close proximity to construction zones is outside of the scope of the Draft EIR. No changes to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.26

Comment (verbatim)

22. Correction requested: The table on page 4-169 titled: Table 4.6-6 Estimated Construction Noise at Closest On-Site Receptors – Alternative 3, lists the address incorrectly in several places for 14622 Granite way. The address is stated incorrectly as Burgundy way. Request for correction of address in the table.

Response to Comment

The commenter identifies an error in the address given for one of the adjacent properties in several places within Table 4.6-6. This same error is also present within Table 4.6-7 and on the text on pages 4-170 and 4-177 of the Draft EIR.

Minor edits have been made to Table 4.6-6 and text within Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR to correct the error in these addresses. **These proposed edits are described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.**

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.27

Comment (verbatim)

23. Correction requested: on page 4-170 Request correction of address in various places from 14622 Burgundy way to 14622 Granite way.

Response to Comment

These errors have been corrected. See response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.26 above.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.28

Comment (verbatim)

24. Update to mitigation plan needed: Under section Noise Impact NOI-1 on page 4-171 it is stated that: “because Alternative 3 would result in daytime construction noise levels at nearby residential receptors that would exceed 80 dBA, the impact would be potentially significant. The Project Applicant and their Contractor have prepared a preliminary Construction Noise Mitigation Plan to help minimize disturbance to existing SRC residents from construction noise from Alternative 3, which is similar to the plan prepared for the proposed Project, but reflecting the differences in project schedule, construction areas and staging for Alternative 3 (RCP 2023, see Appendix E). Update of the Plan to include additional actions as set out in Section 3.12.3 for the proposed Project, and implementation of the plan throughout construction is also recommended for Alternative 3.” Request the update include mitigation plans for the adjacent residential home at 14622 Granite way.

Response to Comment

For Alternative 3 (the Applicant's Alternative), MM-NOI-1a already requires that the existing noise mitigation plan be updated and modified to reflect the final design details for Alternative 3 (if that alternative were to be approved by the City), and to include additional measures that would serve to reduce noise levels for all receptors, including the residence at 14622 Granite Way. As shown in Table 4.6-6 of the Draft EIR, the residence at 14622 Granite Way (which was incorrectly labeled as 14622 Burgundy Way but has been corrected in response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.26 above) is identified as one of the closest receptors for demolition of the cottage and construction of Building D under Alternative 3. Because MM-NOI-1a already requires that the construction contractor take measures to reduce noise at sensitive receptors to below the applicable threshold, and to undertake weekly monitoring to confirm that the thresholds are not being exceeded, no additional mitigation or modifications to MM-NOI-1a are required for Alternative 3.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.29

Comment (verbatim)

25. Correction requested: The on page 4-176 titled: Table 4.6-7 Estimated Maximum Vibration at Sensitive Receptors – Alternative 3, lists the address incorrectly for 14622 Granite way (instead listed incorrectly as Burgundy way). Request correction to the address in the table.

Response to Comment

The errors in property address for the residence at 14622 Granite Way (incorrectly listed as 14622 Burgundy Way) have been corrected in Table 4.6-7 of the Draft EIR, as discussed in response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.26 above. In addition, the stated minimum distance between this receptor and the construction zones for "Cottage Demolition" and "Building D Construction" in Table 4.6-7 are also incorrect. This residence is approximately 25 feet from the SRC property boundary, and the construction zones for these activities would be fully contained within the SRC campus. The same error (16 feet minimum distance instead of the correct distance of 25 feet) is also present for the nearest receptor to "Cottage Construction" (19300 Chablis Court). The minimum distance to other receptors (and associated calculations for estimated vibration levels) in Table 4.6-7 are correct.

Edits have been made to Table 4.6-7 and the supporting information in Appendix E of the Draft EIR to correct the minimum distance for the 14622 Granite Way and 19300 Chablis Court residences and to recalculate the estimated maximum vibration at these two receptors. Minor edits are also made to the text following the table to accurately describe the results and whether the corrected vibration levels exceed the relevant thresholds of significance. **These proposed edits are described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.**

See response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.30 below for further discussion regarding the impacts of vibration to the receptor at 14622 Granite Way.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.30

Comment (verbatim)

26. Mitigation needed: Under section Impact NOI-2: Exposure of People to Ground borne Noise and Vibration Levels – Construction on page 4-177, It is stated: “Because construction of Alternative 3 would result in levels of temporary vibration that could exceed the applicable threshold for building damage at the Manor Building, three on-site cottages, and two neighboring residential structures, and that would substantially exceed the threshold for human annoyance for several campus residents and neighbors, impacts related to vibration during construction activities of Alternative 3 would be potentially significant.” Request an update to the mitigation plan that would specifically protect the closest residential home on 14622 Granite way.

Response to Comment

As discussed in response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.29 above, the residential home on 14622 Granite Way is approximately 25 feet from the SRC property boundary, therefore the minimum distance between that receptor and the construction zones for demolition of the existing cottage and construction of Building D under Alternative 3 would be at least 25 feet, not 16 feet as incorrectly stated in Table 4.6-7 of the Draft EIR. Edits have been made to Table 4.6-7 and the supporting information in Appendix E of the Draft EIR to correct the minimum distance between these construction zones and the receptor, and to recalculate the estimated maximum vibration at this receptor, as shown in Section 4 of this Final EIR below. An excerpt of the corrected table is included below for easy reference:

Vibration Source	Receptor	Minimum ¹ Distance (feet)	Estimated Max Vibration ² at Receptor (in/sec PPV)	Threshold for Potential Building Damage ³ (in/sec PPV)	Estimated Max Vibration ² at Receptor (VdB)	Threshold for Potential Human Annoyance ⁴ (VdB)
Cottage Demolition	14622 Granite Way	25 feet	0.089	0.3	87	80
Building D Construction	14622 Granite Way	25 feet	0.210	0.3	94	80

As shown in the corrected table above, estimated vibration levels at the 14622 Granite Way residence would not exceed the applicable threshold of 0.3 in/sec PPV for potentially building damage for either cottage demolition or Building D construction activities, but would exceed the threshold for human annoyance.

Because the threshold for potential building damage would not be exceeded, impacts to the building itself would be less than significant. But because the threshold for human annoyance are exceeded, impacts to residents within the building would be potentially significant. These potentially significant impacts to the residents would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of MM-NOI-2, for the reasons described in Sections 3.12.3 and 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR. See also response to MASTER-15: Construction Vibration.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.31

Comment (verbatim)

27. Missing data point to be factored in noise levels from transportation: In the section on “Transportation Impact TRA-1: Conflict with Transportation Plan, Program, Ordinance or Policy”, during Construction, there is no mention of the noise levels to adjacent home on 14622 Granite way. Currently as it is, we experience high noise levels due to a speed bump right behind the residential property line causing trucks to either halt with a loud screech or worse bump with higher speeds causing excessive noise from the sudden bump and from various items being transported. Request appropriate mitigation to be included to protect the noise levels for the adjacent home on 14622 Granite way.

Response to Comment

Impacts from traffic noise are evaluated under Impact NOI-1 in Section 3.12.3 of the Draft EIR. Impact TRA-1 in Section 3.16.3 addresses consistency of the project with applicable transportation plans, programs, ordinances and policies. Because none of the applicable transportation plans, programs, ordinances and policies address traffic noise, noise is not evaluated within this impact.

As shown in Table 3.12-3 of the Draft EIR, construction of the proposed project is anticipated to generate an average of 4 heavy truck trips per hour during the workday, as well as up to 14 worker shuttle trips during the morning and afternoon peak hours.

With respect to the commenter’s concerns regarding noise from the speed bump on Odd Fellows Drive, the speed bump is an existing feature that would not be altered by the proposed project. However, due to the increase in heavy traffic associated with construction of the proposed project, the frequency at which trucks pass over the speed bump would increase compared to existing conditions. Several factors influence the amount of noise generated by speed bumps, including driving speed, the size and condition of vehicles, traffic intensity, type and condition of tires, speed bump geometry, road paving, etc. A study of multiple types of speed bumps (Janusevicius and Akelaityte 2015) measured traffic noise ranging from approximately 82 to 94 dB at a distance of 5 feet from the speed bumps, which is equivalent to a noise level of 80 dB at a distance of 25 feet. Therefore, the movement of heavy trucks over the speed bump would not cause noise levels exceeding 100 dBA at a distance of 25 feet from the noise source (City Ordinance Code Section 7-30-060(a)). Construction-related traffic (and associated increase in frequency of speed bump crossings) would also be limited to daytime hours due to the City’s permissible construction hours. Therefore, the increased frequency of speed bump related noise would not impact normal nighttime sleeping hours but could still be an annoyance to nearby receptors.

Mitigation measure MM-NOI-1a (Section 3.12.3 of the Draft EIR) includes a suite of measures to minimize the effects of construction-related noise, and includes Noise Awareness Training for workers, identification of noise abatement opportunities and mitigation at the noise source, as well as provision of a point of contact for addressing noise-related complaints. Minor edits are proposed to this mitigation measure to include installation of temporary signage on the approaches to speed bumps along on-site haul routes to remind drivers to slow down before crossing. **These proposed edits are described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.**

See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

RAVIKUMAR-R-1.32**Comment (verbatim)**

28. Omissions to be added: Under section 4.7 Environmentally Superior Alternative on page 4-193/194 it is stated: “Alternative 3, the Applicant’s Alternative, would avoid the proposed Project’s significant and unavoidable impact to historical resources, but would require the same mitigation measures as the Project (MM-CUL-1a through MM-CUL-1c), and an additional mitigation measure (MM-CUL1d-ALT3), in order to reduce the potential impact to historical resources to less than significant with mitigation (Impact CUL-1). Alternative 3 would slightly increase the intensity of several impacts compared to the proposed Project due to the larger construction footprint and extended DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT - For Public Review Saratoga Retirement Community AECOM Environmental Impact Report Prepared for City of Saratoga 4-194 construction duration, e.g., construction-related air emissions (Impact AIR-1), tree removal (Impact BIO-5), potential for encountering archaeological, tribal or paleontological resources (Impacts CUL-2, GEO-6, and TCR-1), greenhouse gas emissions (Impact GHG-1), construction noise (Impact NOI-1) and construction vibration (Impact NOI-2), even though the overall level of significance for these impacts would be the same. Unlike Alternative 1, Alternative 3 would not introduce any new or more significant impacts.” Alternative 3 introduces significant impacts to the neighboring residential home on 14622 Granite way, in several areas during construction including excessive dust, significant noise and vibration levels and the obstruction of the scenic quality of open space and the view of the manor (being a Saratoga pride building). Most importantly, mitigation to impacts on the neighboring residential home is largely ignored while only focusing on mitigation for the SRC residents. Request, the addition of the impacts to the immediately adjacent residential home on 14622 Granite way in the summary for the applicant’s alternative on page 4-194.

Response to Comment

As discussed in response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.9, impacts from Alternative 3 (the Applicant’s Alternative) to nearby sensitive receptors such as adjacent property owners have been specifically identified where appropriate within Section 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR, for example with respect to air quality and noise and vibration impacts. The summary of alternatives and discussion of environmentally superior alternative in Section 4.7 summarizes the overall significance level of each alternative with respect to each environmental topic and compares the alternatives to the proposed project in order to identify an environmentally superior alternative.

As discussed in response to RAVIKUMAR-R-1.1 through RAVIKUMAR-R-1.31 above, many of the concerns raised with respect to Alternative 3 would not exceed the thresholds of significance established in the Draft EIR, and therefore would not be significant environmental impacts under CEQA. In particular, see response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.3 relating to privacy response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.7 relating to open space and scenic quality, response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.12 relating to scenic vistas, response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.19 relating to light and glare, and response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.23 relating to views of the historic Manor Building.

Although some impacts (e.g., construction noise and vibration, fugitive dust, and health impacts from air emissions) were identified as potentially significant (i.e., the impacts of

Alternative 3 without any mitigation would exceed the applicable threshold of significance), the implementation of the mitigation measures recommended in the Draft EIR would reduce the impact to less than significant (i.e., Alternative 3 once mitigated would not cause impacts that exceed the thresholds of significance). In particular, see response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.10 relating to noise, response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.11 relating to vibration, response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.20 relating to fugitive dust, and response to comments RAVIKUMAR-R-1.22 and RAVIKUMAR-R-1.24 relating to health risk and emissions.

3.4.87 Commenter REDIG-J

REDIG-J-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-17. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-17.1.

REDIG-J-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-21. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-21.1.

3.4.88 Commenter ROSIER-M

Comment ROSIER-M-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I am a resident at Saratoga Retirement Community since 2021. I enjoy playing Bocce Ball with my neighbors every week, sometimes twice a week. It is a healthy and fun outdoor activity. It gets us out in the outdoors and sunshine which is recommended way to avoid depression.

I am very upset that the Pacific Retirement Services has proposed a master plan to eliminate our wonderful Bocce ball court by building a two story apartment building in that area. The proposed replacement court is only 2/3 the size of our present court.

The Bocce ball court is one of our most important outdoor facilities. Please DO NOT ALLOW THE APARTMENTS TO BE BUILT. Over 60 residents regularly enjoy the games. Some of our Senior citizens come to play even using walkers!

Thank you for your consideration of our side of this issue.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

Comment ROSIER-M-2.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I am a resident at Saratoga Retirement Community. I strongly oppose the building of these apartments right in the center of our community.

That area is our "green belt" on campus. It provides recreational opportunities, a pleasant place read your book, and a great place to walk around and get some sunshine and fresh air which is recommended to combat depression.

In contrast, the DEIR suggest that these campus walking paths can be substituted by the nearby San Marcos Open space (p. 3-260 DEIR). The DEIR claims that the San Marcos Open Space is only 300 feet to the southeast of the Project site, but that is the direct AIR distance, up a steep embankment- inaccessible except by a 2.5 mile round trip along the road. This shows a complete lack of understanding of Seniors' needs and quality of life. Please DO NOT ALLOW THE APARTMENTS BUILDING.

Thank you for your consideration of our side of this issue.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

Comment ROSIER-M-3.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I am a resident at Saratoga Retirement Community. I strongly oppose the building of new health center using the present plan. This plan has several drawbacks:

1. The plan fails to address the requirements for a health center here on campus while the new center is being constructed.

Response to Comment

The proposed project does not include construction of a new Health Center. As described in Section 2.3.2 of the Draft EIR, the existing Health Center would be internally renovated, one wing at a time, to convert the existing semi-private double-occupancy rooms to private single-occupancy rooms with attached bathrooms, to meet changing patient preferences. As further detailed in Section 3.12.3 (page 3-223) of the Draft EIR, the Project Applicant intends to undertake these internal renovations one wing at a time, with nearby patients being relocated to other wings while the work occurs, to minimize disturbance to those sensitive receptors and the services provided within the Health Center.

See also response to MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Care Renovations.

Comment ROSIER-M-3.2:

Comment (verbatim)

2. The resident plan has been completely ignored. It would address the problem of building a new one while continuing to use the old one. A residential building would replace the old health care center when the new one is completed.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

Comment ROSIER-M-3.3:

Comment (verbatim)

3. What is the impact on the resident patients on the noise, vibrations, and dust during construction?

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

Comment ROSIER-M-3.4:

Comment (verbatim)

4. Are the rooms going to be renovated one at time or all at once. We had a very bad experience while management was repairing the balconies in 2018-2021. The repair was done as a block. It took 9 months to repair each balcony while residents had no natural light, no fresh air, or use of the terrace for each apartment. It was handled poorly by management with no consideration for the residents needs.

Please reconsider this plan and reject it. It is a poor one. We do need a new health care center, but the resident plan is much better for achieving that end.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Care Renovations.

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

Comment ROSIER-M-4.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I am against the planned expansion of SRC by PSR. Alternative 1 plan addresses all these objections, but does not have the devastating environment impact. Alternative 1 makes the necessary improvement without the terrible impact of SRC's plan!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

Comment ROSIER-M-5.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a near duplicate of comment letter ROSIER-M-4. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment ROSIER-M-4.1.

Comment ROSIER-M-6.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a near duplicate of comment letter ROSIER-M-4. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment ROSIER-M-4.1.

Comment ROSIER-M-7.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a near duplicate of comment letter ROSIER-M-4. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment ROSIER-M-4.1.

Comment ROSIER-M-8.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a near duplicate of comment letter ROSIER-M-4. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment ROSIER-M-4.1.

Comment ROSIER-M-9.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a near duplicate of comment letter ROSIER-M-4. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment ROSIER-M-4.1.

Comment ROSIER-M-10.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

Comment ROSIER-M-11.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a near duplicate of comment letter ROSIER-M-4. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment ROSIER-M-4.1.

Comment ROSIER-M-12.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a near duplicate of comment letter ROSIER-M-4. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment ROSIER-M-4.1.

3.4.89 Commenter SAYRE-L

SAYRE-L-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

Although you see from my address that I no longer live in Saratoga, my husband and I did live there for 26 years. It has come to my attention that the SRC is planning to cut down 123 trees, including 28 Redwood and 26 Coast Live Oak. Some of the trees are over 100 feet tall and/or 6 feet in diameter. 85 of these trees are protected per city code 15-50-050. Saratoga has been named TREE CITY every year since 2006, requires residents to protect trees on their property and encourages tree planting not killing.

As you undoubtedly know, our climate is changing. It looks like July will be the hottest month ever recorded on the planet. According to the report issued by the American Planning Association, temperatures are exacerbated by concrete pavement, tall heat-retentive buildings, and a lack of shady greenery. The elderly and people with chronic health conditions are more vulnerable to heat-related illness or death. Air conditioning helps when people are inside but also contributes to the warming of the earth.

Planting trees or keeping them in the ground mitigates these effects. Saratoga is very lucky to have so many native trees. In addition to providing much needed shade, studies have shown that spending time in nature increases a feeling of well being.

Please encourage the management of SRC to work with the residents to find a way to preserve the trees and allow some expansion on campus.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

3.4.90 Commenter SCHMIDEK-D

SCHMIDEK-D-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

WOW! The city does not care about the timeline?

Does this suggest that the process may take 8-10+ years, as someone forecasted? Does this mean that the main section of the campus will be in noise, dust, mud and dirt for all this time? That the roads will be jammed with trucks, etc.? That the safety of walking, driving and standing will be greatly jeopardized?

Is this what seniors should expect while paying the high accommodation rates? What protection do we have that this will be financially sound and that residents will not suffer financially while suffering from low quality of life levels? Does the City of Saratoga look at this when Seniors' lives are concerned? Can we request that only ONE building be constructed and finished at a time, and when finished the next one can be started to be dug and built. This may protect the campus from unfinished construction, residents from chaos, etc. This plan would minimize the maelstrom that we can anticipate on the campus and along West Cottages Lane and Pavilion Circle unless the Alternate plans are accepted and undertaken. How do we request that this be considered and stipulated by the City? Is this request something we can bring up in the next 45 days?

I know this is a mouthful, but the future looks very dusty and muddy to us, the financial situation questionable, the schedule unrealistic, and the impact staggering! Thanks and I apologize for this dump, but we all have just one life, and we do not want to end it in a terrible dusty, noisy construction zone that the proposed plan will bring to us.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality.

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

SCHMIDEK-D-2.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Schedule credibility and safety:

This project, as documented and its schedules of under 3 years, will requires so much mitigation, changes, controls, time extensions etc. that it is most probably above the ability and capacity of construction management and SRC management, thus endangering the lives of residents and converting the campus to a Danger Zone, not suitable for seniors.

The EIR should address the safety issues of building all concurrently and sequentially, and analyze The traffic, machinery, noise, safety issues and not permit such a perilous sequence and exposure which demonstrates a lack of concern about resident wellbeing, sanity and lives. The latest information from PRS estimates this project to take over 7 years vs. the EIR documents under 3 years which should NOT be allowed.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

SCHMIDEK-D-2.2:

Comment (verbatim)

1. Project Objective Pg III. PRS Plan. REJECT

Item 4) HEALTH CARE - This is NOT in the plan submitted or in the schedule- this is far out in the future, but there is mention of it. The EIR should not approve or include it as it is not a construction or a detailed description or a “plan”, and should be stricken out, not to confuse. It is a “promise” that may happen sometime.....

Response to Comment

As described in Sections 2.3.2 and 2.4.1 of the Draft EIR, Phase 4 of the proposed project includes internal renovations to the existing Health Center, which would occur in stages over a 2-year period that overlaps with Phases 1, 2, and 3. The Health Center would be internally renovated in order to convert the existing semi-private double-occupancy rooms to private single-occupancy rooms with attached bathrooms, to meet changing patient preferences. As further detailed in Section 3.12.3 (page 3-223) of the Draft EIR, the renovations would occur one wing at a time with nearby patients being relocated to other wings while the work occurs to minimize disturbance to those sensitive receptors and the services provided within the Health Center.

See also response to MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Center Renovations.

SCHMIDEK-D-2.3:

Comment (verbatim)

Item 11) Maintain Landscape..... PRS plan — not described, detailed or scheduled or listed anywhere, thus it should not be included, unless it is intended to define the repair of the open spaces, the trees, etc. that would be impaired.

Response to Comment

A brief description of the landscaping and tree replacement proposed as part of the project is included within Section 2.3.3 of the Draft EIR, which references the more detailed information contained within the Arborist Report (Appendix B to the Draft EIR) and the landscaping plans (Sheets LA-1.10 through LA-4) within the project plans submitted to the City as part of the project application. Although the landscaping plans were not included as appendices to the Draft EIR, they are part of the administrative record considered during preparation of the Draft EIR and the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project under CEQA. Key project plans and drawings are available to view on the same City website that the Draft EIR was published on (<https://www.saratoga.ca.us/461/Proposed-Saratoga-Retirement-Community-P>). As stated on that website, the complete set of proposed project plans can be viewed at City Hall (13777 Fruitvale Avenue, Saratoga).

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

SCHMIDEK-D-2.4:

Comment (verbatim)

Alternative 1 – Pg. IV. Line 8 –

Residents' plan drawing. ACCEPT THIS PLAN but modify the erroneous drawing footprints: This plan was not as submitted by the Preserve group and thus both Buildings were misrepresented:

- a. *Bldg. C1 footprint is NOT correct in the EIR - this was drawn by Ankrom - it is not the same construction and footprint as PRS Bldg. C; similar yes, but shorter. Also important is that Colfax realignment is not needed and all current roads can be retained.*

Note: This location "C" is ill suited for a Residential building, given its proximity to the busy street on one side and on the other side dominated by the AL building. The use of this building as an HC is more appropriate as the duration of stay for medically incapacitated residents is usually short, and traffic and proximity to AL would not be a major issue. Access to Ambulances is also more advantageous and exit from SRC campus emergencies is greatly facilitated.

- b. *Building D would be a new Building, on the same footprint as the current HC is, but 2 stories high and a garage under it, and NOT the 3 stories building, similar the Bldg. 4000, which PRS/Ankrom (?) drew incorrectly and submitted.*
- c. *The rest of the campus would NOT see any construction under this plan, but for the Fitness Expansion building.*

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

SCHMIDEK-D-2.5:

Comment (verbatim)

Alternative 3 – Pg. IV. Bldg. D, HC, Meeting Rm, Trail, etc.

PRS Plan – REJECT THIS PLAN

This plan its similar to the original PRS plan, but deletes Bldg. B in front of the Manor and places a new Bldg. D onto the corner parking lot. It also defines a Manor dining area, removal of small traffic circle, destruction of the Park, Public Trail (questionable as it has been resolved years ago), and Bldg. A in the Park. The location of the new Bldg. D has significant issues: the short length of the driveway ~8-10 Ft. connecting to a side walk and busy street, the overlooking of the neighbor's home on one side and close proximity to busy street on other side, removing a live-in cottage, residents having to cross a busy street to get to the rest of campus buildings.

The driveway's short length is half of that demanded by other cities in CA. This is a matter of safety and life preservations.

Finally the tagging of the Meeting Rm. To the West Side of the Mannor is a terrible aberration and should Not be allowed.

Response to Comment

As discussed in response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project, CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that a lead agency respond to comments that raise significant environmental issues. Comments concerning general opposition to the project (or to Alternative 3, the Applicant's Alternative) do not raise significant environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR.

With respect to the commenter's concerns regarding driveway length from Building D of Alternative 3 and proximity to busy streets, as discussed in response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety, the City does not have specific standards for the length of driveways exiting from multi-residential parking garages. Whilst other California cities may have standards, they have not been adopted by the City and are therefore not applicable to the proposed project or its alternatives. Furthermore, such standards in other cities typically only apply to driveways connecting to public streets, whereas the driveway in question (from Building D of Alternative 3, the Applicant's Alternative) connects to a private road (Odd Fellows Drive). The City's Development Engineer has reviewed the conceptual plans for Building D and did not raise any concerns with the proposed driveway length or proximity to the adjacent private roads. If Alternative 3 were to be approved by the City, detailed design plans would be submitted by the applicant for more detailed review and approval by the City's Development Engineer, and revisions would be requested and/or conditions of approval would be applied, if necessary, to address any concerns.

With respect to the commenter's concerns regarding privacy for the adjacent property owner, please see response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.3.

See also response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

SCHMIDEK-D-2.6:

Comment (verbatim)

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED. Pg. IV- VI. REJECT THIS PLAN

The EIR includes a Reduced Alternate Plan 2 cobbled up by the EIR consultants without intimate understanding of the issues, the impositions on Senior Residents, the needs of the community, the omission of key needs and requirement, etc.

The inclusion of Bldg. A in the Park is totally unconscious, and in full disregard of Resident needs, expectations and wants. This is another Community destructions plan! This plan would be similarly invasive to the residents, as all major constructions in the hart of the community will be required, with its noise, dust and DANGERS.

The selection of a project version developed by the same hired EIR consulting group is not what the State defines as the responsibility of the consulting group. They have to study and define issues and choices of what was submitted.....period Not present their biased ideas.

By selecting Alternative 1 instead of self imagined Alt 2, no mitigation is required for the very many Major concerns, which are extensive and overbuilding on the other 2 locations would not be needed. Only Building C' would be on a new location, no streets would be blocked and moved, and the Park would be preserved.

Response to Comment

CEQA Guidelines Section 15084 allows a Lead Agency to contract with another entity, public or private, to prepare the Draft EIR, provided that the draft EIR is subject to the agency's own review and analysis and reflects the independent judgement of the Lead Agency. In this case, AECOM was retained by the City to prepare the EIR for this project, and the Draft EIR was reviewed by City staff prior to being released for public review. See also response to MASTER-5: Appropriateness of Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative 2) and response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See also response to MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See also response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

See also response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

SCHMIDEK-D-2.7:

Comment (verbatim)

Impact NOI-1 Ambient Noise/Vibration. Pg XVI. REJECT ALT 2 & 3

As documented, "substantial" (overwhelming) generation of noise, traffic and disruption will occur with Alt 2 and 3, while Alternative 1 will impact only a small section of the AL building, vs. the impact of 5 buildings on W. Cottages by Alt 2 and 3.:

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

- 1) *Park. – one very large 2 stories building*
- 2) *Front of the Manor (or in the parking lot, etc.) and*
- 3) *Side of the Manor ugly appendage.*
- 4) *Noise and vibration from Building C, as defined by the Alt 2, that requires 2 streets realignments, will affect Manor residents. (Building C', as defined by Preserve is shorter and does not require realignment of 2 streets.)*

Very little is mentioned about the safety/dangers that building 5 structures on one street will bring - W. Cottages Ln. – with domiciles on both sides, for SEVEREAL YEARS vs. the building of ONLY two main building on the East side of the campus, where extensive open space exists on 3 sides of the proposed buildings.

Response to Comment

The noise impacts of Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative) and Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative) are evaluated within Impact NOI-1 of Sections 4.5.3 and 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR, respectively. As described in those sections, noise impacts from both of these alternatives were determined to be less than significant with mitigation, which is the same level of significance as the proposed project and Alternative 1 (Resident's Alternative). The Draft EIR (page 4-52) also acknowledges that the noise impacts of Alternative 1 would affect a smaller area than the proposed project, due to having fewer construction zones within the campus.

Similarly, the traffic safety impacts of Alternative 2 and 3 were also determined to be less than significant with mitigation (Impact TRA-3 in Sections 4.5.4 and 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR, respectively), which is the same level of significance as the proposed project and Alternative 1. Edits have been made to the discussion of Impact TRA-3 for Alternative 1 in Section 4.3.3 of the Draft EIR to acknowledge that construction traffic from this alternative would affect fewer of the private roads within the SRC campus, due to having fewer construction zones. **These proposed edits are described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.** These minor edits do not affect the overall conclusions of the Draft EIR with respect to traffic safety impacts.

See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See also response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

SCHMIDEK-D-3.1:

Comment (verbatim)

A. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE. Pg. V. REJECT

It is stated that among the alternatives, an environmental superior alternative be selected.

Who requested that AECOM develop an alternative? They are not a party involved in the development. They do not make the selection only a suggestion!!!!!!

The creation of Alternative 2 by AECOM shows great PRETENTION, bias and MIS-understanding by the EIR developing organization and a significant lack of perception of what the Senior community needs and wants, as it locates Bldg. A in the Park.

It fails to recognize the significance that destruction and elimination of the Park and the removal of its very many trees and its facilities would have on the campus, its resident and the environment. The Park is used by residents daily and it provides a very important environmental and mental contribution to all residents.

It also fails to comprehend the impact of building in the middle of the senior campus.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-5: Appropriateness of Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative 2).

See response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

SCHMIDEK-D-3.2:

Comment (verbatim)

Traffic study. 3.16.3. Pg. 3-285. MM-TRA-3b. Garage exit driveways and entries to 3 buildings are too short and dangerous to pedestrians and vehicles.

Review of the drawings and documentation available from PRS and AECOM MM-TRA-3a/b. Garage exits and entries driveways are too short to be safe.

According the visual examination of the drawings of the entry and exit driveways from 3 garages, they measure as significantly shorter than the 20ft. considered required for safety, by several other California towns (Los Gatos) and cities (Sacramento) and many others California communities. Saratoga City has not addressed this consideration so far, but they should not allow such a "clear and near danger" for a Senior community.

The driveways of the 3 proposed buildings range from 8 ft to 12 ft. and pose grave danger for senior citizens while walking on the sidewalk in front or driving on the street in front of these 3 Buildings.

The Garages of (1) Bldg. D, Bldg. (2) Meeting Hall and (3) Bldg. A have short and dangerous garage exits. The Meeting Hall garage is located after a downhill curve of the W. Cottage Ln. that obfuscates the exit for downhill traffic, while exit from Bldg. A (3) garage runs into double parked delivery trucks, pedestrian walking down W. Cottages Ln. or exiting Bldg A. and traffic that uses Pavilion Dr. Driveway of Building D garage is short and exits to busy Odd Fellows Ln. where semis, trucks and cars drive by continuously and Residents walk down the sidewalk.

There is requirement that the garage exit view not be blocked for 150 ft. It is questionable if this requirement will be met by any one of the 3 garages, thus endangering the lives of drivers and walkers. Why this is defined as vegetation not to

block the line of sight, thus is assumed that it is unconditional requirement for line of sight.

It is also stated that the Project Applicant shall develop and implement a delivery schedule for vendors so that the number of simultaneous deliveries to the campus does not exceed the available loading space! This is a challenge now, and during the years of construction of Alt 2 and 3 an impossibility.

Response to Comment

As discussed in response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety, the City does not have specific standards for the length of driveways exiting from multi-residential parking garages. The City's Development Engineer has reviewed the plans for the proposed project's Buildings A, B, and C, and the plans for Building D under Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative) and was satisfied with the proposed driveway length.

As discussed in response to MASTER-25: On-site Traffic Congestion/Disruption, mitigation measure MM-TRA-3b requires that the applicant implement all recommendations of the Traffic Study prepared for the project. These recommendations included ensuring that no tall vegetation would block sight distance from driveways. Edits have been made to MM-TRA-3b to expand the requirements for maintenance of sight distance to include signs and ancillary structures as well as vegetation, and to reflect that the sight distances recommended by the Traffic Study are not 150 feet in every case, but rather vary based on the speed limit of the roadways. **These proposed edits are described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.**

See also response to MASTER-25: On-site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

SCHMIDEK-D-3.3:

Comment (verbatim)

ENVIRONMENTAL SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE BE SELECTED (1) Pg. V

Accept this erroneous 2 buildings plan and request that the correct Building "D" plan be submitted as well as Building "C1" Plan.

WRONG & MISLEADING Depiction by Ankrom/PRS of the PRESERVE BLDG D as similar to the Bldg. 4000 layout but Three (3) stories high.

The Preserve submitted plan was to be built to the same footprint as the current HC Building but 2 stories high and garage underground.

In addition, it depicts Bldg. C1 as a same length as their plan, but the Preserve Plan Bldg C is Shorter and does NOT require the alteration of the 2 streets.

The Plan A was incorrectly depicted and described and thus the claimed advantage over it by Plans 2 & 3 is fallacious.

This Plan also places a second Building (A) in the Park, which is a major incursion into a space and place most appreciated and used by residents and eliminates many outdoor facilities.

The list of reduced issues of the "Reduced Development Alternative" is a biased self-glorification that creates more issues and does NOT satisfy the original objectives.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

SCHMIDEK-D-3.4:

Comment (verbatim)

Construction 3.15.3. Pg. 3-279

As stated: Project construction would not conflict with any applicable program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, the impact would be less than significant.....and therefore, would not cause a significant impact under this threshold. The temporary effects of Project construction on internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation on private roads within the Project site is therefore not a potential physical effect on the environment requiring analysis under CEQA, but rather is an issue for SRC management to address directly with their construction contractor and existing residents.

Reminds me of Pontius Pilate when he washed his hands!!!! No kidding..... this time the Residents will be the ones that get run over.....during the short term.....

Moreover, the proposed Project's effects would only be noticed during the short-term construction period and would not have long-lasting impacts that could adversely affect operations or plans for new elements or improvements to the transportation network.

Response to Comment

Edits have been made to the text on page 3-279 of the Draft EIR referred to by the commenter, in order to clarify that the temporary effects of project construction relation to congestion and disruption on internal private roadways do not conflict with the threshold of significance for Impact TRA-1, because the relevant public policy documents and programs only address the public transportation and circulation system, not private roads. The edits also clarify that whilst temporary traffic-related impacts to private roadways are not evaluated under Impact TRA-1, they are evaluated in the Draft EIR under Impact TRA-3 (traffic safety) and Impact TRA-4 (emergency access). **These proposed edits are described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.** These minor clarifications do not affect the overall conclusions of the Draft EIR with respect to transportation impacts.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption and MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

SCHMIDEK-D-3.5:

Comment (verbatim)

Issues to be resolved - as stated in EIR:

The State CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR present issues to be resolved by the lead agency. These issues include the choice among alternatives and whether or how potentially significant impacts can be mitigated. The major issues to be resolved by the City regarding the Project are:

It is not reasonable or expected that the Organization Preparing an EIR should also create an alternative solution. This creates a conflict of interest, as the EIR agency should be an uninterested party.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-5: Appropriateness of Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative 2).

SCHMIDEK-D-3.6:

Comment (verbatim)

Project-Related Interference with Emergency Access

Closure of streets for extended periods of several months. How do we get to our garages. How about disabled residents?

As stated: However, construction activities would require temporary closures of some internal roadways within the Project site, including West Cottages Lane and Colfax Lane for approximately three months during Phases 2 and 3. The construction contractor has indicated that at least two out of the three main access roads into the campus from Odd Fellows Drive (West Cottages Lane, Colfax Lane, and McLaren Lane) would be open for emergency vehicle access at all times.

Movement and maneuvering of construction traffic and equipment could also cause temporary congestion along Odd Fellows Drive and the short section of San Marcos Road connecting it to Fruitvale Avenue, and on other private roadways on the SRC campus, MM-TRA-3a, described previously, would require the development and implementation of a detailed plan to manage construction traffic and internal road closures throughout the construction period to ensure continued access during emergencies, and to communicate that plan with emergency response providers and affected SRC residents and neighbors. Therefore, with implementation of MM-TRA-3a, potential impacts to emergency access during Project construction would be less than significant with mitigation.

Note: Just like it would be very questionable that the whole project could be completed in 26 months, same applies to the 3 months of street closures.

We do not need this project as defined by a remote architect – is a project is needed it must consider the senior population that has made large entry fees and pays high monthly fees. If a project is needed, it should be with due consideration of everything!

Response to Comment

As discussed in Section 3.16.3 of the Draft EIR, Mitigation Measure MM-TRA-3a requires the construction contractor to develop and implement a Construction Traffic Control Plan. Item (ii) of the mitigation measure specifically requires that the plan include a process for communicating with affected residents and providing at least 72 hours' advanced notice of any temporary lane or road closures (including of the private roadways within the SRC campus) and providing information on available detours or alternative routes. As occurs for construction projects throughout the city, even if a road or lane is temporarily closed to through-traffic, provision is typically made for local residents living within the closed street to access their properties, except for very short periods of time when construction activities are required in the roadway immediately

adjacent to their driveway. MM-TRA-3a also requires that emergency access be maintained to all residences throughout construction. As discussed in response to MASTER-25: On-site Traffic Congestion/Disruption and MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety, and detailed in Section 4 of this Final EIR below, edits have been made to MM-TRA-3a to require that the Construction Traffic Control Plan specifically address both vehicular traffic and pedestrians, including pedestrians utilizing mobility devices such as wheelchairs, motorized scooters, and walking frames, for example, as well as pedestrians with visual and/or hearing impairments. See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

With respect to the accuracy of the estimated duration of street closures presented in the Draft EIR, as discussed in response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration, CEQA does not require technical perfection in an EIR, but rather requires adequacy, completeness, and a good-faith effort at full disclosure (CEQA Guidelines Section 15003). The information in the Draft EIR pertaining to the temporary re-routing of Colfax Lane and West Cottages Lane for approximately 3 months during Phases 2 and 3 was based on information prepared by the applicant's construction contractor based on the conceptual construction schedule they developed. As discussed above, a more detailed road closure plan based on final project design and construction schedule would be included within the Construction Traffic Control Plan prepared in accordance with mitigation measure MM-TRA-3.

Comments relating to fees paid by SRC residents do not raise significant environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR. See also response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

SCHMIDEK-D-3.7:

Comment (verbatim)

Impact NOI-1 Increase in Ambient Noise/Vibration. Pg. XVI

As documented, "substantial" generation of noise will occur with all Alternatives, except Alt 1, which may impact ONLY a very small portion of the AL building, vs. the impact of building in Park, in the front of the Manor or side of the Manor which will affect most of the central campus. Noise and vibration from Building C, as defined by the Alt 2, that requires street realignment, will also affect Manor residents. Building C', as defined by Preserve, is shorter and does not require street re-alignments. It also does not require staging of construction materials, etc. in the Park.

Very little is mentioned about the safety or dangers that building 5 structures concurrently on one street – W. Cottages – for several years!

This compared to building two main building on the campus East side, with extensive open space on their 3 sides and not in the path of pedestrians or vehicles.

In addition, a different, unused and available space for staging would be much closer and readily available. This in contrast to staging in the Park for the whole building duration of XX?? years is a major difference on the horrible effects on residents, etc. that [sic].

Response to Comment

The noise impacts of Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative) and Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative) are evaluated within Impact NOI-1 of Sections 4.5.3 and 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR, respectively. As described in those sections, noise impacts from both of these alternatives were determined to be less than significant with mitigation, which is the same level of significance as the proposed project and Alternative 1 (Resident's Alternative). The Draft EIR (page 4-52) also acknowledges that the noise impacts of Alternative 1 would affect a smaller area than the proposed project, due to having fewer construction zones within the campus. See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

Similarly, the traffic safety impacts of Alternative 2 and 3 were also determined to be less than significant with mitigation (Impact TRA-3 in Sections 4.5.4 and 4.6.3 of the Draft EIR, respectively), which is the same level of significance as the proposed project and Alternative 1. As discussed in response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-2.7, edits have been made to the discussion of Impact TRA-3 for Alternative 1 in Section 4.3.3 of the Draft EIR to acknowledge that construction traffic from this alternative would affect fewer of the private roads within the SRC campus, due to having fewer construction zones. See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption and MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

It is unclear which "different, unused and available space for staging" the commenter is referring to in the last paragraph of the comment. General discussion relating to impacts from construction staging areas and in particular from use of the "park" as a staging area is provided in response to MASTER-17: Construction Staging.

SCHMIDEK- D-4.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Impact TRA-3. Pg XIX: Potential for Creation of Substantial Traffic-Related Hazards LTSM

The Project could (WILL) substantially increase traffic-related hazards. Mitigation: "MM-TRA-3a: Construction Traffic Control Plan" is a joke.

This subject was glanced over and not analyzed. The closure of streets over many months (8++?) will prevent SENIOR residents from getting to their domiciles and garages (W. Cottage Ln cottages) for MANY +++ months.

Impact REC-1: Pg XIX. Construction or Expansion of New Recreational Facilities

The Project would NOT increase the use of needed existing recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

It would REDUCE the use and availability of Recreational facilities!!!

These two issues were just glanced over by suggesting that Mitigation via a Traffic Control Plan would solve this. VERY Questionable solution, or lack of a solution. What does deterioration have to do with this?

Response to Comment

With respect to the traffic-related concerns raised in this comment, please see response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-3.6 above, as well as response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption and MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

With respect to the deterioration of existing recreational facilities, as discussed in response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space, there are two applicable thresholds of significance under CEQA for evaluation of impacts to recreational resources. The first threshold (analyzed under Impact REC-1 in the Draft EIR) is whether the project would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of those facilities would occur or be accelerated. The second threshold (Impact REC-2) is whether the project would include construction of new or expanded recreational facilities that would themselves have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The City has not adopted any thresholds of significance for the purposes of CEQA that relate to the loss, or reduction in size, or reduction in use and availability of existing private recreational facilities on private property.

SCHMIDEK- D-4.2:

Comment (verbatim)

This is a very scare plan which will overwhelm the then residing residents, endangering their lives and limbs.

F. TRAFIC CONTROL /STREET CLOSURES: 2.4.4 Pg. 2-34 Par 3

Emergency access routes within the campus would be maintained throughout construction. Colfax Lane and West Cottages Lane would be temporarily rerouted for approximately 3 months during Phases 2 and 3; however, at least two of the three access roads would be open for emergency vehicle access at all times.

This rerouting of just 3 months is illusory (would you believe 9?), and does not address how residents of the W Cottages will be able to enter their garages, get to their domiciles, etc. Same applies to Pavilion Circle.

This is a real double talk. In one section it is said that analysis and resolution of the traffic within the SRC campus during construction is a SRC issue, and that the EIR does not address such. It just Promises that emergency routes will be open – but what about normal inhabitants??

Response to Comment

See responses to comments SCHMIDEK-D-3.4 and SCHMIDEK-D-3.6 above.

See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See also response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

SCHMIDEK- D-4.3:

Comment (verbatim)

In another section it is stated that the Park would be used for staging During the whole XX [sic] years of construction (Pg 2-37). This is really grand – see Site Management Plan.

Effort to endanger and encumber the lives of residents for who will have to put up & suffer with this for who know how many years.

The last stated duration was announced on July 20, 2023 by the PRS hired Consultant and Project Leader, that it would take 7 (seven) years to complete the construction of plan 3, so for all these years we would be looking at dirt, trucks, etc.

This is not acceptable, this is not what we contracted for, this is a horrible demonstration of the lack of concerns the planners have for senior who came to SRC for their peaceful last years.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-17: Construction Staging.

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

SCHMIDEK- D-4.4:

Comment (verbatim)

CONSTRUCTION PHASING. PG 2-33 - PAR 2.4.1

The timeline of 2.3 years for all 5 buildings, July 2023-August 2025 is extremely questionable! The durations of the construction of 25 months is also unrealistic plan, that it questions the entire PRS Plan C. This would cause unbelievable anguish and disruption to the residents, as well as to the Saratoga streets. The renovation of the HC has been defined as occurring between July 2023 and July 2025 as well... another questionable date and not relevant to this EIR?

The latest verbal statement from the Manager of the total plan, at a meeting of prospective residents, has put the construction to 7 years! (Hmmm..... very auspicious and realistic timeline never before stated!!!)

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

SCHMIDEK- D-4.5:

Comment (verbatim)

Volume of material to haul off campus. Pg. 2-34 Par 2.4.3

It is stated that 37,000 cubic yards would be off hauled for the entire construction plan.

It is unclear if this is for B plan or C plan. That translates to thousands of trucks round trips on Odd Fellows Ln. as well as on other campus streets – W. Cottages, Pavilion Dr., etc. Large double trucks, with trailers, could not turn around on SRC streets readily.

Other calculation, estimates more than double++ this dirt load for the original B plan, somewhat less for the updated plan relocating the Bldg. B to location D. The Preserve plan A. has the least amount of dirt to be hauled away.

A normal truck, which could enter SRC campus, can haul ~10 yards of uncompressed soil and not 16. This would require some 7400 one way truck trips on Odd Fellows lane, and up and down campus streets, of which mostly will be on W. Cottages.

Something to look forward to – dust, dirt, noise, traffic, blockage of street, etc.

Note that large dirt trucks with trailers (16 cu. ft.) could not turn around in SRC readily thus could not be used.

Response to Comment

This comment uses terms such as “B plan”, “C plan”, “original B plan”, and “Preserve plan A”, which are not defined by the commenter and are not terms used within the Draft EIR or project application. It is therefore unclear if the commenter meant to refer to Building B and Building C rather than B plan or C plan, or if the different “plans” are in fact references to the various site plans presented for the proposed project and the three alternatives (which are numbered 1 through 3 in the Draft EIR).

To the extent that the comment appears to be questioning the accuracy of estimated material haul volumes for the proposed project and/or the alternatives presented in the Draft EIR, the estimated volume of material for off-haul presented in Section 2.4.3 of the Draft EIR relates only to the proposed project, and includes material from the construction of all new buildings (i.e., Buildings A, B, and C, the Meeting Room Addition, and the Fitness Center Addition) as well as from the internal renovations to the existing Health Center that are proposed as part of the Project. These calculations were based on the preliminary grading plans provided as part of the project plan set, as well as additional information provided by the applicant in support of their application, as described in the Draft EIR.

Similar calculations for each of the alternatives are presented in Section 4.4.1 (Alternative 1 – Residents’ Alternative), Section 4.5.1 (Alternative 2 – Reduced Development Alternative) and Section 4.6.1 (Alternative 3 – Applicant’s Alternative), respectively. It is unclear what “other calculations” the commenter is referring to.

To the extent that the comment appears to be questioning the accuracy of the construction-related truck traffic associated with the material haul volumes for the proposed project and/or the alternatives, this information is summarized in Table 3.16-2 for the proposed project, and in Table 4.4-8 (Alternative 1), Table 4.5-8 (Alternative 2) and Table 4.6-8 (Alternative 3), respectively, and is based on the calculations and assumptions presented on page 17 of Appendix E of the Draft EIR. A 16 cubic yard dump truck was assumed in the calculations, as this is the typical capacity of dump trucks used for large construction projects. A typical dump truck with this capacity has a 210-inch wheelbase with a dump body length of 16 feet and overall length (including cab) of approximately 25 feet (City Rent-a-Truck 2024) and does not include a trailer, as suggested by the commenter.

For comparison, a typical ambulance has a 170-inch wheelbase and overall length of 24.5 feet, a fire engine (pumper) has a 201-inch wheelbase and overall length of 32 feet, and an aerial platform fire truck has a wheelbase of 256 inches and overall length of 48 feet (Amherst 2024). Because the existing roads on campus (and proposed roads to be created/alterd by the proposed project) are sufficient to meet fire access requirements, they would also be sufficient to allow access from dump trucks of this size. Furthermore, the Construction Traffic Management Plan required by mitigation measure MM-TRA-3b would identify haul routes for construction trucks which would likely minimize or eliminate the need for turning around within the roadway.

The comment does not include any new information that would affect the conclusions of the Draft EIR in relation to impacts associated with material haul volumes or construction traffic. No edits to the Draft EIR are required for these comments.

SCHMIDEK- D-4.6:

Comment (verbatim)

The plan and proposal does not meet the open spaces element, and actually destroys the one Open Space Park in the community.

Regulatory Framework. Par 3.2.2 Pg. 3-14

Open Space Element

Goal OSC 2: To preserve the City's existing character which includes small town residential, rural/semi-rural areas and open spaces.

Policy OSC 2.1: Ensure that all development proposals, public and private, are sensitive to the natural environment and the community's open space resources.

Response to Comment

As discussed within response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space, Government Code Section 65560 defines open space as any parcel or area of land or water which is essentially unimproved and devoted to an open space use and which is designated on a local, regional or state open space plan. Within the SRC campus, the only such designated open space is an approximately 10.6-acre open space easement/riparian open space covenant along the northeastern edge of the property (east of McLaren Lane) and to the south of the existing Health Center and Eucalyptus Lane, as shown on Figure 2.3.1 of the Draft EIR and Sheet CS-0.5 of the project plans. As discussed within Section 3.4.3 of the Draft EIR (Impact BIO-2), the proposed project would not involve any construction or disturbance within or immediately adjacent to this riparian corridor/open space area.

The area of the SRC campus between Pavilion Circle and West Cottages Drive (location of Building B under the proposed project) that is currently used for recreational purposes by SRC residents is not designated on any local, regional, or state open space plan and is not identified as an open space resource within the City's General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element.

Section 3.11.3 of the Draft EIR (Impact LUP-2) evaluates whether the proposed project would cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect (CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Threshold XI.b). Section 3.2.3 of the Draft EIR

(Impact AES-3) also evaluates whether the project would conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality (CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Threshold I.c). As discussed in those sections of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would result in an intensification of existing senior residential and related land uses at the site; however, with approval of the requested Planned Combined District overlay, the alternative would not conflict with applicable zoning regulations. Furthermore, the intensification of uses on one specific property would not affect the overall character of the City in a manner that would conflict with Goal OSC 2.

The total area of development on campus is governed by the site development maximum and floor area maximum for the property, which are established through the PC Overlay and site's Master Plan. The 1996 approved Master Plan includes a total site coverage of 695,990 SF (51.12 percent), and a total floor area of 423,813 SF (31.13 percent). For comparison, the proposed PC Overlay designation associated with this project would include a total site coverage of 761,300 SF (55.92 percent) and a total floor area of 542,801 SF (39.88 percent).

SCHMIDEK- D-4.7:

Comment (verbatim)

Project Site. Pg 3-199. 3.11.1

Environment Setting - Existing Zoning (Pg. 199-200). Project Site 2nd Par Pg. 3-199

An approximately 1.1 acres landscaped area with outdoor recreational facilities is located just south of the Manor building (and Bldg. A will be built on it and the recreational facilities buried under the building!)

The Project site is designated as a Community Facilities Sites in the City's General Plan, R-1-40,000 and must be evaluated and comply with criteria indicating its compatibility with adjacent uses and to provide space for community facilities needed to complement residential areas.

This is the site (1.1 acres) that will be covered by a building - no description of its use - and shall deprive residents of open space and park atmosphere and utilization. This may violate the City's Building Intensity as it must comply with adjacent uses. This is a terrible plan that violated the Contractual implications and abuses seniors in a senior community!

Response to Comment

The requirement to evaluate expansions of "Community Facilities Sites" for compatibility with adjacent uses applies to compatibility with uses on properties adjacent to the community facility, not to existing uses within the community facility site itself. Impacts to adjacent properties are discussed within the Draft EIR, in particular in relation to aesthetics (Section 3.2), air quality (Section 3.3), noise (Section 3.12), and transportation (Section 3.16).

Comments pertaining to contractual violations do not raise specific environmental issues that require a response under CEQA.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See also response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

SCHMIDEK-D-5.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Environment setting - Cumulative impact 3.16.4 Pg 3-287 to 3-295

Contrary to what the EIR states, the project will have impact on physical division of community by inserting a building in the Park, providing a path with steps which, will prevent Seniors with walkers or other devices to reach the area and the Fitness Center or the Bldg. A front entrance.

Quote: Project while continuing to serve existing development in compliance with Policy LU 5.2 and Policy LU 13.1. In addition, as discussed in Section 3.17, Transportation, the Project would not lead to any significant impacts at the study intersections in compliance with Policy LU 5.3.

These are very questionable statements, and just opinions and not decipherable. It is not clear which intersection this refers to but it has to be the one next to the Bldg. A garage exit, which is an accident begging to occur.

Finally the statement that the area is Partially Developed (used to be a well organized and maintained Park, but was intentionally by the Management left to decline for 7 years with no maintenance or grounds support), this is an understatement and expresses a wrong opinion and not that of RESIDENTS!

To confuse the issue further, the expansion of Fellowship Plaza was introduced, with no justification or consideration into this argument for further complexity and confusion!!!

Response to Comment

The evaluation of whether a project would physically divide an established community under CEQA (as discussed in Impact LUP-1 of the Draft EIR) is typically concerned with impacts to larger scale communities such as neighborhoods or suburbs, not to small private communities on a single land parcel or several parcels owned and operated as a single entity and constructed by the operator or owner of the community. Nonetheless, the proposed project would not physically divide the private SRC community, as the proposed buildings, once constructed, would be part of the SRC community. Although existing walking paths within the campus would be altered by the proposed project, alternative routes would be established to maintain accessibility from one part of the project site to the other, including for people with disabilities, in accordance with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

With respect to the text quoted by the commenter (which occurs within Section 3.11.3 of the Draft EIR in relation to Impact LUP-2, not Section 3.16.4 as indicated at beginning of the comment), the “study intersections” refer to the identified intersections of public streets that were analyzed within the Traffic Study prepared for the proposed project (Appendix F of the Draft EIR).

With respect to the commenters concerns regarding the lack of maintenance or grounds support, these comments appear to be concerned with existing conditions at the property and do not relate to any environmental impacts of the proposed project.

The future expansion of the adjacent Fellowship Plaza property is identified in the EIR as a cumulative project, as introduced within Section 3.1.2 of the Draft EIR.

See also response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See also response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

SCHMIDEK-D-5.2:

Comment (verbatim)

Page 3-207 to 3-242. Par 3.12 Noise

This plan and AECOM conclusions are an imposition on seniors of astronomic proportions and totally unacceptable.

After reading all the Fundamentals (!), we came up with the real NOISE. To begin measuring the current noise at 5 locations over 20 minutes, in the afternoon, around 2 and 3 PM proves little. The 24 hrs. measured location is away from traffic and residences.

What relationship this has with construction noise is a mystery.

The Peak construction traffic is very optimistic, and does NOT address the SRC Campus traffic. The discussion about construction noise is baffling as the expectations and suggestions are that resident should absent themselves from their domiciles during the high noise?

The list of Mitigations demanding residents vacating their residences is overwhelming (Page 3-226) etc. is shocking. Having noise barriers across the street of cottages for the long construction periods are a negation of the peace and quiet we contracted for.

THIS IS TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE FOR A SENIOR COMMUNITY, OR ANY OTHER. THERE IS A BETTER PLAN! THE RESIDENTS PROPOSED PLAN!

Response to Comment

The noise measurements described in Section 3.12.1 (subheading Existing Noise Sources) of the Draft EIR were taken to establish the existing ambient conditions at the project site, in order to inform the environmental baseline. Short-term measurement locations were selected on their varying exposure to existing noise sources. In terms of establishing baseline noise levels, the long-term deployment sited at a distance from the adjacent roadway and internal to the facility would be advantageous to all noise-sensitive receptors as it would establish a conservatively low baseline noise level due to the reduced noise contribution from vehicles due to distance and line-of-sight shielding.

The typical intent of baseline noise measurements in a CEQA noise study is establish existing ambient noise levels to be used in the assessment of additive noise impacts related to the project's future operational noise sources (i.e., the assessment of permanent noise sources introduced by the project). However, due to the City's strict regulations for operational noise levels at residential properties (40 dBA), and because measured sound pressure levels were continuously greater than this sound level, the baseline sound level data did not need to be utilized for the impact assessment within the Draft EIR.

With respect to construction traffic noise, the analysis focuses on the increase in traffic due to construction-related trips such as construction worker shuttles, delivery and haul trucks. Existing SRC campus would not be expected to increase as a result of project construction, and therefore is part of the baseline. Furthermore, existing campus traffic would be expected to be travelling at or below the 15 mile-per-hour posted speed limit, speeds at which noise generation would be negligible and familiar.

See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See also response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See also response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

SCHMIDEK-D-5.3:

Comment (verbatim)

Population Housing

This section describes the existing setting of the Project area related to population and housing and evaluates whether the Project would result in adverse effects on population and housing.

Concerns about the misalignment between the demographic of people that the project aims to serve, and the demographic (e.g., “up-scale” retired individuals) that the proposed housing will serve. It rambles on about population growth, and concludes that these new apartments will satisfy future demands and requirements.

Conclusion of the section on Page 3-247. 3.13.4

As discussed above, the Project would have no impact related to inducement of unplanned population growth or displacement of people or housing. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to any potential cumulative impacts associated with population and housing requirements.

The City of Saratoga has an overabundance of planned constructions in the income bracket, more than the State requires, and the apartments that the PRS plan suggests in this section of the EIR is superfluous and does not convey the reality of the requirements. It just confuses the reader, if any reader ever gets this far in the EIR!

Response to Comment

As discussed within Section 3.13.3 of the Draft EIR, the thresholds of significance for impacts to population and housing relate to the inducement of unplanned population growth and displacement of people or housing, and are based on the thresholds from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Because the proposed project would not induce unplanned population growth or displace people or housing, there would be no impacts in relation to these thresholds, as discussed in the Draft EIR.

Concerns relating to a “misalignment between the demographic of the people that the project aims to serve” and/or to an “overabundance of planned constructions in the income bracket” do not raise any environmental issues requiring a response under CEQA.

SCHMIDEK-D-5.4:

Comment (verbatim)

Pag 3-249 . Par 3.14.1

The EIR does NOT address all the services provided to the Campus and Residents as pertinent, as they are not considered “public services” under CEQA. Not clear which services are NOT Considered, such a food delivery, trash, taxi, SRC Bus, Mail to mailboxes, Amazon, Fed-Ex, etc. but these services are essential and MUST be considered in the plan.

Lack of consideration and provisions of these over several years of construction will have a devastating effect on senior residents who rely on such services. (It goes into lengthy diatribe about Fire Protection and the organization of these but does not negate the services ability)

The analysis does address the accessibility of Fire Engines, Ambulances, Police Vehicles, etc. during years of construction very casually.

With street closures the access to certain dwellings and apartments will be severely hindered. There is no workaround or plans addressing these issues.

Note that the Preserve Plan does NOT have such critical issues, as:

NO streets will be blocked that may limit access to ANY parts and all of the habitations on the campus.

Response to Comment

As described in Section 3.14.3 of the Draft EIR, the thresholds of significance for impacts to public services are whether the proposed project would result in the need for new or physically altered government-provided services, such as fire, police, schools, parks, or other public services (e.g., libraries), the provision of which might result in physical environmental impacts. Private services such as food delivery, taxi, private shuttle buses, package delivery services are not public services provided by the government. Impacts relating to solid waste disposal (trash) are discussed in Section 3.18 of the Draft EIR (Utilities and Service Systems). Any temporary delays for postal carriers to access the central mail drop-off points for each SRC building or the adjacent Fellowship Plaza property due to construction-related traffic congestion on Odd Fellows Drive or other private roads within the SRC campus would not require provision of new or physically altered U.S. Postal Service facilities that would cause a physical environmental impact.

See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

SCHMIDEK-D-5.5:

Comment (verbatim)

It fails to address some of the key requirements in Alt 2 & 3:

Regulatory Framework – City of Saratoga General Plan -- Page 3-258 . Par. 3.15.2

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The Open Space and Conservation Element of the City's General Plan provide objectives, policies, and programs regarding recreational facilities. The following General Plan policies relating to recreational facilities apply to the Project:

Goal OSC 2: To preserve the City's existing character which includes small town residential, rural/semi-rural areas and open spaces.

Policy OSC 2.1: Ensure that all development proposals, public and private, are sensitive to the natural environment and the community's open space resources.

Goal OSC 3: To provide and maintain parks and a variety of passive and active recreational sites which are located, designed, and improved to serve the needs of the residents, the community, and the neighborhoods of Saratoga.

Policy OSC 3.1: Ensure that existing and future parks and dedicated open spaces remain part of the public domain in perpetuity.

Policy OSC 3.3: Promote retention and dedication of land which provides room for a variety of passive and active recreational pursuits and offers important opportunities for the fulfillment of human and psychological needs, including: .

The EIR fails to meet the above City objectives by overbuilding over the one Park the Senior Community has.

Response to Comment

As discussed within response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space, Government Code Section 65560 defines open space as any parcel or area of land or water which is essentially unimproved and devoted to an open space use and which is designated on a local, regional or state open space plan. Within the SRC campus, the only such designated open space is an approximately 10.6-acre open space easement along the northeastern edge of the property (east of McLaren Lane) and to the south of the existing Health Center and Eucalyptus Lane, as shown on Figure 2.3.1 of the Draft EIR and Sheet CS-0.5 of the project plans. As discussed within Sections 4.4.3 and 4.5.3 of the Draft EIR (Impact BIO-2), Alternatives 2 and 3 would not involve any construction or disturbance within or immediately adjacent to this riparian corridor/open space easement.

The area of the SRC campus between Pavilion Circle and West Cottages Drive (location of Building B under the proposed project) that is currently used for recreational purposes by SRC residents is not designated on any local, regional, or state open space plan and is not identified as an open space resource within the City's General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element.

SCHMIDEK-D-5.6:

Comment (verbatim)

Impact REC-1 Project would NOT use neighborhood parks,

Which is a questionable question, given the average age of SRC residents and their ability to walk to regional parks!

The Project does NOT require the construction of a City Park, but does require that the current Park not be built over by Bldg. A or any other!

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The Analysis of the impact as written is fallacious as it addresses only 4 of the outdoor activities in the Park, which they propose to build somewhere, BUT NOT the whole Park. Even the Relocating of the 4 activities has not been resolved or presented and would eventually be forgotten and not provided or would be minimized.

As to the trail, that has been resolved years ago and is just a smoke screen or lack of knowledge! Introducing the expansion of Fitness Center has no connection with recreational facilities.

The most incorrect statement is that the Project may have significant impact on neighborhood park or regional parks!!! The next most egregious statement is the one stating that there are 28 acres of parks within one mile of the campus as well as Freemont Older and Villa Montalvo on Pg. 3-261.

Apparently, the author of the EIR does not comprehend what a Senior facility is, and that Seniors cannot go 1 mile or more to a park with their walkers. We moved to SRC because it DID HAVE a Park!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

SCHMIDEK-D-5.7:

Comment (verbatim)

Environment Setting. 3.15.4. Pg. 3-249 ->276

Cumulative Impact on Recreational Facilities. 3.15.4. Pg 3-262 The overall cumulative impact for CREC-1 would be potentially significant, however, the Project's contribution would be less than cumulatively considerable -- ?????? PLEASE EXPLAIN!!!!!!

Cumulative Impact Analysis As described previously, there are 87 acres of existing parkland within the City, including 63.5 acres of City Parks and a network of open wilderness areas and trails. Based on the 2020 City population of 31,030, this equates to approximately 2.8 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, which is substantially below the City's goal of 5 acres per 1,000 residents. High land costs and the limited amount of undeveloped land pose challenges to the City in seeking to attain its goal. The overall cumulative impact could be potentially significant.

Really????

This is another bit of double talk. If it is "potentially significant" the elimination of a Park space within a stone's throw distance for a senior population, why then build over it, and suggest that seniors who do not drive could access a City Park miles away with their walker! In addition, the whole space of the PARK would be covered over with a huge multistory building. The impact of this devastating plan would be enormous and irreplaceable and should NOT be permitted. We were promised a good life, but this is an affront to seniors, a breach of promises, and will have everlasting negative effects! The city apparently is BELOW their goal of 5 acres/1000 so why make this even lower?

Response to Comment

The potentially significant cumulative impact to recreational resources identified in Section 3.15.4 of the Draft EIR relates to the fact that there is an existing city-wide shortfall in public recreational land (as a result of past and present development within the City) compared to the City's goal of 5 acres per 1,000 residents. Therefore, any future development within the City that does not provide the same or greater ratio of parkland for any new residential capacity introduced by that development (or payment of parkland fees in lieu) would contribute to that potentially significant cumulative impact by exacerbating the existing city-wide parkland shortfall. Although the proposed project will contribute to this overall cumulative impact, by providing additional residential units within the City without providing additional public recreational facilities or payment of fees in lieu, the contribution that the proposed project would make to this overall cumulative impact would be less than cumulatively considerable, due to the small number of additional residents (between 44 and 89) and because the SRC campus provides a variety of private recreational activities and facilities for its residents on site, and because the proposed increase in population is generally consistent with the approved residential capacity of the campus under the 1995 Master Plan, which has not been fully realized.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

SCHMIDEK-D-5.8:

Comment (verbatim)

This is the statement in the EIR Environment Setting. 3.15.4. Pg. 3-249 ->276, and Transportation. 3.16 Pg. 3-265. which does suggest that: At a future time the campus traffic will be defined, safety considered and plans submitted:

TRA-3 Impact Analysis:

Construction

All construction staging activities would occur on the Project site or within the designated off-site staging area at West Valley College Parking Lot #6. Temporary traffic controls, temporary lane closures, and construction zone entrances may be required within the Project site itself on the network of internal roadways within the SRC campus, or at the entrance to Odd Fellows Drive from San Marcos Road. The Project Applicant's contractor has submitted a preliminary "Construction Management Plan" to the City as part of their application, but the preliminary plan lacks the level of detail required to ensure that the potential for traffic safety hazards would not be increased. If temporary controls, closures, and entrances are not implemented in accordance with the City's standards, there is potential for increased traffic safety hazards within the Project site.

This impact could be potentially significant and life threatening.

Comments:

Discussion of Transportation is the issue of Campus internal traffic as well as external truck traffic of deliveries and exportation of excavated dirt and removed trees, and the importation of various construction equipment and materials has been very meager.

The article failed to consider and include the normal truck traffic experienced without construction. The truck number of 5633 over a span of 535 days, or about 10 trucks per day, appears grossly understated and confusing. The number of 29 avg. trips per day vs. the 10 is also confusing and understated. There should be a penalty of \$500 per truck trip per day for any trips exceeding the forecasted one to be paid to residents.

The submitted plan TOTALLY omits the major traffic issues on the Campus, what with street closures, Park used for storage of construction materials, machinery, etc. and the use of heavy noisy equipment roaring during digging, transportations, etc. The suggestion to relocate residents is a real winner.

This plan, which applies to the PRS plan and the AECOM plans, totally disregards the Senior resident's lives, health, etc. vs. the Preserve plan which avoids almost entirely these issues.

This cannot be acceptable to any jurisdiction that considers senior Lives, security and health a vital responsibility! The submitted plan TOTALLY omits the major traffic issues on the Campus, what with street closures, Park used for storage of construction materials, machinery, etc. and the use of heavy noisy equipment roaring during digging, transportation, etc. The suggestion to relocate residents is a real winner.

Response to Comment

The “normal truck traffic experienced without construction” that the commenter mentions is part of the existing baseline conditions at the site. The existing environmental setting in relation to transportation is described in Section 3.16.1 of the Draft EIR, which states that existing traffic to/from the site includes private vehicles of residents and employees, deliveries and vendor trips, postal services, and garbage collection. Because the population of the campus would not substantially change until after construction is complete, the number of operational truck trips per day associated with deliveries and vendor trips, postal services and garbage collection (and other vehicle trips for residents and employees) is not expected to substantially increase during the construction period. Therefore, the discussion of construction-related transportation impacts of the project focuses on the impacts from additional truck and worker shuttle trips that would be generated by construction (discussed in Section 3.16.3, Impact TRA-3).

The commenters confusion regarding the average number of truck trips per day appears to at least partially relate to the difference between the number of trucks versus the number of truck trips, i.e., one truck visiting the site would create two one-way truck trips. Therefore, the 5,633 trucks that are estimated to visit the site over all four construction phases would average to approximately 10.5 trucks per day visiting the site or 21 truck trips per day (10 trips “in” and 10 trips “out”) when averaged over the entire construction duration of 535 days. In addition to calculating the average number of trucks over the entire construction period, the EIR also calculated anticipated truck traffic for the most intensive period of construction (i.e., the 11-month period when all four construction phases overlap). When averaged over this shorter, more intensive period, the project is anticipated to generate approximately 14.5 trucks per day or 29 truck trips per day. A more detailed breakdown of the anticipated number of construction-related truck trips, worker shuttle trips, and worker commute trips by construction phase is provided on page 17 of Appendix E to the Draft EIR and a more detailed breakdown of hourly construction traffic volume by roadway segment is provided on page 18 of Appendix E.

The Draft EIR acknowledges the potential for temporary disruption to the private roading network within the SRC campus and evaluates these impacts in relation to conflicts with transportation-related plans and policies (Impact TRA-1), vehicle miles travelled (Impact TRA-2), traffic safety (Impact TRA-3), and emergency access (Impact TRA-4). In order to mitigate the potentially significant traffic safety and emergency access impacts during construction, mitigation measure MM-TRA-3a is proposed, which requires a detailed construction traffic control plan to be submitted to the City for approval, prior to construction.

The commenter states that issues relating to street closures, use of the on-site recreational area for construction staging, and use of noisy, heavy construction equipment would occur with both the “PRS Plan” (assumed to refer to the proposed project) and the “AECOM Plan” (assumed to refer to Alternative 2, Reduced Development Alternative), but would largely be avoided under the “Preserve Plan” (assumed to refer to Alternative 1, Residents’ Alternative). Analysis of traffic-related impacts from these alternatives is contained within Section 4.4.3 (Alternative 1) and Section 4.5.2 (Alternative 2) of the Draft EIR. As discussed in those sections, although Alternative 1 would reduce some of the traffic-related impacts compared to the proposed project or Alternative 2 due to reduced number of construction zones, both of these alternatives would have the same overall level of impact as the proposed project (i.e., less than significant for Impacts TRA-1 and TRA-2; less than significant with mitigation for Impacts TRA-3 and TRA-4). As discussed in response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-2.7, proposed edits have been made to the discussion of Impact TRA-3 for Alternative 1 in Section 4.3.3 of the Draft EIR to specifically state that construction traffic from this alternative would affect fewer of the private roads within the SRC campus, due to having fewer construction zones. **These proposed edits are described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.**

Similarly, with respect to noise impacts from heavy construction equipment, the Draft EIR acknowledges that the maximum predicted noise levels for nearby receptors under Alternative 1 would be lower (up to 86 dBA) than for the proposed project and Alternative 2 (up to 95 dBA), but that the overall level of significance (less than significant with mitigation) and the nature of the required mitigation would be the same. Mitigation measure MM-NOI-1a for the proposed project and the alternatives requires a suite of measures to reduce the level of noise generated at the source, increase the distance between noise sources and receptors, and/or to reduce noise propagation from source to receptor through use of barriers. In addition, the mitigation requires monitoring to determine if the suite of measures are effective, ongoing communication to inform affected parties of noise-generating activities, and establishment of a point of contact for noise concerns. Potential relocation of residents would only be required if that suite of measures was not sufficient to reduce the noise level at nearby receptors to below the established threshold (or if requested by affected residents).

The commenter provides no specific details as to the inadequacy of the analysis within the Draft EIR pertaining to these impacts and provides no additional information that would change the conclusions therein.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

SCHMIDEK-D-5.9:

Comment (verbatim)

Project Impacts and Mitigation. 3.16.3. As stated in the EIR Pg 3-279 Par. 2 Line 4:

Project construction would not conflict with any applicable program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, and therefore, would not cause a significant impact under this threshold. The temporary effects of Project construction on internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation on private roads within the Project site is therefore not a potential physical effect on the environment requiring analysis under CEQA, but rather is an issue for SRC management to address directly with their construction contractor and existing residents. Nonetheless, it is noted that MM-TRA-3a, requires the construction contractor develop and implement a construction traffic control plan to mitigate potential impacts relating to traffic safety and emergency access (see Impacts TRA-3 and TRA-4 below).

However, during the period when all phases of construction overlap, up to 29 truck trips could travel to/from the Project site each day. Assuming that construction truck traffic would be spread throughout an eight-hour workday, this equates to approximately 4 truck trips per hour. The Project would not exceed the recommended screening criterion from the ITE for construction traffic, which sets a threshold level of 50 or more new truck trips during the peak hour, below which a detailed construction truck traffic evaluation is not required. This is the most current "industry standard" guidance for assessing the effects of construction Projects that create temporary traffic increases (ITE 1988).

Considerations and concerns:

Given the above dismissal of responsibility, and negating due concerns, by stating that the CEQA does not care about resident lives and wellbeing, but an SRS management responsibility, it becomes very clear that there will be Extreme disturbances and dangers during the MANY years of construction.

Note that the Preserve plan does not expose residents and visitors To any life and limb dangers.

Response to Comment

As discussed in response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-3.4 above, edits have been made to the text on page 3-279 of the Draft EIR referred to by the commenter, in order to clarify that the temporary effects of project construction relation to congestion and disruption on internal private roadways do not conflict with the threshold of significance for Impact TRA-1, because the relevant public policy documents and programs only address the public transportation and circulation system, not private roads. The edits also clarify that whilst temporary traffic-related impacts to private roadways are not evaluated under Impact TRA-1, they are evaluated in the Draft EIR under Impact TRA-3 (traffic safety) and Impact TRA-4 (emergency access). **These proposed edits are described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.** These minor clarifications do not affect the overall conclusions of the Draft EIR with respect to transportation impacts.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See also response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

SCHMIDEK-D-6.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Here are my observations about specific items in the EIR, as I thought we were asked to present. I am not sure that it matters, as well as I am not sure that the lady from AECOM cared or captured the points. But, as I did not have sufficient time to express my observations, I am trying to remedy this way. I have also provided my inputs (~30) about the rest of the EIR to you, but the fact that AECOM gets to vote on our future as a non involved party, with Alternative 2, is WRONG. I just want to pass on the key issue of the EIR, is that the concepts generated by AECOM should NOT be considered, as they are not an interested party or an affected one, now, during or after construction.

Response to Comment

CEQA Guidelines Section 15084 allows a Lead Agency to contract with another entity, public or private, to prepare the Draft EIR, provided that the draft EIR is subject to the agency's own review and analysis and reflects the independent judgement of the Lead Agency. In this case, AECOM was retained by the City to prepare the EIR for this project, and the Draft EIR was reviewed by City staff prior to being released for public review.

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the Draft EA to evaluate a "reasonable range" of alternatives, which are typically developed by the EIR authors, in conjunction with the Lead Agency.

CEQA also requires that an "environmentally superior" alternative be selected from those analyzed in the EIR, and that the reasons for such selection be disclosed. In the event that the "no project" is the environmentally superior alternative, CEQA requires that the EIR identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives, as was done in Section 4.7 of the Draft EIR. The identification of the environmentally superior alternative was undertaken by the EIR authors in conjunction with Lead Agency staff, for the reasons outlined in Section 4.7 of the Draft EIR.

See also response to MASTER-5: Appropriateness of Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative 2) and response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.

SCHMIDEK-D-6.2:

Comment (verbatim)

The organization of the EIR is baffling. If I search for a topic I get the Page number – but the pages do not have numbers... Amazing...

Response to Comment

Page numbers for the Draft EIR can be found at the bottom right of each page. Note that if searching within the PDF version of the Draft EIR that was posted on the City's website, the page number of the results will reflect the page number within the total 646-page file, rather than the page number written on the bottom right of each page. E.g., Page 1-1 of the EIR is page 33 of the PDF, due to the 32 pages of front matter (cover page, executive summary, table of contents, etc).

SCHMIDEK-D-6.3:

Comment (verbatim)

The EIR was to have 2 or 3 choices or plans, but it had 4, one of the opinions was from the EIR originators. Is this self-generated plan a function for the EIR writers and analyzers? Or is their task to just render solid commentary and analysis on the submitted plans - 2 or 3 - and suggest the optimal in their analysis?

Response to Comment

See response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-6.1 above and response to MASTER-5: Appropriateness of Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative 2).

SCHMIDEK-D-6.4:

Comment (verbatim)

The EIR is ~80% full of stuff that is of no benefit to most, and it detracts from the essence of the objectives and needs! It may meet the requirements, but it is not clear or crisp or comprehensive!

Response to Comment

The content and format of the EIR follows the requirements of the CEQA Guidelines, and the analysis within attempts to explain the sometimes complex environmental evaluation in a way that meets the requirements and provides substantial evidence on which the Lead Agency can base their final decision regarding the proposed project, but that is also understandable to a lay person. No specific concerns regarding the accuracy of the Draft EIR content is raised that requires a more specific response.

SCHMIDEK-D-6.5:

Comment (verbatim)

The method used by AECOM to select is arbitrary, mysterious and capricious, and to suggest that Table 4.7-1 (Par. 4-195. Pg. #??) supports Alternative 2 as the optimum, requires great imagination, questionable science ... as it also places a building in the Park.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

SCHMIDEK-D-6.6:

Comment (verbatim)

The EIR has grossly incorrect information thus conclusions on the plan are erroneous. Alternative 1 shown in EIR uses a PRS interpretation (Pg. 4-13. fig 4.4-2) of Building D (replacing the HC) with a 3 stories building, footprint similar to Bldg. 4000, is an incredible screw up (Ankrom drawing). The Preserve Plan has a 2 story Building, with a configuration similar to the current HC. (Pg, 4-11). Need I say more!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-3: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

SCHMIDEK-D-6.7:

Comment (verbatim)

On Pg. 4-36 are many comments of Alternative 1. some notable: Due to the extended duration of Alternative 1, and additional haul truck trips associated with the demolition, Alternative 1 would result in higher overall energy consumption really?... vs. a full Building A in the Park? The Conclusion has been reached ... do not bother me with facts...

Response to Comment

The sentence cited by the commenter relates to construction-related energy use. As discussed in Section 4.4.1 (Subheading Site Preparation, Demolition, and Earthworks) of the Draft EIR, construction of Alternative 1 (Residents' Alternative) is estimated to require approximately 48,500 cubic yards of excess soil and debris from the site, compared to approximately 37,100 cubic yards for the proposed project, i.e., approximately 30 percent more haul truck trips (and associated energy use for fuels) than the project.

To the extent that the commenter is suggesting that construction-related energy use for Alternative 1 would be less than for the proposed project due to efficiencies gained by constructing the same number of new units within fewer buildings, no supporting evidence is included to support the commenter's suggestion.

Although specific calculations for energy use were not included in the Draft EIR for the alternatives (as they were for the proposed project), energy consumption associated with construction is estimated using the construction-related GHG emissions (in CO₂) and United States Energy Information Administration Carbon Dioxide Emissions Coefficients of pounds of CO₂ per gallon of fuel type (diesel or gasoline). As such, the calculations of construction-related GHG emissions can be used as a proxy to evaluate the difference in energy consumption between Alternative 1 and the Project. As stated in Section 4.4.1 (Impact GHG-1), construction of Alternative 1 would generate approximately 1,731 MT CO₂e compared to approximately 1,493 MT CO₂e that would be generated by construction of the Project (i.e., approximately 16 percent more GHG emissions than the Project). Therefore, it can be estimated that construction-related energy use associated with Alternative 1 would be approximately 16 percent higher than the Project.

SCHMIDEK-D-6.8:

Comment (verbatim)

My take on EIR presented version is that the Preserve Two (2) building plan is the best between Alternative 1 and Alt 3, as it does not create a multi-year (2.2 or really 7) year construction zone and preserves the essential features of the SRC campus. while providing the 50 apartments and the much-needed replacement and modernization of the old Health Center. As to Alt 2, it should be totally disregarded as the authors did not understand the issues.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

See response to MASTER-5: Appropriateness of Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative 2).

SCHMIDEK-D-7.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Among the many issues found in the EIR, the one that is most mysterious, is the conclusion that Alt 2 is the best choice. Naturally the unbelievable error is the inclusion of incorrect plans, in the Preserve section, of maps, etc. generated by/for PRS/ANKROM, this must be remedied first.

I have studied over the concluding tables 4.7-1 which allegedly give more merit to Alt 2 than to the other 2, in the opinion of the authors, and I have been unable to understand these and follow to their conclusions. There needs to much more clarification about these conclusions, these tables, etc. specially as the final conclusion and selection of Alt 2 is by the same organization that generated the EIR, generated Alt 2!

That is by definition not proper - I will not draw comparisons!

To start I would suggest that the Alt 2, generated by the group that wrote the EIR, be rejected due to conflict of interest, lack of understanding by the authors of issues, campus life, resident needs, etc. We do not need a solution which does not fit the needs and requirements of either party.

Given the implications the 2 EIR tables below allegedly provide, I would expect that much more clarification and common sense be extracted from the data, which is not understandable (just raw data) and was identified as the justification for the selection of Alt 2, which the EIR group generated! We cannot accept a scoring system which is arbitrary and not impartial.

[NOTE: comment includes excerpts of the Draft EIR not reproduced here, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

See response to MASTER-5: Appropriateness of Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative 2).

See response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.

SCHMIDEK-D-7.2:

Comment (verbatim)

I would appreciate the mathematical work-up as well as the definitions of each impact. LUP-1 mean nothing to a reader! To have to go back and forth to find what AES-4, etc. are, should not be imposed on the readers and decision makers.

Response to Comment

Table 4.7-1 has been updated to include brief titles for each impact, to aid reader interpretation. **The updated table is included in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.** These minor clarifications do not affect the overall conclusions of the Draft EIR with respect to the environmentally superior alternative.

SCHMIDEK-D-7.3:

Comment (verbatim)

Also, given the very close scores of 58, 62, 62, we really need to use common sense and not just arbitrary numbers to justify the selections and scoring. As a minimum the items which have the highest grades of long term impact need to be discussed and analyzed with more details by all parties. This is not first grade arithmetic! Also note that Project Duration has great impact on the scoring, which is a very arbitrary comparison, specially since the duration the of construction of Alt 3 in just 2.2 years (EIR Pg. 4-182 shows 48 months while Pg 2-33 shows 25 months for Alt 3) is extremely questionable (with 100-206 workers on campus each day), and further does not consider the written commitment made by the IOOF organization for not building Bldg A in the Park for 7 years after the approval of the project by the City of Saratoga.

Response to Comment

Table 4.7-1 summarizes the overall significance conclusion of each impact for the proposed project and each alternative, based on the more detailed evaluation described within the various subsections of the Draft EIR. The duration and intensity of impacts are taken into consideration within the detailed analysis and are also indicated in the table with a plus (+) or minus (-) symbol where the overall significance conclusion for an alternative is the same but the duration or intensity of a particular impact would be greater or lesser, respectively. As described within the text of Section 4.7 of the Draft EIR, all three alternatives (and the No Project Alternative) would avoid the significant and unavoidable impact to historic resources that the proposed project would have, and therefore all of the alternatives are environmentally superior to the proposed project. See also response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.

The commenter suggests that there is inconsistency regarding the construction duration for Alternative 3; however, the 25-month duration described on page 2-33 of the Draft EIR relates to the proposed project, not to Alternative 3 (for which the construction duration is 48 months, as described on page 4-182 of the Draft EIR). With respect to the accuracy of construction duration or the IOOF organization's statement to residents that construction of Building A would be delayed for 7 years, please see response to MASTER-13: Duration of Construction.

SCHMIDEK-D-7.4:

Comment (verbatim)

Finally, I would suggest that Alt 2 be removed as it is judged not acceptable by either party (as I understand) and as it was generated by a third party not familiar with the campus and the Residents needs, Management needs and Campus life. It is really questionable why such a selection and submission should be made by a less than an involved party which may not, and does not, understand all the issues and negative implications of their inputs. For the same organization to be Judge, Jury and Plaintiff is not proper.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-5: Appropriateness of Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative 2).

SCHMIDEK-D-7.5:

Comment (verbatim)

I may have misunderstood the derivations and conclusions the EIR group made, but reading the EIR, the selection does NOT jump out, just to the contrary.....the table below mixes critical items with minutia, etc. and gives all items equal scores, etc.

There are just a few critically impacting issues with the proposals, and these should have major values.... I suggest that the two interested parties submit their top ~10-20 issues and objectives, and then a best can be derived.

Just for clarification, the opinions, conclusions and suggestions stated above are my own.

[NOTE: comment included excerpts from Draft EIR not reproduced here, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.

The purpose of CEQA is to analyze the proposed project as presented by the project applicant, and to identify and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project that might avoid or reduce the significant impacts of the proposed project, for consideration by the Lead Agency as part of their decision-making process (in addition to other non-CEQA matters). It is not within the scope of the CEQA process for the EIR to include negotiations between the project applicant and other interested parties regarding the issues and objectives.

SCHMIDEK-D-8.1:

Comment (verbatim)

In order to bypass the issues about the elimination of the Park in the middle of the SRC campus, which was so dedicated by the Odd Fellows years back, a lot of extraneous information is included in the EIR.

In the EIR on Pg 3-53 and 3-54 reference is made to a Camp 1.5 miles from SRC. Of what value is to suggest such an abandoned site, away more than the 3+ times the 1.5 miles suggested, on really hard mountain roads to drive on, is mind blowing. It is referenced as the nearest "largest open space". Is this to replace the Open Space, i.e. the Park, that the Alt 2 and Alt 3 plans eliminate by their suggestion to building upon with Bldg. A?

In addition, on same page, it mentions an Eucalyptus Grove and 5 acres of open space on the SRC campus. The grove was cut down some time ago for safety reasons, and is not and was not accessible! The 5 acres are not accessible either, are unkept, are steep, have bushes, fallen branches, and do not have trails and are defined as not accessible Open Space. Again why mention such locations, if they are of no consequence or use.

It also mentions a San Marcos Open Space trail. Again this is not easy to access, is relatively distant, and has worn steps and trails, and is quite steep in sections. The EIR is replete with such information which obfuscates the real issues of the horrible construction plans (Alt 2 and Alt 3), the many years of total disruption in the SRC Community, and ultimate elimination of open spaces.

Below is the current description of the referenced Camp Stuart.

History of the Nearest Large Open Space: Camp Stuart.

Founded in 1944, this camp is a defunct camp in Saratoga, California. The camp contains 144 acres (0.583 km²).

The camp had a pool, dining room, multipurpose building, flush toilets, shower building, meeting lodge and many campsites. The site served as a Cub Scout day camp, one of the largest in the United States, serving nearly 3000 Scouts each year.

The camp's last summer of operation was in 1988. The Santa Clara County Council already owned two other camps, and decided to sell this camp to take advantage of rising land values. The camp was sold in 1989, shortly before several buildings were damaged in the Loma Prieta earthquake. The county has not demolished or developed the camp, and has no funds or apparent plans for the area.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

The only reference to Camp Stuart is within Section 3.4, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR. The paragraph in which it is referenced is describing the presence of open space resources in the Santa Cruz Mountains generally, and the reference to Camp Stuart is provided for additional geographic context only. Furthermore, this section of the Draft EIR describes the environmental setting as relevant to biological resources, not recreational resources, therefore the current status of the camp facilities is not relevant to the description of the general area as an open space area or potential habitat for biological resources. Similarly, the commenter's concerns regarding the accessibility of the on-site open space easement and San Marcos Open Space are not of relevance to the potential of these areas to contain biological resources/habitat. No changes to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

SCHMIDEK-D-9.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Comments about the EIR for SRC augmentation. EIR Pg ii. And Pg 609.

This section already assumes that a Proposed Project was selected and awarded. Really?

This is a shameful section.

The EIR contains broken promises, contradictions and errors regarding the Park in Alt 2 and 3, as both eliminate the Park and its uses. Park uses are a plethora, from open air picnics with relatives, to Bocci Ball plays (7+ different matches each week with about 90

participants, to Horse Shoes (which has not been up-kept for years) to just ordinary sitting in an open air Park with friends and relatives for a Pic-Nic or just a rest.

It also negates the PRS proposal's construction time frame of 2.2 years, which is hard to believe.

Below are EIR sections with the broken promises regarding the Bocci Ball and Horse Shoes that were to be relocated, had Alt 2 or 3 been selected, to a location where the Bocci Ball Court would preserve its length of ~90 Ft. as well as space to allow spectators to be present during competitions.

Same applies to the Horse Shoes court which need much fixing, including the need for new horse shoes intended for seniors.

As to the trail, that has been resolved about 2 years ago with the City of Saratoga and its Trails Section and it just adds more line items to the EIR that are superfluous.

[NOTE: comment included excerpts from Draft EIR with some text colored for emphasis, which are not reproduced here. See Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

The Draft EIR does not assume that a proposed project was selected and awarded. As required by CEQA, the Draft EIR evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the project as proposed to the Lead Agency by the project applicant. The Draft EIR also evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project that might avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project and identifies an environmentally superior alternative, as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2). See also response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.

The existing use of the park area in the center of the SRC campus for picnics, bocce ball, horseshoe games, and other recreational activities is described in several sections of the Draft EIR (e.g., page 2-8 in Section 2.3.3, page 3-7 in Section 3.2.1 and page 3-258 in Section 3.15.1) and the required demolition/displacement of these features to facilitate construction of the proposed project (and Alternatives 2 and 3) is also acknowledged in multiple locations (e.g., page 3-94 in Section 3.5.3, pages 3-260 and 3-261 in Section 3.15.3, page 4-115 in Section 4.5.3, and page 4-180 in Section 4.6.3). See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

With respect to the commenter's statement that discussion of the public trail within the EIR is superfluous, the proposed construction of wayfinding signage and dedication of a public easement over the southern side of Odd Fellows Drive is a part of the project application submitted to the City, therefore it is appropriate to describe and evaluate these project components within the EIR.

SCHMIDEK-D-10.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Here is another contradiction of many, of the time line the PRS proposal suggests and others. It also draws wrong conclusions on construction durations, but it also uses the wrong building design that the EIR submittal includes, based on PRS documentation and not on Preserve documentation. The whole EIR should be scrapped and a new one

provided based on real information, less erroneous assumptions, and biased opinions. And the proposal from AECOM omitted.

[NOTE: comment included excerpts from Draft EIR not reproduced here with some text colored for emphasis. See Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

See response to MASTER-5: Appropriateness of Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative 2)

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

SCHMIDEK-D-11.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Please note that the construction has just doubled to 48 months from the previous 2 years and 2 months.

This nullifies the issue of the extended construction period that the Preserve suggested for the Alternative 1 Plan.

AECOM 4-181

[NOTE: comment included excerpts from Draft EIR not reproduced here. See Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

It is unclear what changes to the EIR (if any) are being requested by this comment. The excerpted section of the Draft EIR included in the comment relates to Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative), for which the construction duration would be 48 months (as described in Section 4.6.1 on page 4-126 of the Draft EIR). Alternative 3 is estimated to take longer to construct than the proposed project (25 month construction duration), as only limited overlap of construction phases would be possible under Alternative 3. Because the employee parking lot in the northern corner of the site is the proposed location of a new building (Building D) under Alternative 3, this area would not be available for construction staging throughout all construction phases (as it would be for the proposed project). Therefore, construction of Building A would not be started until Buildings C and D are largely completed, so that the Building A area could be used for staging.

To the extent that the commenter may be suggesting that the construction duration assumed within the Draft EIR for the proposed project and/or one the alternatives might be inaccurate or unrealistic, please see response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration. To the extent that the commenter may be suggesting that the construction-related impacts of Alternative 1 (Residents' Alternative) would be different if the construction duration of the proposed project were to take longer than assumed in the Draft EIR, it should be noted that the environmental impacts of each alternative were analyzed based on the estimated construction duration for each alternative, independent of the proposed construction duration of the proposed project.

SCHMIDEK-D-12.1:

Comment (verbatim)

There are hundreds of issues with the SRC EIR.

Here are the few key ones as I see it:

- 1. The fact that AECOM decided to be judge and jury and had the gall to present THEIR Alt 2, which is not a compromise or anything acceptable.*

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-5: Appropriateness of Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative 2).

SCHMIDEK-D-12.2:

Comment (verbatim)

- 2. The facts that they misrepresented and misjudged the Alternative 1 by NOT using the Building footprint and size that was submitted by Preserve.*

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

SCHMIDEK-D-12.3:

Comment (verbatim)

- 3. By having numerous gross errors, contradictions and totally irrelevant material in the EIR as filler, preventing reasonable analysis of the alternatives.*

Response to Comment

With respect to the alleged “gross errors, contradictions, and totally irrelevant material” in the EIR, the commenter appears to have in some cases confused the description and analysis of the proposed project (as described in Section 2 of the Draft EIR and analyzed within Section 3) with the alternatives, as described and analyzed in Section 4.4 (Alternative 1, Residents' Alternative), Section 4.5 (Alternative 2, Reduced Development Alternative), and Section 4.6 (Alternative 3, Applicant's Alternative). See also response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-12.5 below.

Whilst some minor inconsistencies and errors have been identified within the Draft EIR, these are proposed to be corrected in response to the various comments that have identified them and/or as staff initiated changes, as described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below. These minor corrections do not result in any changes to the conclusions of the Draft EIR or the significance of environmental impacts and are not sufficient as to have precluded meaningful public review of the EIR.

SCHMIDEK-D-12.4:

Comment (verbatim)

- 4. By minimizing or omitting reference to critical and life impacting conditions, by suggesting that life issues are campus internal and not pertinent to EIR.*

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

SCHMIDEK-D-12.5:

Comment (verbatim)

5. *By not addressing the terrific impact of the contradictory multi years (2 or 4 or 6 or ???) constructions and closures on lives of ~300 inhabitants of SRC*

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

SCHMIDEK-D-12.6:

Comment (verbatim)

Bottom line: The EIR is a compendium of error, misstatement, incorrect conclusions and assumptions, using incorrect construction plans, and irrelevant information, which confuses the readers and will prevent correct final selection.

Response to Comment

See response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-12.3 above.

It is unclear what “incorrect construction plans” the commenter refers to. The analysis of the proposed project’s environmental impacts within the Draft EIR was based on the plans submitted to the City by the project applicant, the most recent version of which are dated April 4, 2022, and which excerpts are available on the City’s website (full plans available for viewing at the City offices). To the extent that this comment concerns the differences between Alternative 1 (Residents’ Alternative) as described and analyzed in the Draft EIR compared to the submittal by Preserve SRC, see response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents’ Alternative (Alternative 1).

SCHMIDEK-D-13.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Here is another set of reasons why the PRS so called Project in the EIR should be rejected, and this is to include the Alt 2 and Alt 3, as all three will impact the living center of the SRC campus for years of construction and gravely affect the SRC senior residents.

These three (3) project alternatives have a very similar terrible effect on the lives of current and future residents and NONE of them should be considered acceptable and thus approved.

All 3 Alternatives introduce horrible disruption of the lives of a Senior Community for many years, and thus the ~ 200 current and future residents. It also removes open air facilities by a building in the Park.

This project, in any disguise, will affect Residents for 430,000 days in their lives. Just for validation here is the calculation:

—> 200 residents in IL, for 356 days per year, for 6 years, results in 430,000 person days, will be affected by this project during construction. (This excludes secondary affects on the Assisted Living and HC residents.)

Please note that the duration of the constructions is defined differently in different sections of the EIR, and is questionable given the assumption of manpower availability, of up to 200 workers at the same time on the campus, etc. Just the transportation of workers from the WV College campus will take hours, twice per day, and the truck traffic will be horrible, and the noise unacceptable. To top it off, streets will be closed for months, not allowing Residents safe access to their Cottages and to their garaged vehicles, etc.

Is this what a Senior in a senior community in Saratoga should expect? Is this why we paid huge entry deposits and pay large monthly fees? Our contracts did not have this devastating eventuality exonerated!

This does not address the disruptions and noise in the current HC building, when bathroom shower upgrades may be made to all Double Beds rooms - somehow the single bed rooms were not included in the upgrade plan.

The PRS proposed plans and alternatives are a horrible treatment of Seniors in a Senior Community, which the City of Saratoga MUST not allow.

If it must be, THERE IS A BETTER WAY!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

Comments relating to entry deposits, monthly fees, and contractual expectations are not of relevance to the analysis of environmental impacts and do not require further response under CEQA.

SCHMIDEK-D-14.1:

Comment (verbatim)

One of the key features that all constructions generally have is the provision for human needs for all the different construction plans over the full duration of each of the plans.

I would expect that the EIR would include the location, quantity, installation durations, of Porta Potties for the each of the five (5) plans identified in the EIR for up to 200 daily workers.

We would expect that such locations be somewhat obfuscated and not “in your face” to reduce the visual unpleasantnesses of the constructions and thus of the view of these facilities during the many years of construction.

To show that I am an advocate of the Preserve Plan, Alternative 1, these provisions for these human needs could be located in a much less visible and in less your face location, just off McLaren Ln, in open space.

I appreciate you bringing this up to assure that the next version of the EIR addresses such needs.

Response to Comment

Construction worker sanitary facilities would be located within the construction staging areas for the proposed project (or its alternatives). In accordance with City Code 16-75.050, construction project sites must be fenced with 6-foot high opaque fence and kept in a reasonable clean condition as defined in that section of the code. Such fencing would largely screen any portable sanitation facilities from adjacent areas of the campus. Although some existing residents in elevated units facing towards a construction staging zone might be able to see such sanitary facilities due to the angle from their unit to the facility, such temporary views from private residential units, particularly on the Project site, do not rise to the level of a significant aesthetic impact under CEQA, for the same reason described in response to MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Quality.

See also response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

SCHMIDEK-D-15.1:

Comment (verbatim)

This is the commentary to the City announcement about the SRC project.

I have some of my own comments as current resident of SRC:

- 1. Relocation of outdoor facilities — should read: Elimination of outdoor facilities/Park*
- 2. New Landscaping — Wonder where this may be???*
- 3. Public Trail — this was defined, agreed to and documented with city many months ago - it is not a trail.*
- 4. Meeting Room — is more like a 2 stories Building with Garage for XX vehicles appended to the Manor*
- 5. Protected trees — should state “majestic redwood” and other trees for a total of ~65*
- 6. Received plans from the public - SRC residents are not “public” but 120 plus Senior SRC Residents.*
- 7. Also included is an minimalistic alternate (?) Plan from the EIR consultants.*

I would think that the EIR description in the City web site deserves more clarity and revising.

[NOTE: comment included excerpts from the City's website for the SRC project, not reproduced here. See Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

This comment relates to details about the SRC project from the City's website, not the Draft EIR. To the extent that the comment raises concerns regarding topics that are addressed in the Draft EIR, please see response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space; MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room on Historic Manor Building; MASTER-22: Loss of Trees; MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors; and MASTER-5: Appropriateness of Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 2).

SCHMIDEK-D-16.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I have one additional comment as a current resident of SRC:

- 8. The current PRS request for additional buildings is based ONLY on the fact that the 1996 approved expansion did not build all the units approved, thus the new submittal is based on ONLY unbuilt "number of units" and not by approved buildings by size? Was not the previous approval based on specific building size (Width, Length, Height) or just on number of Units to be constructed. (Note that a present suggestion (Alt 2) is to reduce the size of units, to thus be able to structure more apartments in the same space!)*

I would think that the PRS submission and the EIR description in the City web site deserves more clarity, completeness and revising.

[NOTE: comment included excerpts from the City's website for the SRC project, not reproduced here. See Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

This comment relates to details about the SRC project from the City's website, not the Draft EIR. Information regarding the previous Master Plan that was approved by the City in 1996 is provided in Section 1.3, Project Background (page 1-7 of the Draft EIR), for context. The proposed project is a separate development application and would include a zoning change request for a Planned Combined District overlay, which (if approved by the City) would allow an increase in the number of units, total site coverage, and total floor area compared to the previously-approved Master Plan.

SCHMIDEK-D-17.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I just found the description of the SRC project on the Saratoga City web site that includes some information not found (?) in the EIR and at the same time it fails to fully analyze the traffic in the proposed plan. Most significantly it omitted the view from Garage exits of several building, and thus the very high danger of this plan.

If you view the maps copied for the Project description you will notice:

- 1. The Garage entry/exit from the Meeting Room has not been considered for safety and uphill viewing.*
- 2. The intersection between the Pavilion Circle and West Cottages lane similarly has not been analyzed for safety, etc.*

3. *The analysis of several intersections did not consider the blocked views by parked cars.*
4. *The width of W. Cottages Ln. appears to have been reduced as parking places have been eliminated.*
5. *Sidewalks on W. Cottages Ln. appear to have been deleted and entry to the Meeting Rm. for visitors is very hazardous.*
6. *The view of the truck unloading on Pavilion Circle in the trash staging area is bogus. No semi will be able to back into that space.*

[NOTE: comment included excerpts from the City's website, photographs of the project site, and figures that are not reproduced here. See Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

This comment includes excerpts of Figure 6 and Figure D-1 from the traffic study prepared for the proposed project, which was included as Appendix F of the Draft EIR. With respect to the specific issues raised by the commenter, these are addressed in turn below.

1. Sight distance from new driveways and intersections that would be created on the SRC campus by the proposed project are analyzed on pages 17 through 19 of the traffic study (Appendix F of the Draft EIR). The analysis included the driveway out of the meeting room garage, which was determined have approximately 230 feet of sight distance looking south, provided that landscaping does not block the sight distance, as included in the second-to-last paragraph on page 17 of the traffic study. Mitigation measure MM-TRA-3b requires that vegetation be maintained to prevent obstruction of sight distance, and minor edits are also proposed to this mitigation measure in response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-3.2 to ensure that no signage would be installed that could block sight distance.
2. The intersection between Pavilion Circle and West Cottages Lane is an existing intersection that is not proposed to be modified as part of the project. Although the volume of traffic using this intersection would increase due to the proposed construction of Building A, which would be accessed via a parking garage off Pavilion Circle, the sight distance and geometry of the intersection would not be changed by the proposed project.
3. The only proposed new intersection or driveway which has on-street parking on the same side of the street as exiting vehicles is the proposed exit from the Building A entry plaza onto West Cottages Lane. Parking would be set-back approximately 10 feet from either side of this driveway exit. As discussed in response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space, the Project Applicant has submitted a revised design for the area immediately west of Building A, which would eliminate the circular access driveway/drop-off zone to make space for a full size bocce court. Removing this access driveway/drop-off zone would eliminate two new curb cuts on West Cottages Lane and would not introduce any additional features that would adversely affect traffic safety compared to the original project design.
4. The width of West Cottages Lane and provision of on-street parking shown in the traffic study figures are identical to that shown in the project plans submitted to the City

by the applicant. Site circulation is analyzed on page 22 of the traffic study (Draft EIR Appendix F).

5. The sidewalks and pedestrian access network shown in the traffic study figures are identical to that shown in the project plans submitted to the City by the applicant, and are analyzed on page 22 of the traffic study (Draft EIR Appendix F). Access to the Meeting Room would occur via off-street pedestrian pathways that enter at the eastern end of the Meeting Room, away from West Cottages Lane and the Meeting Room garage.

6. As described on page 21 of the traffic study (Draft EIR Appendix F), the loading zone at the rear of the Manor Building (off Pavilion Circle) is 12 feet by 45 feet with 14 feet of overhead clearance, as required by Section 15-35.070 of the City's Code.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See also response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

SCHMIDEK-D-18.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Please add these comparisons to the EIR comments, in case the readers have a hard time finding this in the EIR.

Not sure what Bldg. D in Alternative 1 is in Table 4.4.1, and why it requires the longest construction time. (Should be C1)

Also not clear why Alt. 3 (ACD) has a duration of 48 months (Max. 165 workers) while Original (ABC) has a duration of 25 months, with an average of 99 workers (Max. 206 workers). Note that the Preserve plan has an average of 45 workers, with a max of 75, less than half of the workers for the other plans, and thus much less intrusive and invasive.

In addition it must be considered the location of the constructions. The PRS and AECOM are in the middle of the campus, while the Preserve are at the periphery of the campus, thus hardly invasive to the residents or campus.

The Alt 2, construction of Bldg. A and Bldg. C concurrently would be a real nightmare and pose great hazards.

Finally, using averages, for worker numbers, this is not the real picture for workers on site, as over many months the number ranges between 165 and 205, which equates to the number of IL Residents at SRC!

Given the worker shuttle capacity of about 15 persons per trip from the WVC parking lot to SRC, this would require over one hour to bring all the workers to the work site, and an other hour to shuttle them from the site, thus reducing the actual hours worked, and extending the overall duration of construction by ~15% or more.

Bottom line..... Having from 100 to 200 workers per day on the campus for years, with noisy and dirty construction in process, would be such an horrendous disruptions to the lives of all SRC residents, that it cannot be considered or allowed.

This would be an INHUMAN actions taken on Senior SRC Living Residents.

[NOTE: comment included excerpts from the Draft EIR, not reproduced here. See Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

Building D under Alternative 1 (Residents' Alternative) is the 52-unit independent living building that would be constructed in the same location as the existing Health Center, once that building has been demolished, as described in Section 4.4.1 (page 4-9) of the Draft EIR. Note that Building D of Alternative 1 is different than Building D of Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative), which would be constructed in the same location as the existing employee parking lot in the northwest corner of the campus as described in Section 4.6.1 (page 4-125) of the Draft EIR.

As discussed in response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-11,1, the 48-month construction duration for Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative) is longer than the proposed project (25 months), even though there are the same number of new buildings, because Alternative 3 would have less overlap between construction phases due to the need to use the Building A construction area for staging during the construction of Buildings C and D.

As stated by the commenter, Alternative 1 (Residents' Alternative) would require fewer daily workers than the proposed project or other alternatives. This is because each phase of construction for Alternative 1 would be undertaken in sequence, with no overlap, due to the need to have continuous, uninterrupted operation of the skilled nursing services currently undertaken in the Health Center building. This results in a longer, less intensive construction period for Alternative 1 than for the proposed project.

With respect to the comments regarding worker shuttle use, please see response to comment MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion.

See also response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

See also response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See also response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

SCHMIDEK-D-19.1:

Comment (verbatim)

How can such a determining and concluding statement be in the Preliminary EIR: The City has Determined? I did not think that the City had determined anything yet.

Does this suggest that a One Building alternative would be even more superior?

[NOTE: comment included excerpts from Draft EIR and City website, not reproduced here. See Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

As indicated by its title, the Draft EIR is a draft document, which is released to allow review and comments from responsible and trustee agencies, stakeholders, and the general public prior to being finalized and presented to City decisionmakers for potential certification. This Final EIR will be considered for certification by the City. In response to

this comment, minor edits have been made to the EIR to remove the statement “the City has determined that” from the excerpted section, to provide better clarity for readers as to the current status of the document and conclusions within. **These proposed edits are described in Section 4 of this Final EIR, below.**

See also response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.

3.4.91 Commenter SCHMIDEK-J&V

SCHMIDEK-J&V-1.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-15. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-15.1 through FORM-15.2.

SCHMIDEK-J&V-2.1:

Comment (verbatim)

Concerning the Environmental Impact Report on Saratoga Retirement Community

Let me ask you a question.

If you had a swimming pool in your backyard, & you were told, “We’re taking it away from you & building an apartment house in its place.”

How would you feel?

If they told you that it would be of minimal impact on you because the YMCA a few miles from you has a very nice pool.

How would you feel?

And if they said to you: “We’re taking your remaining yard away from you to build even more apartments. No matter. You have plenty of open space just a few miles away.”

How would you feel?

And what if you couldn’t drive to get to that pool or park or open space?

And what if you had limited mobility – and even hiring an Uber would be out of the question?

And what if you currently pay for those lovely resources which were promised to you even before you moved in?

And what if you had to continue to pay for these amenities even after they were taken away from you?

How would you feel?

Would this be of minimal impact to you? Minimal to your life style, to your comfort, to your well being, to your very health?

The DEIR does not even begin to understand or address these issues.

These matters not only affect the 200 Independent Residents of SRC, but the 130+ Residents in Assisted Living, the 18 folks in Memory Care, the 60 patients in the Health Center, the families who visit us, and all the outside residents who live in the areas surrounding the SRC campus who use our space for their own enjoyment.

Put yourself for a moment in the place of all those folks. And NOW, How do you feel?

We are not against enhancements & modernizations. But please review & adopt the Residents Plan. It addresses & implements the needed improvements but without the devastating impact that the PRs plan would have on our lives.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness

SCHMIDEK-J&V-3.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-23. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-23.1.

SCHMIDEK-J&V-4.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-3. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-3.1.

3.4.92 Commenter SHEW-R

SHEW-R-1.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

SHEW-R-2.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

SHEW-R-3.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

SHEW-R-4.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

3.4.93 Commenter SILBERMAN-N

SILBERMAN-N-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

- 1. The DEIR did not consider the Scenic impact of the proposed Meeting center on the side of the Manor which will bloc the full view of the Manor and affect its historic character, also will block the view from the three apartments located on the western side of the Manor.*
- 2. The DEIR did not consider the impact of building A on top of the Historic park hill blocking of the western view from building 4000 and from the Pavilion Entry to buildings 4000 and 5000.*

Response to Comment

As discussed in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR (in particular, Impact AES-2 in Section 3.2.3) and in response to MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Quality, views of the project site (including the Manor Building and “Historic Park”) from surrounding properties are not identified as a scenic vista by the City, and the project site is not located within or near a State Scenic Highway. Furthermore, the Manor Building and “Historic Park” has limited visibility from public roads in the vicinity or other publicly accessible vantage points. Impacts to the private views of individual residents from their homes are typically not considered a significant aesthetic impact under CEQA. No revisions to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

See also Impact CUL-1 in Section 3.5.3 of the Draft EIR and response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building, for further discussion of why of the proposed meeting room would not have a significant and unavoidable impact on the historic character (including setting) of the Manor Building.

See also response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park for further discussion of why the “Historic Park” is not an historical resource under CEQA.

SILBERMAN-N-2.1:

Comment (verbatim)

1. *The EIR did not consider the following regarding building A impact to the air a climate quality:*
 - a. *The building will block the Western air flow which typically has a cooling effect. Building A will create a standing air pocket together with buildings 4000 and 5000 and increase the ambient temperature significantly, especially in hot days. The EIR should consider the fact that the eastern slope trees will be removed and with them the shade. Concrete building and black asphalt around will absorb the and retain the heat increasing the surrounding temperature through radiation. There are better places for building A to be considered.*
2. *THE EIR did not consider the compound impact of all Air Quality components*
 - a. *The city consultant recommends that residents stay indoors with Air conditioner during lengthy construction (estimated 3-5 years). This is not a reasonable request. Continuous use of Air Condition will increase the carbon profile of the entire site and generate more greenhouse gases.*
 - b. *While it is possible that during construction each one of the Air Quality components will meet the required standard, the EIR did not consider the compound effect of all air quality elements being present at the same time and their impact on the more sensitive elderly population living on site. For example dust, pollens, gases emitted by construction equipment, gases emitted by construction trucks, gases emitted by cars around the campus, plus the elements generated by existing SRC equipment could be present at the same time beyond allowable limits and creating health hazards. Therefore serious mitigation required needs to be put in place before start of construction or change the implementation plans.*

Response to Comment

With respect to the comment regarding the loss of shade from the removal of trees, refer to response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees. As shown in the landscape drawings submitted to the City with the project application, the landscape surrounding Building A would not include black asphalt; rather, Building A would be surrounded by permeable concrete pavement, low irrigation ground covers, and shrubs and planting beds; therefore, the urban heat island effect described by the commenter would not occur. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 3.6.3 of the Draft EIR, the new buildings would meet the energy efficiency standards set forth by Title 24 of the California Administrative Code and the Appliance Efficiency Regulations, which regulates energy consumption for the heating, cooling, ventilation, and lighting of residential buildings. The project would also be designed to meet “Build It Green” energy standards. These standards include

roofing requirements for the thermal emittance, three-year aged reflectance, and Solar Reflectance Index (SRI) of roofing materials used in new construction to minimize the urban heat island effect. Furthermore, each of the proposed apartment buildings would be provided with roof mounted solar photovoltaic system, which is an identified measure included in the BAAQMD's Clean Air Plan for cool roofs.

With respect to the comment regarding the use of air conditioning and potential impact to greenhouse gas emissions, the use of air conditioning within each individual unit would vary by each resident's personal preference for indoor temperatures. Therefore, the potential increase in energy consumption would not be consistent across each building or unit, and would vary by season and time of year. In addition, as described in Section 3.6.1 of the Draft EIR, the existing buildings at the Project site receive power through the community choice aggregation program, the Silicon Valley Clean Energy. Silicon Valley Clean Energy program provides 100 percent greenhouse gas emissions free electricity to participating customers; therefore, even if air conditioning use, and thereby, energy consumption, increases for the duration of construction, because the existing buildings receive power from clean and renewable resources built and purchased by Silicon Valley Clean Energy, the additional energy consumption would not lead to an increase in indirect greenhouse gas emissions.

With respect to the comment regarding the compound effects of all air quality elements being present at the same time during construction, refer to Section 3.3.3 (Impact AIR-3) of the Draft EIR and response to MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality. Impact AIR-3 concludes that Project construction activities would not expose on-site receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (i.e., the excess cancer risk for onsite receptors would not exceed the BAAQMD threshold of significance). However, the maximum annual PM_{2.5} concentrations would exceed the BAAQMD threshold of significance. With implementation of mitigation measure MM-AIR-3, the maximum annual PM_{2.5} concentrations would be reduced below the recommended threshold of significance. Therefore, the on-site, elderly residents would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations. In addition, Section 3.3.4, Impact C-AIR-2, includes a cumulative cancer risk and annual PM_{2.5} concentration analysis associated with Project construction activities, and concludes that the overlapping construction activities in the project vicinity and existing SRC emission sources would not exceed the BAAQMD cumulative threshold for cancer risk of 100 in a million or the 0.8 micrograms per cubic meter annual PM_{2.5} concentration threshold. No revisions to the Draft EIR are required in response to this comment.

SILBERMAN-N-3.1:

Comment (verbatim)

The Draft Environmental Report does not represent Alternative 1 - Residents' Alternative, Section 4.4, correctly. A number of glaring errors are included in this Section 4.4. Starting with Figure 4.4-1, the Conceptual Site plan for the Residents' Alternative submitted by the Residents shows the layout of the New Health Center, Building C', and the New 2 story Apartment Building, Building D. The layout of Building D is important as it is the same footprint as the current Health Care Center and would provide for 52 apartments and an auditorium. However Figure 4.4-2 Conceptual Building D Layout- Alternative 1, shows a completely different building layout (shape) and claims the building needs 3 stories. This Layout was provided by Ankron Mclean,

the architect for the Project Applicant, who changed the Alternative 1 design, thereby attempting to discredit the Residents' Alternative.

Ankron Moisan also misrepresented other features in Alternative 1, such as the size and shape of Alternative 1 's New Health Center, Building C' (should be 40 beds rather than the Project's 52 beds), the number of Parking spaces in Building D'S underground garage (only 50 spaces vs 90 submitted under Alternative 1), and incorrect values in Table 4.4-2 for the Cut volume and max depth of cut for a correct Alternative 1, Building D. Based on these errors the DEIR Section 4.1 Alternative 1 needs major corrections.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

SILBERMAN-N-3.2:

Comment (summary)

This comment contains text identical to that found within FORM-24.

Response to Comment

See response to comments FORM-24.1 through FORM-24.3.

SILBERMAN-N-3.3:

Comment (verbatim)

Also needs evaluation of composite (additive) air hazards together impact on the health and wellbeing of current residents living on site.

Response to Comment

See response to comment SILBERMAN-N-2.1, above.

SILBERMAN-N-4.1:

Comment (verbatim)

WHY BUILDING A SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM THE HISTORIC PARK PLAN AND PLACED SOMEWHERE ELSE IF NECESSARY:

It takes away the only easily accessible Recreation area with no equivalent replacement somewhere else on the campus and within easy reach distance. The project architects proposed a minimal recreation area insufficient for the size of population and type of population on campus. The EIR recommendation does not consider the type and age of the campus population, recommending using parks outside the campus. The city's consultant did not consider need for easy and Equal-Access . Many of the residents are over 80 years old and not driving. Many residents are using canes, walkers and wheelchairs and need easy access to outdoor recreation. The EIR recommendation is totally inconsiderate and oblivious to the current resident's needs. Can you see your 80 or 90-year-old grandparents using a walker, to walk over a mile and cross busy streets to get to a remote park? How about the other irreplaceable facilities in the Historic Park, like Bace ball, and others? How about the picnic tables in the shade to play games and have lunch? How about equal access law in California which prevents handicapped discrimination?

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

SILBERMAN-N-5.1:

Comment (verbatim)

My name is Nathan Silberman, and I am a resident of the Saratoga Retirement Community, also known as the Odd Fellows retirement home. Some of the reasons I joined this community are the beautiful open spaces surrounded by green lawns and mature, protected redwoods and oaks and the stunning recreation area in the center of the community in the Historical Park.

The over-the-top expansion being pursued by the developer Pacific Retirement Solutions in Medford OR is totally disastrous to the environment and to the elderly residents' quality of life.

One of the many reasons I am in opposition to the proposed implementation of the project is that the management company/developer plans to wipe-out the Odd Fellows Historic Park, which is the only outdoor recreation space we have. They plan to fill the Park with a large 2-story [or, I believe, possibly a 3-story?] apartment building and underground garage with an entry and exit in the worst possible place, prone to traffic jams and presenting a worse safety risk. Also, no more protected, mature redwoods and oaks; no more open space and no more easily accessible (to handicap residents) bocce ball court and other play grounds. All of that sacrificed to the inappropriate infill construction proposed by management.

The Draft EIR comments that residents could possibly make use of public parks in Saratoga if they want exercise... parks miles away from campus. But can you imagine old folks with canes, wheelchairs and walkers having to go off campus to partake in open-air recreation, crossing busy roads? Someone said to me, "even state prisons have an exercise area, so why not us oldsters; because we're old"? It looks to me like age discrimination, or elderly abuse....

I would like to encourage the city of Saratoga council to deeply analyze this development application, especially the irreversible impacts it will bring to an historic building, a Saratoga institution and 65 endangered, beautiful, mature protected trees... And to also be aware of your fellow neighbors, local senior citizens whose life will be detrimentally affected forever due to poor management's decisions on implementation.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

SILBERMAN-N-6.1:

Comment (verbatim)

We disagree the mitigation suggestions are practical and enforceable. (Mitigation MM-TRA-3b: Implement Recommendations of Traffic Study page xx (and page 3-285)

“A. The Project Applicant shall implement all recommendations of the Traffic Study prepared for the Project by Hexagon Transportation. My analysis of Hexagon Transportation Report shows major errors in assessing /or not assessing at all the internal traffic models and critical traffic intersections within the campus. The report is flawed in many areas and City consultants should question the conclusions reached by the PRS traffic consultants.

iv that the Project Applicant clearly communicate with the delivery vehicles that they need to park in designated areas on site. History shows that communication with the delivery vehicles is inexistent and probably not feasible.

B. In addition, the Project Applicant shall develop and implement a delivery schedule for vendors so that the number of simultaneous deliveries to campus does not exceed the available designated loading space.” SRC does not have a traffic control and coordination personnel on site neither any personnel with appropriate skills and training.

[NOTE: comment included images, see Appendix A for details.]

Pictures the right shows the current loading zone, full of garbage and bins and narrow space for loading. Picture on the right: where the white truck parks would be the entrance to the potential Building A garage entrance. Currently delivery trucks, maintenance vehicles and garage bins are all along the Pavilion Cir. Can you imagine how much worse it will be if there is the additional garage entrance for building A ? What happens if emergency vehicle has to come through this congestion? Calling the police to enforce is too slow for any emergency. Notifying the emergency vehicle for road blocking is not practical.

Response to Comment

As discussed in Section 3.16 of the Draft EIR, the existing congestion issues at the receiving dock and loading zone, and potential for the proposed project to exacerbate them, were identified in the Traffic Study prepared for the project (Appendix F of the Draft EIR). This report, and earlier iterations of it, were peer reviewed by an independent third party retained by the City (Fehr and Peers 2020a; 2020b). Mitigation measure MM-TRA-1b includes measures to address the identified congestion issues. Responsibilities for implementing mitigation measures during project construction as well as throughout ongoing operations would be defined in the Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program that is required to be prepared and adopted by the City, if the project (or an alternative) is adopted. Ultimately, the City, as Lead Agency, would be responsible for verifying that mitigation measures are implemented.

See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Response/Evacuation.

SILBERMAN-N-6.2:

Comment (verbatim)

We disagree with the Mm-TRA-3a

- It is unsafe for this Senior population to walk or drive during and after construction at the particular intersection. The senior have a particular set of requirements because of the slow reaction time, the impaired mobility , poor eye sight and hard at hearing. Much more detailed studies need for this particular population. The intersection mentioned is the only way from the Pavilion entrance to the Western Cottages and to the employees parking.*

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

SILBERMAN-N-6.3:

Comment (verbatim)

- Emergency Evacuation for the 600 plus SRC residents and employees and neighbors on San Marcos Lane and the Fellowship Plaza, needs more study. It is a basic health and safety issue.*

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

SILBERMAN-N-7.1:

Comment (verbatim)

These following key points are our arguments against the Alternative 2

- 1) Replacement of the full size Bocce ball court by a 2/3-size court at West Cottage Lane is not acceptable.*
- 2) SRC would lose most of our outdoor recreation space*
- 3) Loss of the safe and green space that we all enjoy*
- 4) Loss of our public park*
- 5) Loss of our walking pathways on Campus*

[NOTE: comment included images, see Appendix A for details.]

**Building A occupies entire open space of ODD Fellows Historic Park*

**The View from street becomes of balconies and buildings. Instead of trees and green open space.*

**Bocce Ball Court reduced from 91 feet to 60 feet and shade eliminated.*

Following are the bases for our objections:

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Odd Fellows Historical Memorial park today May 2023 – residents play Bocce and relax at the picnic area in the desolated park – the only outdoors green space on campus.

[NOTE: comment included images, see Appendix A for details.]

Support argument for:

1) Replacement of the full size Bocce ball court by a 2/3-size court at West Cottage Lane is not acceptable.

The full-length Bocce ball court should not be replaced by the smaller 2/3-length court. Currently, over 60 residents regularly participate on Bocce ball teams. Bocce ball is the only outdoors recreation that many SRC residents enjoy. It is the most popular sport regularly enjoyed by SRC residents. To reduce the court to 2/3 of full size is a real loss, not just a displacement.

We do not agree with the following statement from the DEIR. It is not "displaced." it is not replaced. The "reconstructed elsewhere" option is vague and not an acceptable alternative.

Mitigate loss of Recreation topic 3-260 shown in underlined paragraph from DEIR:

The proposed construction of Building A would displace the existing outdoor private recreational facilities (e.g., bocce ball court, putting green, horseshoe pits, picnic tables). These facilities would be reconstructed elsewhere on campus, although some of the reconstructed facilities may be of smaller size than the existing facilities. The existing bocce ball court, putting green, picnic tables, and horseshoe pits would be demolished to create space for proposed Building A and smaller replacement facilities would be constructed to the west of Building A.

The impact is significant. We do not agree with the conclusion here:

Impact REC-2: Construction or Expansion of New Recreational Facilities

Impact REC-2 would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Support material for:

2) SRC would lose most of our outdoor recreation space

This proposal would completely eliminate our only on-site outdoor recreational space. The wide range of indoor private recreational activities do not replace outdoor recreational activity. The Odd Fellows Park is the ONLY place for OUTDOOR activities. Outdoor space for relaxation and exercise is imperative to maintain the health, physical and mental, of our residents. The picnic tables, the chairs, the shaded areas to sit under are essential environmental requirements for senior living. Having a safe and uncrowded green campus is one of the reasons that residents choose to live here. Diminishing the outdoor recreational area also has an adverse physical effect on the environment, which is currently in a green, open undisturbed area, contrary to the DEIR.

We do not agree with the following statement from the DEIR

These relocated recreational facilities are for the private residents of the SRC and would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment, as they

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

would be constructed on previously disturbed areas as part of the overall development of the proposed Project.

"Nevertheless, given the wide range of indoor and outdoor private recreational activities available on campus . . ."

This park is the heart of the SRC campus. Even though there are 28 acres of existing public park nearby, these are inaccessible to elderly SRC residents who have limited mobility on walkers or wheel chair or who do not drive. The EIR consultants contend that residents can travel to other public areas for outdoor recreation. But the closest area, Gardiner Park, is 1.2 mile away. Would you require your elderly parents to travel to parks when they have an accessible park at their back door?

[NOTE: comment included excerpts from Draft EIR not reproduced here. See Appendix A for details.]

Support material for:

3) Loss of the safe and green space that we all enjoy

Even though the Project would occupy only 6% of the 37- acre SRC campus, this is the entire amount of green open space available here. We lose 100% of our outdoors open green space. The impact on Scenic quality is substantial and completely destroys the bucolic, semi-urban atmosphere, leaving a cluster of apartment buildings spread over the campus. The EIR failed to analyze this important issue. The PRS master plan plants a two-story apartment building on one of the two remaining open spaces we have (the other being the west side of the Manor, where the proposed meeting room would be erected). To eliminate all the green open space would also have a detrimental effect on air quality.

Support material for:

4) Loss of our own campus green open space.

We do NOT agree with the following assessment from the EIR. The Senior SRC residents are not able to take advantage of the existing public park and recreation facilities within proximity to the Project site. Do you expect that the Seniors take a Uber to go to these open space on walkers? Once our own green open space is eliminated, there is no substitute.

"Based on the provision of new private indoor recreational facilities on campus the availability of existing public park and recreation facilities within proximity to the Project site, the new public trail connection that would be provided along Odd Fellows Drive as part of the Project. and the limited number of new residents on the Project site compared to City projections. implementation of the Project is not anticipated to increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other public recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of such facilities would occur or be accelerated. Therefore. the impact would be less than significant. "

Recreation impact and environment

Impact REC-I: Construction or Expansion of New Recreational Facilities As for the public, we see regularly the neighbors walking their dogs, jogging or bicycling on our

campus. To them it is very pleasant and closely so that they do not have to take a car to drive to the other city parks. When told there would not have the Odd Fellows park and the other green open space, they were shocked and will protest. This is a total destroy of the beautiful, suburban environment. It eliminates the only green open spaces in this neighborhood. The environment impact would be very significant to the SRC residents and the neighbors.

[NOTE: comment included images, see Appendix A for details.]

Support material for:

5) Loss of our walking pathways on campus

Is it possible or practical to have at the SRC seniors hike up the San Marcos Open space along the Odd Fellow Lane Easement to Chester road or Gypsy Hill Road and via de Marcos where there are NO pedestrian sidewalks? What do they mean by “no impact or less than significant impact” on the environment? The DEIR claims that the San Marcos Open Space is only 300 feet to the southeast of the Project site, but that is direct air distance, up a steep embankment – inaccessible without a helicopter! It is at least a 2.5-mile round trip on foot. The statements shown below show no understanding of seniors’ needs or respect for seniors’ quality of life. It is an insult to the Senior citizens. The consultants should measure the real walking distance through paved streets and not the aerial distance on a map.

Response to Comment

Although this comment pertains specifically to Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative), the comments raised relate to the impacts of Building A, which is part of both the proposed project and Alternative 2. The master responses MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space and MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park address these issues as they pertain to Building A of the proposed project and are equally valid in response to the same issues as they pertain to Building A of Alternative 2.

See also response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors, which is also applicable to the analysis of Alternative 2 as well as the proposed project.

3.4.94 Commenter SNOWBRIDGE-S

SNOWBRIDGE-S-1.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-17. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-17.1.

SNOWBRIDGE-S-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

Our full-size Bocce Ball court is very important for many of our people!! It is outdoor event and the only place we can use to play Bocce Ball. Please don't take the only outdoor we have to use.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

3.4.95 Commenter SORENSON-D

SORENSON-D-1.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-21. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-21.1.

SORENSON-D-2.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

SORENSON-D-3.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

SORENSON-D-4.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-7. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-7.1.

SORENSEN-D-5.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

SORENSEN-D-6.1:

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-26. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-26.1.

3.4.96 Commenter STRATMAN-J&T

STRATMAN-J&T-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

We have lived at Saratoga Retirement Community for three years, having been attracted by its open spaces and vegetation. We have been alarmed by plans to decrease both in the planned expansion. Please help us maintain the ethereal beauty that originally attracted us.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

3.4.97 Commenter STRATMAN-T

STRATMAN-T-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-31. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-31.1.

STRATMAN-T-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

P.S. see attachment for further concerns.

Response to Comment

This comment references an attachment, but there was no attachment included with the comment. No further response is required.

STRATMAN-T-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

STRATMAN-T-2.2:

Comment (verbatim)

PS: See attachment for further concerns.

Response to Comment

This comment references an attachment, but there was no attachment included with the comment. No further response is required.

STRATMAN-T-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-25. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-25.1.

STRATMAN-T-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-24. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-24.1 through FORM-24.3.

STRATMAN-T-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-5. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-5.1.

STRATMAN-T-6.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

3.4.98 Commenter TALTY-C

TALTY-C-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

TALTY-C-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

TALTY-C-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-7. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-7.1.

TALTY-C-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-7. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-7.1.

TALTY-C-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

TALTY-C-6.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

TALTY-C-7.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I am against the entire expansion plan!!

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

TALTY-C-8.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

TALTY-C-9.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-6. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-6.1.

TALTY-C-10.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-8. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-8.1.

TALTY-C-11.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-7. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-7.1.

TALTY-C-12.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-3. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-3.1.

TALTY-C-13.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-18. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-18.1.

TALTY-C-14.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-31. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-31.1.

TALTY-C-15.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

TALTY-C-16.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-7. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-7.1.

3.4.99 Commenter TIERNAN-F

TIERNAN-F-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

I am currently a resident of the Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC). I would like to submit the following comments and request regarding the Draft EIR report for the SRC project.

This is a very controversial and significant proposal. Accordingly, it is important that third-party work-products such as this EIR be as impartial and even-handed as possible.

The applicant's Statement of Objectives included on page iii of the Draft EIR contains certain financial assumptions, implications, and characterizations of an unsupported and subjective nature.

Fairness would dictate that the following counterpoints be included in the final EIR so that decision makers may have a more balanced perspective when reviewing the rest of the report:

There is absolutely no indication that the proposed project is in any way necessary for the financial viability of SRC. The applicant provides no projections of the financial impact, let alone the need, for this project.

SRC is currently on very solid financial footing, having contributed more than \$31 million in Operating Income to its parent, Odd Fellows Homes of California (OFHC), over the last 12 years (based on the publicly available, audited, financial statements of OFHC).

Given the demographics and economics of Saratoga and the surrounding area, there is every reason to believe that SRC, as currently built out, will continue to enjoy extremely solid financial performance well into the foreseeable future.

Without projections there is no basis to presume any "additional income stream" (net positive revenues minus expenses) for this project (as referenced by applicants in their item #3). Moreover, cost overruns and delays often associated with projects of this type may well turn profit projections (once they are made) into actual losses with negative consequences for both current and future residents.

I respectfully request that the four points shown above be included with the final Environmental Impact Report under an appropriate heading as close as possible to the Applicant's Objectives section in the final EIR.

A file (SRC_Operating_Income_Raw_Data.pdf) containing relevant scanned pages from OFHC annual reports supporting item #2 above is attached.

[NOTE: comment included an attachment, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Needs/Objectives.

3.4.100 Commenter UMBACH-L

UMBACH-L-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-5. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-5.1.

UMBACH-L-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

UMBACH-L-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-31. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-31.1.

UMBACH-L-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-6. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-6.1.

3.4.101 Commenter VANDERSTEEN-R

VANDERSTEEN-R-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

I was unable to attend the meeting last week, but I have an opinion that I would like to share. Until 2016 my husband and I lived in a quiet Cupertino neighborhood. Our house backed onto Steven's Creek, and we were surrounded by trees and wildlife and the sound of running water when the creek was in flow (most of the year) In the summer we spent many hours outside enjoying our environment. We were far enough from 280 that we rarely heard the sound of traffic.

We spent at least one and a half years visiting retirement communities before we decided on our current home, as the campus with its mature trees, beautiful landscaping and very quiet and protected environment most replicated our former home. We were stunned and very upset when Pacific Retirement Communities announced in one fell swoop that they planned to destroy the environment that we had come to love and enjoy.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-8: Residents Not Informed of Project.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

VANDERSTEEN-R-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

Their plan to add 5 buildings has been revised but any building will involve several years of construction, and its accompanying dust, dirt and noise, not to mention road closings and traffic difficulties. The fact that they want to destroy mature trees, shrink our outdoor space and strain our already limited facilities did not factor in their plan, which was presented as “Agree or we keep raising your rents”. Probably to maintain their profits too.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

VANDERSTEEN-R-1.3

Comment (verbatim)

I could accept a very modified plan for one additional apartment building which would minimize all of the above but not the more recent proposal they have come up with which would destroy our only large, and fairly flat area, ideal for a bocce court and picnic tables for when our families visit. I also agree that our existing Health Center needs to be remodeled to meet current needs but please help us to keep our campus the way we enjoy it now. Resident of SRC for almost seven years.

Response to Comment

To the extent that this comment raises concerns regarding loss of the area used for bocce and picnic tables, please see response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

To the extent that this comment suggests consideration of an alternative with only one apartment building on campus that avoids construction of Building A, Section 4.4 of the Draft EIR evaluated Alternative 1 (the Residents’ Alternative), which included provision of 52 new independent living apartments within one new building (in the current location of the existing Health Center) and construction of a new skilled nursing facility in the

location of the proposed project's Building C, thereby avoiding construction within the area of campus currently used by residents for bocce, picnics, and other recreational activities.

3.4.102 Commenter WAGGONER-J

WAGGONER-J-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-28. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-28.1.

3.4.103 Commenter WALLACE-B

WALLACE-B-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-27. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-27.1.

WALLACE-B-2.1

Comment (verbatim)

Every single tree you see in this picture will be destroyed to build 1 room next to the Manor (if PRS's expansion plan goes through). This is needless destruction of our beautiful gentle giants.

Please either deny the PRS Expansion plan or adopt the Residents' Alternative 1 Plan.

[NOTE: comment included image, see Appendix A for details.]

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

WALLACE-B-2.2

Comment (verbatim)

Please ether deny the PRS Expansion plan or adopt the Residents' Alternative 1 Plan. Cottage 6104 – my cottage is slated for destruction on PRS plan!

Response to Comment

Given that the proposed project does not include demolition of any existing cottages, it is assumed that the commenter's reference to the "PRS Expansion plan" is referring to Alternative 3 (Applicant's Alternative) which does include demolition of one duplex cottage.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that a lead agency respond to comments that raise significant environmental issues. Comments concerning general support or opposition to the project or one of the alternatives do not raise significant environmental issues or provide input about the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR. The demolition of a duplex cottage in and of itself is not an environmental impact under CEQA and the commenter provides no additional details regarding specific environmental concerns regarding Alternative 3.

See also response to MASTER-4: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

WALLACE-B-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-7. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-7.1.

3.4.104 Commenter WEILER-H&F

WEILER-H&F-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

This letter responds to the City of Saratoga's invitation to react to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) on the Project of a major expansion of the residential capacity of the Saratoga Retirement Community (SRC). The letter is written by a resident couple that has lived at SRC for more than four years now and has carefully followed the discussion over the expansion of SRC; Hans Weiler has been instrumental in conceiving, organizing, and evaluating a major survey in 2021 on residents' views of the expansion; an extensive report on the survey's findings and the overwhelming participation of the SRC residents in the survey is available upon request.

Our reactions to the DEIR are informed by our overall assessment of the expansion project; our assessment concludes that the Project as submitted is going to dramatically alter and diminish the nature and quality of the existing institution and its environment and of the quality of life of present and future residents. It is this assessment that makes us concur in most of our fellow residents' criticisms of the DEIR in general and of Alternatives 2 and 3, in particular.

Response to Comment

The level of support (or lack thereof) for a proposed project or its alternatives by community residents does not in and of itself raise any specific environmental concerns that require a response under CEQA. The commenter expresses general support for

other commenter's criticisms of the Draft EIR, responses to which are provided throughout this Final EIR.

See also response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See also response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

WEILER-H&F-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

The Project will substantially and irreparably shrink the existing natural environment of the SRC campus and the wide open quality of its overall landscaping; this environment not only benefits the quality of life of the current and future residents of SRC, but stands out as an exemplary exhibit of the organic co-existence of human (and senior) habitation and its natural context. Saratoga has every reason to be proud of this remarkable exhibit, but the openness and serenity of the site that is so highly rated by current as well as prospective residents will be substantially compromised by the proposed expansion.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

WEILER-H&F-1.3

Comment (verbatim)

The excavation, construction, and deforestation activities required in the implementation of the Project will subject the current and prospective residents for a multi-year period to a sustained and serious infringement of their quality of life – quite possibly to the point of endangering their physical and mental health.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of life/Peacefulness.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

WEILER-H&F-1.4

Comment (verbatim)

None of these substantial detriments can be justified by commensurate benefits that would accrue to the long-term quality of the SRC campus. Notably, nowhere does the application for this Project – as the letter of resident Frank Tiernan to Cynthia Richardson of August 10, 2023, clearly shows – provide any evidence for the financial necessity of a major expansion of the current residential capacity of SRC. On the contrary, the much more congested quality of the campus envisaged by the Project and

the reduction of the existing campus' open green spaces will most probably reduce the attractiveness of moving into SRC among prospective future residents.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

WEILER-H&F-1.5

Comment (verbatim)

The thorough and overwhelmingly representative survey of current residents conducted in late 2021 provided ample evidence for the important role that the open quality of the existing campus played in residents' decision to move to SRC. (Having lived for almost 50 years on the wide-open campus of Stanford University with its immensely rich arboretum, the authors of this letter have found the openness of the SRC campus and its precious reserve of protected trees a particularly congenial environment to move into for their senior living.)

Response to Comment

See response to comment WEILER-H&F-1.1 above.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

WEILER-H&F-1.6

Comment (verbatim)

The needs of the market for senior living can most likely and adequately be met by the growing number of senior residence facilities in the greater Bay Area.

Response to Comment

Comments relating to the needs of the market do not raise specific environmental concerns that require a response under CEQA. The Lead Agency is required to evaluate the environmental impacts of a proposed project prior to making considering whether to approve the project or not.

WEILER-H&F-1.7

Comment (verbatim)

Against the background of these general assessments of the Project, the mitigation measures and alternatives presented in the DEIR need to be critically reviewed and properly amended. The remainder of this letter indicates the kinds of changes that we consider necessary; they attach much less importance than the Project does to expanding the residential capacity of SRC and much more importance to (a) a major transformation of the severely neglected Health Care Center into a state-of-the-art skilled nursing facility for the nursing needs of both the CCRC residents of SRC and outside patients; (b) adequate road, traffic and entrance/exit arrangements to allow for the safe exit of all residents (independent, assisted living, and skilled nursing) in case of evacuation and other emergencies in what is likely to be an increasingly disaster-prone environment.

This could be accomplished through one or two variants of the “No Project Alternative” in the DEIR, which would (in one variant) be limited to the clearly necessary reconstruction of the Health Care Center (HCC) and the (equally necessary) evacuation arrangements (with no expansion of the overall residential capacity of SRC), or – alternatively in a second variant and on the basis of realistic cost and income projections – combine the reconstruction of the HCC and the evacuation provisions with the modest expansion of the campus’ residential capacity in a Building C (eliminating from the Project and the suggested alternatives the construction of Buildings A, B, and D); in this latter variant, the eventual size of Building C could vary in accordance with reasonable cost and income projections. This latter variant would also have the added advantages, given the peripheral location of Building C, of (a) keeping most of the disturbance of a major construction project away from most of the rest of the SRC campus and (b) of protecting a large share of the rich population of mature trees on the SRC campus.

We regret that, given the serious objections against the Project contained in this letter and in many of the other reactions to the DEIR, the DEIR totally avoids including these alternative considerations. In other words: The alternatives proposed in the current version of the DEIR do by no means exhaust the full range of important alternatives.

Response to Comment

As described in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIR, CEQA requires that an EIR describe and evaluate a “reasonable range” of alternatives to the proposed Project and need not “exhaust the full range of important alternatives as suggested by the commenter. Rather, the “range of alternatives” is governed by the “rule of reason,” which requires the EIR to describe and consider only those alternatives necessary to permit informed public participation, and an informed and reasoned choice by the decision-making body (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), (f)). The range of alternatives must include alternatives that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)-(c)). The Draft EIR also must evaluate a “No Project Alternative [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)] which in the case of a development project on an identifiable property, is the circumstance under which the project does not proceed, and the evaluation should compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state against the environmental effects which would occur if the project (as proposed) is approved, unless disapproval of the project would result in predictable actions by others [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B)].

The first “variant” suggested by the commenter (renovation of the existing Health Center and emergency evacuation improvements only with no increase in residential capacity) would not “feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project”, as one of the Project Applicant’s key objectives for the project (Objective 2) is to add new independent senior living housing units, and another (Objective 3) is to generate an additional revenue stream. Such a variant would also not achieve Objective 6 (new and larger Meeting Room), Objective 7 (expansion of independent dining services), Objective 8 (additional fitness building space) or Objective 10 (augmentation of parking), as presented in Section 2.2 of the Draft EIR.

The second “variant” suggested by the commenter (renovation of the existing Health Center and emergency evacuation improvements, plus a new apartment building in the location of Building C) is very similar to Alternative 2 (Reduced Development

Alternative) that was evaluated in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIR, except that Alternative 2 included two new apartment buildings (Buildings A and C) rather than just one (Building C) as the commenter suggests. Given that the Draft EIR did not identify and any significant and unavoidable environmental impacts associated with Building A, the consideration of an additional alternative that would not avoid any additional significant environmental impacts was not considered necessary to provide a “reasonable range” of alternatives within the Draft EIR.

See also response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.

WEILER-H&F-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a duplicate of comment letter WEILER-H&F-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within this letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See responses to comments WEILER-H&F-1.1 through WEILER-H&F-1.7, above.

3.4.105 Commenter WESSLING-A

WESSLING-A-1.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-10. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-10.1 through FORM-10.3.

WESSLING-A-2.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-11. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-11.1 through FORM-11.7.

WESSLING-A-3.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-29. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-29.1.

WESSLING-A-4.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-1. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-1.1.

WESSLING-A-5.1

Comment (summary)

This letter is a copy of the form letter FORM-26. No additional topics are raised, therefore individual comments within the letter have not been delineated separately.

Response to Comment

See response to comment FORM-26.1.

3.4.106 Commenter WHIPPLE-C

WHIPPLE-C-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

I moved to SRC from Virginia twelve years ago as it offered many of the advantages I sought that were lacking back there.

- *Open space: a lovely campus that is safe and attractive for outdoor activities*
- *Beautiful mature trees and gardens*
- *Smaller community: where one knows the other residents; no high-rise buildings, no crowding.*
- *Good access: to nearby shops, restaurants, professional help, etc.*

I have felt safe and happy here all these years, but now all is being threatened by the expansion plans put forward by Pacific Retirement Services, especially the two story apartment building in the Odd Fellows Historic Park. That would destroy our one open space, force the removal of numerous mature trees and create havoc during the construction stage.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-17: Construction Staging.

WHIPPLE-C-1.2:

Comment (verbatim)

We have just one main entrance/exit road (San Marcos) for our community, for Fellowship Plaza just beyond us and for our local Saratoga neighbors. This already

creates traffic problems, and, if there were an emergency when we all needed to evacuate the property, it would be an impossible, dangerous bottle neck. Now just think of the life-threatening problems that would be added during PRS's proposed construction and the resulting increase in population.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

WHIPPLE-C-1.4:

Comment (verbatim)

I strongly oppose the expansion plans that are on your table. Save our trees, our open space, our peace and quiet and our wonderful community.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

3.4.107 Commenter WHITBY-STREVENS-P&C

WHITBY-STREVENS-P&C-1.1

Comment (verbatim)

We are residents living in the Saratoga Retirement Community. We write to voice our strong objection to the expansion of SRC being proposed by Pacific Retirement Services. We note the many errors in the Draft EIR, which other objectors have pointed out to you. Our objections include the following:

The proposal would destroy the landscaped campus (for example over 100 trees would be removed, the Odd Fellows Park would be removed, plus various other outdoor amenities), replacing it with an urban environment. As such, environmental impact on both the campus itself and the surrounding neighborhood would be significantly negative and permanent.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

WHITBY-STREVENS- P&C-1.2

Comment (verbatim)

We see no benefit to the City of Saratoga from the proposal, apart from a modest increase in the amount of retirement accommodation. However, the quality of this accommodation would be negatively impacted by being sited within an urban environment.

Response to Comment

The purpose of CEQA and the EIR is to evaluate the environmental effects of a proposed project, not to evaluate the benefits of, or need for, the proposed project. Such considerations are undertaken by City decisionmakers outside of the CEQA process. With respect to commenter's suggestion that the proposed new development itself would negatively impacted by its location within an urban environment, the CEQA Statute, Guidelines and supporting case law are clear that EIRs should only consider the effects of the project on the environment, and not the effects of the existing environment on the project, except where certain specific provisions of the CEQA Statute require it (e.g., when the proposed project: is located adjacent to an airport [PRC § 21096]; involves the purchase of a school site or the construction of a new elementary or secondary school [PRC § 21151.8]; or involves certain types of housing development projects [PRC §§ 21159.21, subs. (f), (h); 21159.22, subs. (a), (b)(3); 21159.23, subd. (a)(2)(A); 21159.24, subs. (a)(1), (3); 21155.1, subs. (a)(4), (6)]), or where a proposed project might exacerbate existing environmental hazards [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a); *California Building Industry Assoc. v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District* (2015) 62 Cal.4th 369].

WHITBY-STREVENS- P&C-1.3

Comment (verbatim)

There would be a significant negative environmental impact on the lives of the approximately 400 residents during the estimated five years of construction. The health of numerous resident with heart/lung related health issues would be very directly impacted, and this alone makes the proposed development uncaring and irresponsible.

Taking these and other factors into consideration, we strongly recommend that the City take all necessary steps to limit the proposed development and its impact.

Response to Comment

As described in Section 2.4.1 of the Draft EIR, project construction is anticipated to occur in overlapping phases, with a total construction duration of approximately 25 months (i.e., just over two years), not five years as suggested by the commenter. See also response to comment MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

See response to MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

3.4.108 Commenter ZAVOSHY-J&Y

ZAVOSHY-J&Y-1.1:

Comment (verbatim)

We have several friends that live in the Saratoga Retirement Community. They have shared with us their sincere concerns of the development plans and Environmental Impact report submitted by their PRS Management Company.

Viewing the plan as proposed, we (my husband and I), feel it would be a great loss to cut down the number of trees proposed and eliminate so much green space for the residents. WE STRONGLY OPPOSE IT.

Green space is so necessary for everyone, and even more so for people that are unable to travel readily to parks and open spaces. Mental and physical health (walking), is necessary and should be encouraged. And pleasant, green, open spaces encourage that. More should be added, rather than taking it away.

Please do not allow the number of structures proposed, be built, with the concomitant EXCESSIVELY LARGE LOSS OF OPEN GREEN SPACE. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Response to Comment

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project.

Page left blank to facilitate double-sided printing.

3.5 Responses to Verbal Comments

Approximately 60 members of the public attended the Draft EIR public meeting held on August 2, 2023, and 17 of those in attendance presented verbal comments. A transcript of each verbal comment is presented below, followed by the City's response to that comment, in turn. Verbal comments and associated responses are organized in the order presented at the meeting. A list of all speakers in alphabetical order is presented in Table 2-B in Section 2.

3.5.1 Speaker-1: Michael Griffin

Speaker-1.1:

My name is Michael Griffin and I'm going to be speaking about construction noise. The EIR draft states construction noise levels even when meeting local codes can still be disruptive to normal daytime residential activities. The noise level of a multi-year, multi-site, multi-storied construction project in the heart of a densely populated residential setting far exceeds residential norms, especially when work sites are immediately adjacent to the domicile of retired folks who take naps in the afternoon who are subjected to noise levels in excess of 80 decibels over a timeframe of supposedly 24 months.

I question why the Draft Report didn't make use of a more rigorous rating standard for noise that took into consideration the sensitivity of retired occupants living in the middle of a job site over a period of years. The FTA standard is for highway construction, not hospitals, not old folks' homes and not other sound-sensitive construction.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to written comment GRIFFIN-M-1.1. See response to comment GRIFFIN-M-1.1 in Section 3.4.40 above. See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

Speaker-1.2:

I question how the draft report calculated the timeframe of the project. The longer a project takes to complete, the more noise are created, are impacted. Was use made of a bid from a building contractor or was the duration of construction months based on architectural estimates provided by the applicant? Complex projects of this nature are prone to last far longer than early estimates, especially in the case of infill developments requiring excavation in proximity to existing structures where soil conditions are problematic, and in the case of the matter, foundations are 100 years old.

Building A requires the excavation of rock in a hillside for a subterranean garage. The report estimates only five months for this grading and foundation work, and the meeting room with its garage excavation, the time is only three months. I'm asking for a timeline based on substantial real world data from similar projects with similar geology.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to written comment GRIFFIN-M-1.2. See response to comment GRIFFIN-M-1.2 in Section 3.4.40 above. See also response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration and response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

Speaker-1.3:

I question why the draft didn't suggest the use of noise measurement devices to monitor the noise of heavy equipment, rock-drilling machinery, as well as trucks off-hauling dirt and rock. Sometimes older tractors and vehicles lacking modern sound-deadening features are used. Why were sound meters not recommended? Thanks.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to written comment GRIFFIN-M-1.3. See response to comment GRIFFIN-M-1.3 in Section 3.4.40 above. See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

3.5.2 Speaker-2: Jill Hunter

Speaker-2.1:

Hi, I'm Jill Hunter. I'm not a member of the SRC. I don't live there, but I have a 40-year history of working with the SRC with the Odd Fellows. When I first ran for office in the 1980s, I was allowed to go to the upstairs building, the upstairs offices and rooms and knock on the door and I urged them to vote for me. And then in the late '90s, the Heritage Preservation, I was the chairman of it when it came time to vote on the Odd Fellows renovation, and we fought very long and hard to save that building. It's the most magnificent building in Saratoga and I hope you all realize that, including the developer.

And from then on, we went through, after I was on the City Council, we also went and worked on American Bloom and where did we go, the first to take all these judges from across the United States, but to the SRC so they could see how beautiful that building was and what a wonderful group lived there.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to written comment HUNTER-J-1.1. See response to comment HUNTER-J-1.1 in Section 3.4.42 above. See also response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

Speaker-2.2

I'm here primarily because of trees. I am astounded that 70 beautiful redwoods and oak trees are to be removed. I'm so offended by that. Saratoga is proudly a Tree City USA, and to remove 70 of our most protected trees for something that nobody wants is unheard of, and to add another 50 or so that are not protected but are beautiful trees.

The President of the United States spoke the other day and I happened to hear him on the radio urging everybody to plant trees because with the climate change the way it is, we have to start encouraging tree planting, and Saratoga has lost a lot of its canopy in the last storms and they're going to lose a lot more with this project and the project on Quito Road, which is also going to lose a lot of trees. And I urge the Planning

Department and the City Council to consider how important trees are to this community and please be careful and not cut down all our trees. Thank you.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to written comment HUNTER-J-1.2. See response to comment HUNTER-J-1.2 in Section 3.4.42 above. See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

3.5.3 Speaker-3: Tsing Bardin

Speaker-3.1:

Good evening. First of all, can you hear me? Yeah. Thank you, EIR consultants, for your hard work. I'm a resident at the Saratoga Retirement Community for the last 17 years. When I read the DEIR, I found the report ignoring the environment and the lives of our residents on campus. There's issues which cannot be mitigated to less than significant as suggested in the drafted EIR. Here are a few examples on recreation and open space.

One, we lose our Odd Fellows Historical Park if Building A is allowed. The EIR Section 3.15.1 listed 28 acres of existing public park facilities within one mile of the project site. SRC expansion will have no impact on a single existing public recreation facility. Let me ask, where is the study for the impact on the SRC residents? Even though there are 28 acres nearby, would you ask your elderly parents to take Uber to one of these parks with their walkers? At present, the park on campus is accessible anytime and day. Residents take their walkers to the park, sit on the chair, and enjoy fresh air. Neighbors come with their dogs, walk or bike around the campus. This park serves many citizens. To eliminate this park has a very significant environmental impact, but the drafted EIR REC-1 never studies the impact on the residents if you eliminate the park.

Two, loss of the open space on SRC. Building A and Meeting Room take away the remaining 6% of our accessible open green space. EIR 3.15.1, Environmental Setting, listed that the new trail connects the project to the San Marcos Open Space approximately 300 feet southeast of the project site. Please note the 300 feet is as the crow flies distance; one has to climb up a steep embarkment, inaccessible except by a 2.5-mile round trip along the road or by helicopter. While on campus, we currently have safe and smooth paths for the seniors to enjoy the Open Space. Many seniors have mobility issues, poor eyesight, hard of hearing, and limited physical strength. They're not able to go on any of the suggested Open Space or hiking trip.

DEIR ignores the special needs of the seniors on campus. The analyses are inappropriate, irrelevant, and discriminating the senior population. Thank you.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to written comment BARDIN-T-12 and form letter FORM-29. See response to comment FORM-29.1 in Section 3.2.29 above.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See also response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

3.5.4 Speaker-4: Marian Chan

Speaker-4.1:

Thank you for taking time out to hear our input. My name is Marian Chan. I became a resident at SRC just about a year ago. I hold a degree in architecture and a graduate degree in structural engineering from UC Berkeley. My husband and I have been commercial real estate developers for the last 45 years, so I understand clearly the primary objective of the proposed expansion plan.

The proposed expansion plan comes down to only one thing: additional income stream from the new independent living units. I think the thinking is quite flawed because the ratio of independent living units is paled by comparison to the overbuilt units in assisted living and the healthcare center. Even with the increased independent unit, a proposed 195 units versus the current 143, there will still be 103 assisted living units and 52 skilled nursing beds. This ratio will not make a profitable operation. The residents of independent living units will still be supporting the money-losing portion of the assisted living and healthcare center.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to CHAN-M-1.1. See response to comment CHAN-M-1.1 in Section 3.4.21 above.

See also response to MASTER-9: Financial Need/Objectives.

See also response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

Speaker-4.2:

Please note that there's very high vacancy currently in the assisted living. So as I see it, this project going ahead, the claim of improved quality of life for independent living residents will not materialize.

I have many other things to say regarding dining, parking, landscape maintenance. I'm just going to go and tell my final thinking as an architect, the layout of five haphazardly placed building, it hardly blends in and it's not a good design for elderly people who have to walk steep hills.

Response to Comment:

The commenter's concerns regarding existing vacancy rates in the assisted living portion of the facility, and the accuracy of "the claim of improved quality of life for independent living residents" do not raise any significant environmental impacts of the project requiring a response under CEQA.

See also response to comments CHAN-M-1.2 through CHAN-M-1.8 in Section 3.4.21 above.

See also response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

See also response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

Speaker-4.3:

So in conclusion, to meet the project objective, there should be much reduced assisted living and healthcare units and the residents' alternative proposal is totally logical, less disruptive to the campus, all 52 units in one place. Thank you.

Response to Comment:

As discussed in Section 2.3.2 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project includes a reduction in the number of beds at the facility for memory care (in the existing Assisted Living Building) and skilled nursing (in the existing Health Center).

See also response to MASTER-3: Support for Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

3.5.5 Speaker-5: CK Chan

Speaker-5.1:

My name is CK Chan, I'm a professional engineer registered in California and I was an engineering professor at UCLA. Today, I came before you as a concerned SRC resident. I want to bring up the areas of controversies associated with the expansion project currently under review.

Both the owner and the operator of the facility have the common statement to serve the senior residents' interests in the community. What happened in the EIR report is they neglect to mention the human factors, the human beings that are living in the communities, and the quality of life of those people who live in the community. So here are the facts that have been in absence in the present Draft EIR.

The average age of the residents are over 80 years old with serious mobility and health issues. The facilities are located on a hilly lot with very narrow driveways and with limited access to the public streets. There's only one entrance to the facilities. The effect of the project, such as noise, pollution, safety, handicap access, emergency vehicle access on the residents' daily life have not been evaluated. The DEIR have not addressed how horrible the situation will be.

In addition to that, what happened to the disclosure requirement to future residents that are coming to the project to know about the impact of the project?

So here are the conditions that I think you have to be incorporated in your consideration of the project: the effect of the project on the resident's daily life has to be thoroughly studied; the applicants have to provide a detailed, reasonable, workable plan to mitigate all the negative effects; the construction staging and timetable has to be severely enforced with heavy penalties for not compiling. If they propose to do it in six months, they have to finish it in six months; a written signed disclosure to outline the effect of the project on the daily lives shall be given to future potential residents; and all the PRS employees who work in the SRC facilities are asked to be not to harass any residents who are exercising their first right of... I thank you for your attention.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to written comment letter CHAN-C-1. See responses to comments CHAN-C-1.1 through CHAN-C-1.8 in Section 3.4.20, above.

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-8: Residents Not Informed of Project.

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

See response to MASTER-17: Construction Staging.

3.5.6 Speaker-6: Pat McGuire

Speaker-6.1:

Hello. I'm Pat McGuire from Unit 4201 in Saratoga Retirement Community. I have a few comments on the Draft EIR and a couple questions for understanding how some of my other concerns can be met and when.

First of all, energy generation on-site was one of the elements suggested in the mitigations, and if that's being considered, there's no indication where that would be. If it's solar panels, that's not necessarily going to be benign visually, so that's one concern of mine. Also, groundwater was another idea to be mitigated. Are you aware there are springs on site? We're all recently dealing with a newly emerging one.

Response to Comment:

As described in Section 2.3.5, Utilities and Service Systems of the Draft EIR, each of the proposed buildings that would be constructed as part of the project would be provided with roof mounted solar photovoltaic system and battery storage. The analysis of environmental impacts within Section 3 of the Draft EIR (including aesthetic/visual impacts in Section 3.2) includes consideration of the project as proposed (including solar panels). Mitigation Measure MM-GHG-1b in Section 3.8.3 of the Draft EIR requires that the project enroll in the Silicon Valley "GreenStart" or "GreenPrime" program and either provide evidence that the proposed solar photovoltaic system would meet 100 percent of the buildings' energy requirements, or provide evidence of continued enrollment in the program (and compliance with enrollment conditions) if the proposed solar panels would not meet 100 percent of the buildings' energy requirements. Compliance with this mitigation measure would not require any additional physical changes at the project site beyond those described and analyzed within the Draft EIR.

Impacts of the proposed project to groundwater are evaluated in Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality of the Draft EIR. No potentially significant impacts relating to groundwater were identified which required mitigation measures. Depth to groundwater at the project site is 30-50 feet below ground surface, and the maximum depth of excavation for the project is 25 feet below ground surface. As stated in Section 3.10.1 of the Draft EIR (page 3-183), none of the reports or information reviewed during preparation of this EIR, including the site-specific geotechnical report (TRC) 2019) and comments on the Draft EIR by Valley Water (see comments VW-1.1 through VW-1.6 in Section 3.3.1 of this document) mentioned the presence of underground springs at or near the Project site. SRC Management have also indicated that they are unaware of any underground springs at the campus, but did mention a small rainwater seep that sometimes occurs following heavy rain, downhill of the central park area, which runs

into the existing storm drain system (Stel, pers. comm. 2024b). The presence of this ephemeral seep does not alter the conclusions of the Draft EIR with respect to groundwater impacts.

Speaker-6.2:

My other questions have to deal with the fact that this is really the wrong site for expansion. Rather than increasing the crowding on the north side of campus, why not use all that big space on the south side of campus? And so when is the right time to bring that up and have that discussion or is it too late?

Response to Comment:

CEQA requires that the City evaluate the environmental impacts of the project as proposed by the applicant, as well as a reasonable range of alternatives to the project that could avoid the significant environmental impacts while achieving the majority of the project objectives. A large portion of the southern part of the SRC campus is subject to an open space easement and/or has steep slopes, therefore an alternative that considered development on that portion of the SRC campus was not identified or evaluated in the Draft EIR.

Speaker-6.3:

Next is the fitness facility. Eight years ago when I saw the size of the existing fitness facility, I said, "This is ridiculously small," and so on the back of an envelope, I measured the existing facility, put in a request for a comparable amount to be added for the existing population, not for a larger one, and it's still quite inadequate for the existing population at doubling the space, and I'd like to know when we can discuss that.

Response to Comment:

CEQA requires that the City evaluate the environmental impacts of the project as proposed by the applicant. Whether or not the private recreational facilities proposed by the applicant are sufficient to meet the needs of the existing or future SRC residents is not pertinent to the evaluation of environmental impacts.

Speaker-6.4:

Third, we need to fix the problems stemming from our address being on Fruitvale Avenue, which is not mentioned at all. Wasted gas of those trying to find a resident with a cab, a grocery delivery to a resident, even our friends coming to visit for the first time, they're wasting a lot of gas trying to find us.

I'd like all of that to be addressed at some point. Thank you.

Response to Comment:

The concerns raised by the commenter relate to the existing SRC campus and are not associated with the proposed expansion. The proposed project would not exacerbate the conditions in a manner that would result in significant environmental impacts. As described on Sheet A1.05 of the project plans, all existing and proposed buildings must be provided with address identification in accordance with California Fire Code Section 505.1. Where access is by means of a private road and the building cannot be viewed from the public way, Section 505.1 requires a monument, pole or other sign or means to identify the structure.

3.5.7 Speaker-7: Marilyn Basham

Speaker-7.1:

Thank you for allowing us this comment period. This is great.

My name is Marilyn Basham. I'm an independent resident at SRC. I'm also a retired physical therapist and I've worked many years in skilled nursing facilities very similar to the one we have on campus. I was very disappointed in the Draft EIR. There was a lot of lack of details.

For instance, in recent post-COVID studies, one of the contributing factors for the high amount of deaths of the elderly in skilled nursing facilities was shared bedrooms and shared bathrooms. Why is this important? At our HCC, which is our healthcare center, we still have shared bedrooms and shared baths. In the Draft EIR, it shows that the remodel, when it happens for the HCC, it'll happen in phase four. That's way too late. It needs to be the number-one priority for the health and safety of the SRC residents.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-18: Construction Phasing/Health Center Renovations.

Speaker-7.2:

Another omission: the Draft EIR has no ventilation details. Why is that important? Again, post-COVID studies show that those skilled nursing facilities that had the latest in ventilation had less cases and a better job of mitigating the pathogen.

Another omission: the Draft EIR does allow temporary relocation for residents who finds the construction disruptive, but there is nothing for the inpatient at that HCC who's recovering from a major medical event who's trapped in their own beds in their rooms. While the HCC undergoes a remodel, there is no accommodation for that inpatient resident.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

Speaker-7.3:

Another omission: there is no analysis of the Draft EIR for the internal environment, nothing about the impact for that inpatient of the mold, the dust, the noise, the vibration. In fact, in 2019, the Cleveland Clinic was very concerned just about this. They did a study, and their findings were reported in an article, "What Are the Risks to Inpatients During a Hospital Construction or Renovation?" They found increased mold disease, increased legionnaire's disease, increased sleep deprivation, and increased lung disease.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

Speaker-7.4:

Another omission: the Draft EIR does not show any details for energy saving, for water saving, or solar panels for the HCC.

In summary, make the remodel of the HCC the number-one priority for the health and safety of the SRC residents. Include the latest in ventilation, filtration, and purification of the air quality. Include the energy and water saving and solar panels. Thank you very much.

Response to Comment:

As described in Section 2.3.2 of the Draft EIR, the proposed changes to the existing Health Center would involve internal reconfiguration and renovation only—no changes to the building exterior, such as new or replacement landscaping or installation of solar panels, would be undertaken. The reconfiguration would primarily involve the replacement of the existing toilets and sinks in each room with a full accessible bathroom with showers, with some minor interior upgrades to common spaces. The renovations would result in a decreased patient capacity due to the conversion of double rooms to single rooms, which would decrease demand for water and energy associated with the building.

3.5.8 Speaker-8: Barry Lamé

Speaker-8.1:

My name is Barry Lamé and my wife and I are residents of the Saratoga Retirement Community.

Where, after a long search, we chose SRC because of its serene space located within the City of Trees. We had to pay a huge amount to buy into the facilities and then pay another huge amount each month to rent an apartment and enjoy the peaceful and enriching environment for the rest of our lives.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-8: Residents Not Informed of Project.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

Speaker-8.2:

We opposed the proposed expansion of SRC for many reasons, but here are two. First, our community has over 60 bocce ball players who sometimes travel to or host tournaments to challenge other senior communities. We have a standard-sized bocce ball court which is required for competition according to the US Bocce Federation. The proposed expansion would demolish this standard court with its room for teams of players and visitors and replace it with an inconvenient facility less than two-thirds of the standard size and without room for visitors. This would destroy the recreational opportunities of many of our present and future residents.

Second, the new Building A and Meeting Room would remove all of the remaining outdoor recreation green space. Our residents depend on this space for recreation and relaxation and to enjoy our views and fresh air. Indoor recreation activities cannot replace our enjoyment of the outdoor recreation activities.

We disagree with the Impact REC-2 analysis. The Impact Analysis for REC-1 concludes, "The project is not anticipated to cause substantial increased demand for

public open space and recreation facilities within the city," but over 200 current independent living residents and an additional 100 new residents who use our outdoor space daily create a vastly increased demand for open space, which is proposed to be eliminated. Thus, the environmental impact of the proposed expansion would be huge. Our life savings invested into this Saratoga Retirement Community would thus be wasted. Thank you.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

3.5.9 Speaker-9: Marilyn Manies

Speaker-9.1:

My name is Marilyn Manies and I've been a resident of Saratoga for over 40 years. I respect the amount of work that went into writing this very detailed Draft EIR and I've spent many hours reading it, and I respectfully reject many of the items labeled as less than significant.

It is more than significant to me and to hundreds of other SRC residents that 124 trees will be removed from our campus, and no amount of smaller trees can replace the towering oaks and the redwoods, some over 100-feet tall.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to MANIES-M-7.1. See response to comment MANIES-M-7.1. See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

Speaker-9.2:

It is more than significant that the only campus park and bocce court would be destroyed and replaced by a huge apartment building. Suggesting that residents aged 75 to 102 go to the neighboring parks shows how out of touch the writers were. Many of our people do not drive and only get around with walkers, canes, and wheelchairs. Having close-by recreation is vital to their health.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to MANIES-M-7.2. See response to comment MANIES-M-7.2. See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

Speaker-9.3:

It is more than significant that residents would be subjected to extremely loud noise for up to five years, and suggesting that they would get relief only at night is unrealistic. Retired people are home for most of the day and all day long would be subjected to noise from trucks, backhoes, air compressors, drill rigs, bulldozers, excavators, forklifts, generators, and many more. To describe this as less than significant is ludicrous.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to MANIES-M-7.3. See response to comment MANIES-M-7.3. See also response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

Speaker-9.4:

Traffic now on San Marcos and Odd Fellows Drive is constant with vehicles going to SRC and Fellowship Plaza, daily UPS, FedEx, mail trucks, food delivery trucks, workers and residents. We are the number-one destination of fire trucks and ambulances in Saratoga, and with those vehicles that come almost daily, add this to the large number of construction workers and equipment, I do not believe this is less than significant.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to MANIES-7.4. See response to comment MANIES-M-7.4. See also response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

Speaker-9.5:

Emergency evacuation is questionable now. What will it be when roads are jammed with trucks and equipment? That problem is more than significant.

These and other factors lead me to believe that a high number of mitigations suggested in this document are misleading and incorrect. Thank you for listening.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to MANIES-M-7.5. See response to comment MANIES-M-7.5. See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

3.5.10 Speaker-10: Robert Berglund

Speaker-10.1:

My name is Robert Berglund. I've been a resident of Saratoga Retirement for eight years. The project description in the executive summary of the report includes the following statement: the number of skilled nursing beds within the health center will be reduced from 94 to 52. The number of skilled nursing beds is proposed to be reduced due to the conversion of double-occupancy rooms to private single-occupancy rooms where they each have their own accessible bathroom, including shower.

Later on in the project objectives, number four, it states essentially the same thing. That seems to be where the references to the renovation of the health center stop. There are no references to the construction work that will proceed in stages in the health center, nor are there any references to the impact on 50 to 60 vulnerable senior patients housed in the health center during this two-year construction period.

I refer to Table ES-1 Impact Area MFS3: Direct or Indirect Adverse Effects on Human Beings. No reference. Additionally, there are no references to the required mitigation of the noise, vibrations, dirt, dust, or displacing these senior patients to make way for the demolitions and construction which will raise significant health hazards to the patients. I again refer to Table ES-1, numerous impact areas such as HAZ1 and 5, LUP1, NOI1 and 2, POP2, UTI1 and 3, WF3, and again MFS3.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to BERGLUND-R-1.1. See response to comment BERGLUND-R-1.1. See also response to MASTER-19: Impacts on Existing Health Center Patients.

Speaker-10.2:

By the way, the only alternative which avoids this complete problem is alternative one, the residents' alternative.

Speaking of alternative one, the Draft Report does not represent Section 4.4 correctly. It's a number of glaring errors included in this section. Starting with Figure 4.41, the conceptual site plan for the residents' alternative shows the layout of the new two-story apartment building, Building D. The layout of Building D is important as it's the same footprint as the current healthcare center and it would provide for 52 apartments and an auditorium.

There needs to be a lot of corrections in that report. Thank you.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to BERGLUND-R-1.2. See response to comment BERGLUND-R-1.2. See also response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

3.5.11 Speaker-11: Tony Vandersteen

Speaker-11.1:

My name is Tony Vandersteen. My wife and I have lived at SRC since 2016. We were told when we first moved to the place, in fact, I made a special request of the marketing director at that time whether there was going to be any further extensive buildings at the place that we were just moving into and that we just spent a half-a-million dollars as the down payment on. And I was told no, there were not going to be any more buildings, except with the possibility of something going up on the staff parking lot, maybe sometime in the future, to do with the staff. That's all we were told about.

And not just a few months later, we heard about the expansion plan and we were horrified, particularly in the totally insensitive way that it was presented to all of us, old people that moved in there specifically with the idea of relaxing in the beautiful environment the SRC campus represents.

Well, to hear that the plans have changed and all this, a radical plan to add several buildings that would ruin the historical value of the beautiful Manor Building that we particularly liked when we came in, build all over our park and fill much of the available space with more buildings, we were very, very upset about the whole thing.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-8: Residents Not Informed of Project.

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

Speaker-11.2:

The other main objection of course, which is mentioned in the EIR in many places is the construction problems itself. And I've been associated with many building construction

sites. I've been working for Habitat for Humanity for several years. It can be dangerous, dusty, dirty, noisy, completely disruptive of the quality of life of anybody living anywhere near it. And in our case, it'll be at least five years, which would be probably a majority of the years that we have left and which will completely upset our senior life.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-16: Construction Air Quality.

See response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise.

See response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration.

See also response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

Speaker-11.3:

So the only part of this EIR that I'm interested in is the very first alternative to cancel the whole thing. As compromising possibly, we could see that half the number of possibilities of the 52 people that they wanted or 52 places they wanted to move into, that might be an acceptable way, but as far as we're concerned, we don't like the whole thing. Thank you.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-2: Support for No Project Alternative.

CEQA requires that the City evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the project that could avoid the significant environmental impacts while achieving the majority of the project objectives. Because one of the Applicant's key objectives for the project was to add a minimum of 52 new independent living senior housing units to the community, an alternative that included a substantially smaller number of new units was not identified or evaluated in the Draft EIR.

3.5.12 Speaker-12: Chuck Cummins

Speaker-12.1:

My name is Chuck Cummins. I'm an independent living in cottage number 6140. I've written three emails which I hope the consultants will consider carefully, and I hope they also get to the City Council and the city planning people. But they cover three topics, one and the first one people have talked about already, and that's the impact and probably the most important part of the environment to be considered and this environmental report does not consider it at all and that's the people who have to live in this place as it's being constructed and have to live in it after it's completed. And you can see by looking in this room, there must be at least 50 or 60 residents from Saratoga Retirement Community who would say, "We don't need it and we do not want it."

I mean, this is our home. We're the ones that live here. This is for PRS, the manager, and for the Odd Fellows Corporation, the owner, this is a real estate transaction, but this is our home. The entire campus is our home, not just our apartment, not just our cottage, but the entire campus is our home and it's being violated.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-21: Impacts to SRC Residents/Seniors.

See response to MASTER-20: Quality of Life/Peacefulness.

As discussed in response to MASTER-1: Opposition to the Project, the level of support (or lack thereof) for a proposed project by community residents does not in and of itself raise any specific environmental concerns that require a response under CEQA

Speaker-12.2:

Secondly, emergency response. I was horrified to see that really what the consultants have done is kicked the can down the road. There's discussion about emergency response and this and that, but the bottom line in your report is that it says if the fire department approves it, it's okay. No significant impact. They also say that when the fire department approves it, that happens during the permitting process. It's absolutely ridiculous to look at a project and say, "Well, we're not going to consider the emergency preparedness and response evacuation," until the permit has been applied for, you get almost into the project, and then say, "Oops, what's the fire department going to have to say about this?" That doesn't make any sense at all.

Response to Comment:

The Santa Clara County Fire Department (SCCFD) undertook preliminary review of the project in 2020 and their plan review comments were incorporated into the proposed project (see project plan set, Sheets A1.05 through A1.08). SCCFD approval of the project plans for the secondary access and proposed buildings were granted in May 2021 and July 2021, respectively, as part of the development review process (SCCFD 2021a, 2021b). In addition, during the building permit process, the building plans will be re-reviewed by SCCFD to ensure no changes have been made that would affect compliance with the California Fire Code and California Building Code.

Because compliance with the California Fire Code (and other applicable regulations) is mandatory, environmental impacts arising from potential non-compliance with the requirements of those regulations is not considered an environmental impact of the project under CEQA. Furthermore, adopted building codes and standards can be assumed to minimize environmental impacts, and need not be included as mitigation measures, as long as the environmental benefits of the cited codes and sections are described (Oakland Heritage Alliance v. City of Oakland [2011] 195 Cal.App.4th 884).

See also response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

Speaker-12.3:

Thirdly, the trees. You've heard about that, the number of trees that are going to come out, but I'm going to tell the story about what happened last week when some ladies in the campus last Thursday put ribbons, yellow ribbons, around the trees that are going to be taken out. Friday morning I walked the campus and I was shocked, absolutely shocked. I knew they were going to take some trees out, but if you could see the visualization, actually visualize what that campus would look like without the trees, you would be shocked too.

I hope we don't get to the point where we have to lie down in front of bulldozers and chain ourselves to trees because we don't want this expansion. Thank you.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

3.5.13 Speaker-13: Don Schmidek

Speaker-13.1:

My name is Don Schmidek. I've been here at SRC for 12 years and my approach is a little different. I have gone through the 646 pages of the EIR and I have some comments.

First, the organization of the EIR is baffling to me. I searched for a topic, I get a page number, but the pages do not exist on the EIR. It's amazing.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to written comment SCHMIDEK-D-6.2. See response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-6.2.

Speaker-13.2:

To get to more interesting topics, I expected to have two or three choices in EIR, but all of a sudden, I see four choices and the fourth choice is the opinion of the EIR writers. Well, I don't consider those writers to have the insight or the whereabouts of what's happening at the SRC campus. Is their task to analyze what is provided to them or is their task to provide an actual analysis on what is happening? My opinion is they were given three plans and they were supposed to select from the three.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to written comment SCHMIDEK-D-6.3. See response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-6.3.

See also response to MASTER-5: Appropriateness of Reduced Development Alternative (Alternative 2).

Speaker-13.3:

The EIR is, I would say, 80% full of unneeded information, page after page after page of things that are of no interest, hardly pertinent, et cetera. So I think they were just a deterrent for us to get confused what is there.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to written comment SCHMIDEK-D-6.4. See response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-6.4.

Speaker-13.4:

The method that AECOM selected is an arbitrary, mysterious, and capricious method of selecting the best choice. And they gave us a table, which is 4.7-1, which happens to be

on page 4-195, that supports alternative two, which is their opinion of what is to happen to the campus. And naturally, they also place a building in the park, which is a no-no.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to written comment SCHMIDEK-D-6.5. See response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-6.5.

See also response to MASTER-7: Selection of Environmentally Superior Alternative.

See also response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

Speaker-13.5:

The EIR has also some gross incorrect information, which makes me conclude that the plan is erroneous. Alternate one shows the EIR uses a PRS interpretation of Building D, what the residents have suggested. They came up with a three-story building, which is a similar configuration as the building 4,000 we have on the campus. The Preserve group suggested a different configuration, a configuration which is the same as the current configuration of the health center, which is much more prone and is only two stories high. Therefore, the conclusion that was reached is erroneous, grossly erroneous.

I will not bother you with additional information since I've run out of time, but thank you for your attention.

Response to Comment:

This comment is very similar to written comment SCHMIDEK-D-6.6. See response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-6.6.

See also response to MASTER-4: Inaccuracy of Residents' Alternative (Alternative 1).

3.5.14 Speaker-14: Pat DuBridge

Speaker-14.1:

My name is Pat DuBridge. I live at SRC. Yesterday morning, I was up about seven o'clock and I raised our blinds at the front of our house, looked across the park across Santa Clara Valley to the East Foothills, and as I looked across the park, there were ladies out there doing Tai Chi in the early morning sun.

This park in the very middle of the SRC campus is not huge, but it is the only outdoor recreational space on the property and it is well-used by the 200 or so independent living residents. It is our environment. If this park is eliminated, it will affect not only present residents, but will be destroyed forever. The majestic oaks and redwoods, some a 100 years old, will be gone. The DEIR says that there are many nearby parks that residents can use. That's true. However, many residents no longer drive some use walkers, many use canes. They need a pleasant outdoor space for recreation within steps of their home.

My favorite outdoor recreation is bocce ball. Besides that, the park is needed for picnicking, bridge and games under our umbrellas, or just sitting in the sun with friends. Please think about the environmental impact on the residents for generations to come if this park is destroyed. This is a plea to save our park. Thank you for listening.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

3.5.15 Speaker-15: Dick DuBridge

Speaker-15.1:

Good evening. It's nice to meet you all. My qualifications for being here, I've been a resident of Saratoga for 58 years and I like to tell you why I decided to come, and it's because Saratoga is a very unique place.

I read through the EIR, the Draft EIR, and I think if you took out the word Saratoga and read that whole EIR, you would have no idea that they were talking about Saratoga. If they really wanted to know what Saratoga is like, they should ask some Saratogans, why did you come here? Why do you live here? Why do you retire here? It's because Saratoga is a very unique town. We have beautiful scenery that we can see from our own windows. We can look across the Valley, we can see the Eastern Foothills, we can see the Santa Cruz Mountains. We can see beautiful trees across the street. We can see nature at its best, including the wild animals that wander through our backyards. So that is why we came, and this development, if it goes through, we'll destroy it all.

Response to Comment:

The existing environmental setting of the project site with respect to visual character and scenic quality is described within Section 3.2.1 of the Draft EIR. As described in Section 3.2.3 of the Draft EIR, the applicable thresholds of significance for aesthetics within urbanized areas do not include degradation to visual character or the quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, but rather is limited to whether the project would conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality, or would substantially damage scenic vistas or scenic resources, or create a new source of substantial light or glare. The impact of the proposed project in relation to these thresholds were evaluated in Section 3.2.3 of the Draft EIR and found to be less than significant. The commenter presents no new information or inaccuracies within the Draft EIR that would change these conclusions.

See also response to MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Quality.

Speaker-15.2:

Let's talk about preserving the Odd Fellows Home Historical Park. That was declared a park over 100 years ago by the Odd Fellows and it still has a 100-year-old sign designating it as the Odd Fellows Historical Park. We tagged all the trees so that people could see what it looked like. The management at SRC promptly took them all down, afraid of the truth, afraid that people would see this massive destruction that was about to occur to our park.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-11: Impacts to Historical Park.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

Speaker-15.3:

Prisons are entitled to recreational space outside. What are we supposed to do, break a few laws? Do we have to rob a bank? Do we have to change the name of SRC to SRC Prison in order to save our space?

My study is across the street from the park. I can see what goes on there. It is enjoyed by people not only at SRC, but Fellowship Plaza. Our kids come and our grandkids come. They play in that park. We take their pictures in front of the trees and they love it. SRC has done their very best to keep that park simply a dirt platform to make it look as bad as possible. If it were properly developed, as the SRC residents want, it would be a beautiful place for picnics, et cetera, et cetera. Thank you.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space.

3.5.16 Speaker-16: Nitin Jain

Speaker-16.1:

Hi, good evening. I'm Nitin Jain. We live on San Marcos Road, so I'm not living yet in SRC. I hope to live here in a few years down the road-

Sorry about that. Yeah, my name is Nitin Jain. We have been living on San Marcos Road for the last 22 years and we love it. And more than that, we love the beauty and the scenic nature of this retirement community. And I often walk around there.

And so going through the points, a lot of these points have been already mentioned, but I'll just touch upon it. One is the beauty of the place, and so I'm really concerned that the number of oak trees and the redwood trees that we are cutting. I think being a green city, I think it's really important that we take that seriously.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-27: Loss of Views/Scenic Quality.

See response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

Speaker-16.2:

Number two is the beauty of the Manor Building. I'm kind of worried that by addition of this auditorium, it actually spoils the beauty of the Manor Building and we need to really look at why we need the auditorium, especially having a garage at the bottom that raises it up and spoils the view of Manor Building from the side. And so we need to look at that. We don't really need to have a garage underneath, if really, we can't do without it.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-10: Impacts of Meeting Room to Historic Manor Building.

Speaker-16.3:

Number three, I couldn't see the drainage study in the EIR Report. So water drainage has been a main problem over my period of 22 years, and so I would urge that we consider the drainage.

Response to Comment:

The potential impacts of the proposed project on drainage patterns are evaluated in Section 3.10.3 of the Draft EIR, and in particular within the discussion of Impact HYD-3. As discussed in that section, although the proposed project would result in a net increase in the area of impervious surfaces at the site, the project has been designed in accordance with the Santa Clara County Drainage Manual (County of Santa Clara 2007) to calculate stormwater runoff and design appropriate modifications to the existing drainage system, which is designed to appropriately detain, pre-treat, and convey stormwater using low impact development (LID) methods including flow-through planters, bioretention basins, landscaping, and permeable pavement such that existing drainage patterns would not be substantially altered.

Speaker-16.4:

Number four, traffic. So we've already mentioned that there's only one exit and it's a single one road in, one road out. And so during the construction, it's a big problem, and even after the construction, it's not enough. So we really need to consider the impact on the traffic and try to mitigate all these. I think that's all I have. Thank you.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption.

See response to MASTER-24: Emergency Access/Evacuation.

3.5.17 Speaker-17: Frank Tiernan

Speaker-17.1:

Good evening. My name is Frank Tiernan. I'm a resident of SRC. I'm here to express this evening my concerns regarding two deficiencies in the Draft Environmental Impact Report for Saratoga Retirement Community. Given the time limitation, I'm only going to talk about the first one. I'll give you the other one in writing later on.

The first deficiency relates to the project summary and the omission of several relevant facts, specifically to balance some of the content in the applicant's objectives, which are included in the summary and which may be the only thing that some people read. Specifically, at least the following background material should be included in the project summary:

One, there is absolutely no indication that the proposed project is in any way needed for the financial viability of SRC. No financial projections showing the impact, let alone the need for this project to have ever been presented.

Two, SRC is on very solid financial footing, having contributed nearly \$30 million in profit to the parent, Od Fellows Homes of California, over the last 12 years. Given the demographics and economics of the area, there is every reason to believe that SRC, as

currently built out, will continue to be on solid financial footing well into the foreseeable future.

Number three, the applicant's objective number three refers to the additional income stream resulting from the new independent living units as enabling upgrades and maintenance of the strong financial position. However, as no projection of either revenue or expense for the expansion has been provided, this statement should be balanced by one stating that there is no basis to assume that the additional units will generate any positive income, either now or in the future.

Response to Comment:

See response to MASTER-9: Financial Needs/Objectives.

Speaker-17.2:

Number four, the applicant's objective number 11 refers to maintaining a high level of landscape design, amenities, and plant materials on the campus. This statement should be balanced with reference to the fact that the plan requires eliminating many, many trees and the only large open landscape recreational area on campus. Thank you.

Response to Comment:

The objectives for the project, including Objective #11 relating to the level of landscape design, amenities, and plant materials on campus, were provided to the City by the applicant and were included in the Draft EIR as required by the CEQA Guidelines. Section 2.3.3 of the Draft EIR describes the proposed changes to the existing recreational facilities, open space, and landscaping (including tree removal) proposed as part of the project. As discussed in response to comment DUBRIDGE-R-2.3, information pertaining to the proposed tree removal has been added to the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR.

See also response to MASTER-22: Loss of Trees.

4 Changes to the Draft EIR in Response to Comments

This section contains changes to the contents of the Draft EIR for the Saratoga Retirement Community Campus Master Plan Project dated July 2023. These changes include both (1) edits made in response to comments on the Draft EIR, as discussed in Section 3 of this Final EIR, and (2) City staff-initiated text changes to correct minor inconsistencies, to add minor updates to information or clarification, and to provide updated information where applicable.

None of the proposed changes to the text or figures Draft EIR constitute “significant new information” that would trigger recirculation of the document per Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Amended or new language is underlined. All deletions are shown in ~~strike through~~.

4.1 Changes to Specific Sections of the Draft EIR

4.1.1 Changes to the Executive Summary

In the Executive Summary subsection titled “Project Description” (on page ii of the Draft EIR), the following change is proposed to the seventh paragraph in response to comment CHAN-M-1.1:

A total of 52 new independent living residential units would be constructed as part of the proposed Project (22 in Building A, 10 in Building B, and 20 in Building C), bringing the total number of independent living units on the property to 195.

In the Executive Summary subsection titled “Project Description” (on page ii of the Draft EIR), the following change is proposed to the ninth paragraph in response to comment DUBRIDGE-R-2.3:

Recreational facilities displaced by construction (i.e., the putting green and bocce ball court) would be relocated to the west of Building A. The proposed Project would also include a public trail connection along Odd Fellows Drive, connecting Fruitvale Avenue with the San Marcos Open Space, via Chester Avenue, Gypsy Hill Road, and Via De Marcos. To facilitate project construction, the majority of trees within and around the proposed building footprints (approximately 124 in total) would be removed, 65 of which are protected trees under the City’s Tree Protection Ordinance (Saratoga Municipal Code Section 15-50). Approximately 240 replacement trees would be planted, as required by the Tree Protection Ordinance.

In the Executive Summary subsection titled “Environmentally Superior Alternative” (on page v of the Draft EIR), the following changes are proposed to the last paragraph, in response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-19.1:

For these reasons, Alternative 2, the Reduced Development Alternative is identified as the City has determined that the next environmentally superior alternative to the No Project Alternative would be Alternative 2, the Reduced Development Alternative.

4.1.2 Changes to Section 2

In Section 2.3.1 (on page 2-6 of the Draft EIR), the following change is proposed to the first sentence of the second paragraph, as a staff-initiated change for clarification/consistency:

Building B would be constructed within the parking lot north of the Manor Building.

In Section 2.3.2 (on page 2-7 of the Draft EIR), the following change is proposed to the first paragraph in response to comment CHAN-M-1.1:

A total of 52 new independent living residential units would be constructed as part of the proposed Project (22 in Building A, 10 in Building B, and 20 in Building C), bringing the total number of independent living units on the property to 449 195.

Figures 2.3-2 and 2.3-3 (on pages 2-15 and 2-17 of the Draft EIR, respectively) have also been revised, as described in Section 4.3 of this Final EIR, below.

4.1.3 Changes to Section 3

In the introductory text to Section 3.2 (on page 3-7 of the Draft EIR), the following new bullet point is proposed to be added to the list of comments received during the public scoping period in response to DUBRIDGE-R-2.11:

- Concerns regarding the loss of open space, rural feel, scenic quality and vistas, and the Odd Fellows Home Historic Park.

In Section 3.2.3 (on page 3-37 of the Draft EIR), within the discussion of Impact AIR-2, the following changes are made to the third paragraph following the subheading “Construction” in response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration:

As shown in Table 3.3-5, construction-related emissions associated with the Project would not exceed the average daily thresholds of significance. Because construction-related exhaust emissions would not exceed the significance thresholds, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. If the duration of Project construction were to extend beyond that assumed in the modeling and analysis, then the period over which construction-related emissions would occur would also increase; however, the average daily emissions would be lower than

those shown in Table 3.3-5, as the same (or very similar) amount of construction work would be undertaken over a longer period of time, requiring less intensive use of construction equipment and/or less truck trips per day. If the construction start date were to be delayed compared to that assumed in the modeling and analysis, the construction activities are anticipated to result in lower levels of exhaust-related emissions due to advancements in engine technology, retrofits, and on-road and off-road equipment fleet turnover as stricter regulatory standards take effect. Therefore, the results of the modeling presented in Table 3.3-5 are considered to be conservative.

In Section 3.4.1 (on page 3-54 of the Draft EIR), the following changes are made to the second paragraph following the subheading “Wildlife” in response to comment SCVAS-1.5:

A wide variety of bird species likely utilizes the small open space areas within the Project site, as well as the ornamental vegetation and trees within the Project footprint and in the riparian corridor. These species include red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), house finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus*), mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), bushtit (*Psaltriparus minimus*), western bluebird (*Sialia mexicana*), American robin (*Turdus migratorius*), Anna’s hummingbird (*Calypte anna*), and others. A local group of acorn woodpeckers (*Melanerpes formicivorus*) reportedly utilize an existing cork oak (*Quercus suber*) near the intersection of West Cottages Lane and Odd Fellows Drive used as a granary (SCVAS 2023).

In Section 3.4.3 (on page 3-60 of the Draft EIR), within the discussion of Impact BIO-1, the following changes are made to the third paragraph following the subheading “Migratory Birds” in response to comment SCVAS-1.5:

In addition, the Project would involve the removal of approximately 120 trees (65 of which are protected by the City’s Tree Ordinance), which could be used by birds during the nesting season. None of the trees to be removed are within the riparian area associated with the unnamed tributary to Vasona Creek. If a tree containing an active nest were to be removed during construction, such removal would result in nest destruction and failure. In particular, removal of the cork oak near the intersection of West Cottages Lane and Odd Fellows Drive could impact the social group/family of acorn woodpeckers that are reported to utilize this specific tree as a granary. Due to ~~the~~ this potential for loss of nests, and due to potential disturbance of nesting birds from noise and vibration during Project construction, the impact to nesting birds would be **potentially significant**.

In Section 3.4.3 (on pages 3-60 to 3-61 of the Draft EIR), the following changes are made to mitigation measure MM-BIO-1 in response to comment SCVAS-1.5. Note that the full text of the mitigation measure is reproduced below, even those portions which have not been edited, to provide full context.

MM-BIO-1: Nesting Bird Avoidance Measures

- A. To the extent practicable, construction activities and any tree trimming/removal shall be performed from September 16 through February 15 to avoid the general nesting period for birds. If construction or tree trimming/removal cannot be performed during this

period, nesting bird surveys and active nest buffers (as necessary) shall be implemented as follows:

- i. Nesting Bird Surveys: If Project-related work is scheduled during the nesting season (typically February 15 to August 30 for small bird species such as passerines; January 15 to September 15 for owls; and February 15 to September 15 for other raptors), a qualified biologist shall conduct two surveys for active nests of such birds within 14 days prior to the beginning of Project construction, with the final survey conducted within 48 hours prior to construction. Appropriate minimum survey radii surrounding the work area shall be determined by the qualified biologist but should be at least: i) 50 feet for passerines; ii) 300 feet for raptors. Surveys shall be conducted at the appropriate times of day and during appropriate nesting times, as determined by the qualified biologist.
 - ii. Active Nest Buffers: If the qualified biologist documents active nests within the survey area, an appropriate buffer between the nest and active construction shall be established. The buffer shall be clearly marked and maintained until the young have fledged and are foraging independently. Prior to construction, the qualified biologist shall conduct baseline monitoring of the nest to characterize “normal” bird behavior and establish a buffer distance which allows the birds to exhibit normal behavior. The qualified biologist shall monitor the nesting birds daily during construction activities and shall increase the buffer if the birds show signs of unusual or distressed behavior (e.g., defensive flights and vocalizations, standing up from a brooding position, and/or flying away from the nest). If buffer establishment is not possible, the qualified biologist shall have the authority to cease all construction work in the area until the young have fledged and the nest is no longer active. Construction shall only be allowed to impact a migratory bird or its nest, including its young, if a permit from USFWS is obtained in accordance with the MTBA and all permit conditions are adhered to.
- B. Notwithstanding the restrictions in measure A above, the removal of the cork oak tree (identified in the arborist’s report as Tree #136) shall not be undertaken during the fall and winter months (September through February, inclusive). The applicant shall also consult with the City Arborist to determine if the tree could be retained on-site as a “snag”, without creating a safety hazard.

In Section 3.4.3 (on pages 3-61 to 3-62 of the Draft EIR), within the discussion of Impact BIO-1, the following changes are made to the first paragraph following the subheading “Operation” in response to comment SCVAS-1.4:

Ongoing operation of the Project would be similar to existing operations at the SRC campus, with no further substantial ground or vegetation disturbance other than ongoing maintenance and landscaping activities similar to existing operations. The proposed replacement of trees removed during Project

construction with smaller trees could temporarily reduce nesting habitat for migratory birds. However, urban nesting habitat is abundant in the vicinity of the Project, and higher quality nesting habitat is present in the riparian corridor immediately east and south of the Project footprint. As such, the proposed reduction in size and maturity of trees in the landscaped areas of the campus would not result in a significant impact to migratory birds. Furthermore, the proposed project would include measures to reduce potential impacts from new glazing and lighting at the site, such as limiting the correlated color temperature of lighting to 2700K or less; fully shielding all lighting fixtures and prohibiting the use of up-lighting; enabling use of dimmers, timers and motion sensors; requiring all glazed surfaces to use products with a threat factor rating of no more than 20 (as rated by the American Bird Conservancy); providing blinds or curtains for all windows; and avoiding highly reflective glazing or highly transparent glass (Ankrom Moisan 2024a). As such, impacts to birds from new glazing and lighting associated with the proposed project would also be less than significant.

In Section 3.6.3 (on page 3-118 of the Draft EIR), within the discussion of Impact ENE-1, the following changes are made to the paragraph preceding Table 3.6-1, in response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration:

Table 3.6-1 shows the estimated total and annual energy consumption as a result of the fuel used during Project construction activities. The annual energy consumption was estimated using the CalEEMod CO₂ emissions calculations for the proposed construction activities and application of the U.S. Energy Information Administration's CO₂ emissions coefficients (EIA 2021c) to estimate fuel consumption for construction activities. Additional modeling assumptions and more details are provided in Section 3.2, *Air Quality*, and **Appendix C**. If the duration of Project construction were to extend beyond that assumed in the modeling and analysis, then the period over which energy use would occur would also increase; however, the annual average energy use would be lower than those shown in Table 3.6-1, as the same (or very similar) amount of construction work would be undertaken over a longer period of time, requiring less intensive use of construction equipment and/or less truck trips per day. If the construction start date were to be delayed compared to that assumed in the modeling and analysis, the construction activities are anticipated to result in lower levels of energy consumption due to advancements in engine technology, retrofits, and on-road and off-road equipment fleet turnover as stricter regulatory standards take effect. Therefore, the estimated energy consumption presented in Table 3.6-1 is considered to be conservative.

In Section 3.8.3 (on page 3-158 of the Draft EIR), within the discussion of Impact GHG-1, the following changes are made to the first paragraph following the subheading "Impact Analysis" in response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration:

Construction and operational activities of the Project would result in the generation of direct and indirect GHG emissions. Heavy-duty off-road equipment, materials transport, and worker commutes during construction of the Project would result in exhaust related GHG emissions. Construction of the Project is anticipated to begin in 2023 and last approximately 25 months. Construction-related GHG emissions of the Project were estimated using the methodology discussed in Section 3.3, *Air Quality*. As discussed in that section, if the duration

of Project construction were to extend beyond that assumed in the modeling and analysis, then the period over which construction-related emissions would occur would also increase; however, the average daily emissions would be lower as the same (or very similar) amount of construction work would be undertaken over a longer period of time. If the construction start date were to be delayed compared to that assumed in the modeling and analysis, the construction activities would be anticipated to result in lower levels of exhaust-related emissions due to advancements in engine technology, retrofits, and on-road and off-road equipment fleet turnover as stricter regulatory standards take effect. Therefore, the construction-related GHG emissions described in this section are considered to be conservative.

In Section 3.9.3 (on page 3-175 of the Draft EIR), within the discussion of Impact HAZ-5, the following change is proposed to the last two sentences within the second paragraph under the subheading “Operation” as a staff-initiated change to correct an incomplete sentence:

The manual identifies Saratoga Retirement Community as a Shelter-In-Place Facility, and states that full facility evacuation is typically the last resort. The facility is required to conduct a drill of the emergency preparedness plan twice a year or per state regulations, and to review/update the plan annually.

In Section 3.10.1 (on page 3-179 of the Draft EIR), within the first paragraph under the subheading “Flood Hazards” the following changes are proposed in response to comment VW-2:

The Project site is not located in a 100-year flood zone as designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA 2021). According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) 06085C0219H, effective on May 18, 2009, the project site is located in Zone X, an area with a 0.2% annual chance flood hazard. The Project site is designated by FEMA as Zone X, which is an area of moderate flood hazard that is generally located between the 100- and 500-year flood zones. Zone X is defined as the 0.2% annual exceedance probability flood hazard, areas of 1% annual exceedance probability with average flood depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile, and areas protected by levees from 1% annual exceedance probability flood. Flood insurance is not required for facilities that are within FEMA Zone X.

In Section 3.10.1 (on page 3-183) of the Draft EIR, the following changes are proposed to the third and fourth paragraphs of the subsection titled “Groundwater” in response to comment VW-3 and VW-4:

Based on seasonal groundwater contours for 2019, the depth to groundwater in the Project vicinity varied from 320 (in the spring) to 340 (in the fall) feet elevation above mean sea level (i.e., approximately ~~20-40~~ 30-50 feet below the ground surface) (Valley Water 2021-2020). Soil borings obtained at the Project site to depths of up to 30 feet below the ground surface did not encounter groundwater (TRC 2019).

The Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Basin is a high priority basin as designated by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) under the Sustainable

Groundwater Management Act; however, this basin is not in a state of critical overdraft (DWR 2020). Valley Water serves as the Groundwater Sustainability Agency for this basin. Valley Water's 2016-2021 Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP) was submitted to the DWR to fulfill the requirements of periodic evaluation of the Alternative Groundwater Sustainability Plan (Valley Water 2021), and approved by DWR as an Alternative Groundwater Sustainability Plan under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (Valley Water 2016).

In Section 3.10.4 (on page 3-197 of the Draft EIR), within the discussion of Cumulative Impact C-HYD-1, the following changes are proposed to the fourth paragraph under the subheading "Cumulative Impact Analysis" in response to comments VW-1 and VW-3:

Cumulative projects would also be required to implement the requirements of the SCVURPPP's MS4 Permit and to design and engineer stormwater drainage systems according to standard engineering methods to reduce impacts related to stormwater drainage. This includes incorporation of site design measures (including LID design features based on the City's C.3 checklist), specific treatment measures, hydromodification management measures, and operations and maintenance requirements, all of which are specifically intended to reduce erosion and the transport of sediment and other pollutants in stormwater. Individual cumulative projects, while only resulting in a minor increase of impervious surfaces at any individual project site, when considered together, would result in an increase in the amount of impervious area and therefore a decrease in the area available for rainfall to provide groundwater recharge. However, the Valley Water's Groundwater Management Plan (Valley Water 2021) Alternative Groundwater Sustainability Plan (Santa Clara Valley Water District 2016) accounts for cumulative ~~decreases~~ changes in regional recharge resulting from future development that is projected in the general plans of jurisdictions within the Santa Clara and Llagas subbasins Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Basin. The basin is currently in long-term balance (in terms of groundwater supply vs. groundwater demand) due to Valley Water's comprehensive managed recharge and in-lieu recharge programs. Chapter 5 of the District Valley Water's Alternative Groundwater Sustainability Plan sets forth ~~the District's~~ Valley Water's groundwater sustainability goals and includes policies and basin management strategies designed to ensure that groundwater supplies are managed to optimize water supply reliability.

In Section 3.12.3 (on page 3-219 of the Draft EIR), within the discussion of Impact NOI-1, the following changes are made to the third paragraph following the subheading "Construction-related Traffic Noise" in response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration:

Table 3.12-3 shows the estimated peak-hour traffic volumes on local roadway segments in the vicinity of the Project site, as well as the anticipated peak-hour construction traffic that would be generated by the Project on each segment and the estimated increase in traffic noise from Project-related construction traffic. If the duration of Project construction were to extend beyond that assumed in the analysis, then the period over which construction-related traffic noise would occur would also increase; however, the average traffic volume (and associated traffic noise) would be lower as the same (or very similar) amount of construction-related vehicles would be spread over a longer period of time. Therefore, the

estimated increase in construction-related traffic noise described in Table 3.12-3 is considered to be conservative.

In Section 3.12.3 (on page 3-223 of the Draft EIR), within the discussion of Impact NOI-1, the following changes are made to the second to last paragraph prior to Table 3.12-6 in response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration:

Table 3.12-6 shows the closest sensitive receptors to each of the proposed construction zones, and the anticipated exterior noise levels at those receptors during construction. The estimated noise levels are conservative, based on simultaneous use of multiple pieces of equipment, and do not account for screening that might be provided by fences, vegetation, buildings, or other objects between the source and receptor. Actual noise levels perceived by receptors would fluctuate over time and space, depending on the number and type of equipment used, the location of the equipment within the construction zone, and any screening or shielding from objects. Noise levels at receptors further from the construction zones would experience lower noise levels than those shown in the table, due to the increased distance between source and receptor. If the duration of Project construction were to extend beyond that assumed in the analysis, then the period over which construction-related noise impacts would occur would also increase. However, an extended construction duration would likely also involve less intensive use of construction equipment, such that the assumptions as to simultaneous use of multiple pieces of equipment would likely over-estimate the predicted noise levels. Therefore, the estimated noise levels generated by construction equipment described in Table 3.12-6 are considered to be conservative.

In Section 3.12.3 (on pages 3-226 to 3-228 of the Draft EIR), the following changes to mitigation measure MM-NOI-1a are proposed in response to MASTER-14: Construction Noise and RAVIKUMAR-R-1.31. Note that the full text of the mitigation measure is reproduced below, even those portions which have not been edited, to provide full context.

MM-NOI-1a: Update and Implement Construction Noise Mitigation Plan

The Project Applicant and its construction contractor(s) shall retain a qualified acoustic consultant to update the preliminary Construction Noise Management Plan based on the final design of the Project and to include the following actions, and shall implement the updated plan throughout the duration of construction activities at the project site. The updated Construction Noise Management Plan shall be submitted to the City Community Development Department for review and approval prior to issuance of a grading or building permit for the project.

- A. Provide ongoing coordination and training to all subcontractors on “Noise Awareness Training”. Training will help ensure the Construction Noise Mitigation Plan is implemented effectively.
- B. Engage the public and residents for active feedback
 - i. Provide sufficient notice (no fewer than 14 days prior to onset of any noise-intensive construction activity) to the facility, its residents, and neighboring properties within 200 feet of any

- construction area, including the anticipated schedule of planned work.
 - ii. Such notices shall include contact information for a point of contact who shall address questions or noise concerns.
 - iii. Conduct weekly status meeting with the Facilities team outlining upcoming activities, which shall be verifiably relayed to the residents.
- C. Identify noise abatement opportunities below, wherever practicable:
- i. Locate haul routes away from active noise-sensitive buildings
 - ii. Locate storage and construction staff parking areas off site.
 - iii. Design foundation systems that eliminate noise-intensive work, (e.g., pile driving).
 - iv. Design shoring systems that prevent un-necessary noise or vibration.
- D. Mitigation at noise source:
- i. Specify the use of quieter equipment/procedure alternatives, where practicable, in the contract documents.
 - ii. Require equipment used onsite to produce sound levels below the City of Saratoga 100 dBA limit at 25 feet.
 - iii. Schedule construction activities that generate higher noise levels at optimal times of the day.
 - iv. Ensure all construction activities occur within the working hours prescribed by the City of Saratoga.
 - v. Install temporary signage on approaches to speed bumps along on-site haul routes to remind drivers to slow down before crossing.
- E. Path mitigation by providing sound barriers.
- i. Provide temporary sound barriers along heavy traffic paths and portions of the site haul route as needed.
 - ii. Provide temporary sound barriers that would obstruct the line-of-sight from receptors to key construction zone areas for all receptors predicted to experience construction noise levels greater than the FTA criterion of 80 dBA (Leq(8-hour)). Such barriers shall be designed by a qualified acoustic consultant and shall be of sufficient mass and dimension to reduce predicted construction noise levels to the FTA criterion or lower wherever practicable. Should barrier implementation be infeasible, or if monitoring shows that the noise levels at the receptors still exceed the FTA criterion, residence windows shall be acoustically upgraded with sufficient temporary window inserts (as recommended by the qualified acoustic consultant) or affected residents shall be temporarily relocated.
- F. Construction Noise Monitoring
- i. Noise measurements shall be conducted on a weekly basis, or more frequently if complaints are received, to verify that noise barriers are performing as intended and construction noise

levels remain at or below the FTA criterion at receptors. Measurements shall be conducted for a period considered representative of noise levels for the given day/week. Noise measurements shall also be conducted at the onset of new construction phases (considering phase changes in nearby work areas as well) and if ongoing construction activities shift drastically toward a receptor.

- ii. Measurements shall be conducted by or under the direction of a qualified acoustic consultant using a sound level meter rated by the American National Standards Institute as Class 1 or Class 2 per American National Standards Institute S1.4-2014.
- iii. Should monitored noise levels exceed the FTA criterion, construction activities generating the exceedance shall be stopped until either construction noise levels can be reduced to within limits or residents are relocated.

G. Noise Receptor Mitigation

- i. The contractor shall coordinate with the facility to move residents temporarily if needed during construction activities that are disruptive.
- ii. Facility management shall ensure that building heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems are operating at full capacity/function throughout the construction period, to allow residents to maintain closed windows throughout the construction period.

In Section 3.15.1 (on page 3-257 of the Draft EIR), the following changes are made to the third paragraph under the subheading “3.15.1 Environmental Setting” in response to MASTER-23: Loss of Recreational Area/Open Space:

In addition to parks, the City also maintains a network of trails and open wilderness spaces. The San Marcos Open Space area includes approximately 10 acres of natural open space between Crisp Avenue and Gypsy Hill Road, approximately 300 feet southeast of the Project site (as the crow flies). It contains a 0.6-mile loop trail (the San Marcos Open Space Trail) that connects with other City trails along Gypsy Hill Road and Chester Avenue (City of Saratoga 2010a). Access to the San Marcos Open Space from the project site cannot be obtained directly due to topography and lack of a direct road/trail connection. Pedestrians can access the Open Space via a 0.8 mile route along Chester Avenue and Gypsy Hill Road; vehicular access from the SRC campus to the open space requires approximately 1.1 mile route via Odd Fellows Drive, Fruitvale Avenue, and Crisp Avenue. Other nearby trails include the Heritage Loop Trail, which is a 4.5-mile pedestrian trail that parallels Saratoga Avenue, Fruitvale Avenue, and Saratoga-Los Gatos Road (City of Saratoga 2010b).

In Section 3.16.3 (on page 3-277 of the Draft EIR), within the discussion of Impact TRA-1, the following changes are made to the second paragraph following the subheading “Construction” in response to MASTER-13: Construction Duration:

The estimated daily average construction truck trips for each phase of the Project are provided in Table 3.16-2, along with estimated number of worker commute trips (i.e., trips from the workers' homes to the offsite staging area at West Valley College), and number of worker shuttle trips (between the offsite staging area and the Project site). If the duration of Project construction were to extend beyond that assumed in the analysis, then the period over which construction-related traffic impacts would occur would also increase; however, the average construction-related traffic volume would be lower as the same (or very similar) number of construction-related vehicles would be spread over a longer period of time. Therefore, the estimated construction-related traffic described in Table 3.16-2 is considered to be conservative.

In Section 3.16.3 (on page 3-279 of the Draft EIR), the following changes are made to the italicized paragraph preceding the subheading "Operation" in response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-3.4:

It is acknowledged that during the public scoping period for this EIR, multiple comments were received expressing concern regarding the effects of Project construction—in particular with respect to disruption of private roadways and pedestrian facilities within the Project site. As noted above, Project construction would not conflict with any applicable program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system because such programs and policies do not apply to private roads, and therefore, the proposed Project would not cause a significant impact under this threshold. The temporary effects of Project construction on internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation and congestion on private roads within the Project site is therefore not a potential physical effect on the environment requiring analysis under CEQA for Impact TRA-1; however, temporary traffic-related impacts are addressed within Impacts TRA-3 and TRA-4 below, as they relate to traffic safety and emergency access. ~~but rather is an issue for SRC management to address directly with their construction contractor and existing residents. Nonetheless, it is noted that~~ As discussed for those impacts, mitigation measure MM-TRA-3a, requires the construction contractor develop and implement a construction traffic control plan to mitigate potential impacts relating to traffic safety and emergency access (see Impacts TRA-3 and TRA-4 below). Such a plan would also serve to reduce disruption to the internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation system within the Project site during construction.

In Section 3.16.3 (on pages 3-283 and 3-284 of the Draft EIR), the following changes to mitigation measure MM-TRA-3a are proposed in response to MASTER-25: On-Site Traffic Congestion/Disruption and MASTER-26: Pedestrian Safety. Note that the full text of the mitigation measure is reproduced below, even those portions which have not been edited, to provide full context.

MM-TRA-3a: Construction Traffic Control Plan.

- A. Prior to issuance of demolition or grading permits, the Project Applicant and/or its construction contractor shall develop a traffic control plan in accordance with the City's Standard Details and Specifications for Construction and Temporary Traffic Control Plan Requirements and shall submit the plan to the City Community Development Department for

review and approval. The Traffic Control Plan shall be implemented throughout the duration of construction and shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- i. Schedule of construction showing each phase of the project, construction hours, and anticipated method of handling traffic for each phase, including drawings identifying lane configurations, haul routes, road and lane closures, detour routes for vehicular and pedestrian traffic, work areas, staging areas, and worker parking areas. The location of signs, barricades, codes, etc., to warn, direct, and guide traffic shall be shown on the plan, as well as any supplementary traffic control devices that might be required. The plan shall address both vehicular traffic as well as pedestrians, and shall specifically address pedestrians utilizing mobility devices such as wheelchairs, motorized scooters, and walking frames, for example, as well as pedestrians with visual and/or hearing impairments.
- ii. Development and implementation of a process for communicating with owners/occupants of properties accessed via Odd Fellows Drive and/or San Marcos Road about Project construction, with at least 72 hours advance notice prior to commencing work on the Project and of any temporary lane or road closures (including private roadways within the SRC campus). Notification shall include the construction schedule, the exact location and duration of activities on each roadway, detours and alternative routes that may be available to avoid delays, and contact information for questions and complaints. The City Community Development Department shall be included in any notifications.
- iii. Notification of administrators of any affected police and fire stations, and ambulance service providers regarding the timing, location, and duration of construction activities and the locations of detours and road or lane closures. Access for emergency vehicles on and/or adjacent to roadways affected by construction activities shall be maintained at all times.
- iv. Scheduling equipment/deliveries during off-peak vehicular commuter hours and use of flaggers if oversized loads are required.

In Section 3.16.3 (on page 3-285 of the Draft EIR), the following changes to mitigation measure MM-TRA-3b (subsection A) are proposed as a staff-initiated change to better clarify the recommendations of the traffic study. Additional changes to subsection B and the paragraph immediately following the mitigation measure are also proposed in response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-3.2. Note that the full text of the mitigation measure is reproduced below, even those portions which have not been edited, to provide full context.

MM-TRA-3b: Implement Recommendations of Traffic Safety Improvements Study.

- A. The Project Applicant shall implement all recommendations of the Traffic Study prepared for the Project by Hexagon Transportation Consultants Inc., dated January 22, 2021, which are:
- i. that the Project Applicant ensure that there is no tall vegetation near the driveways that would block a driver's sight distance in accordance with Caltrans' stopping sight distance based on roadway speed for 150 feet;
 - ii. that stop signs should be installed for exiting vehicles at all new intersections, and a drop-off area be maintained in front of the Manor Building;
 - iii. that a sign indicating one-way travel be installed at the exit from Pavilion Circle onto West Cottages Lane; and
 - iv. that the Project Applicant clearly communicate with the delivery vehicles that they need to park in designated areas on site.
- B. In addition, the Project Applicant shall implement the following additional measures pertaining to traffic safety:
- i. develop and implement a delivery schedule for vendors so that the number of simultaneous deliveries to campus does not exceed the available designated loading space.
 - ii. ensure that no signage is installed that would block a driver's sight distance (per item A.i above).

Implementation of mitigation measure MM-TRA-3b would reduce the potential for traffic safety issues at the Project site by ensuring that sight distances from intersections are not impeded by vegetation growth or signage, that new driveway intersections are stop-controlled, that the one-way exit from Pavilion Circle is clearly labeled as such, and that protocols for vendor deliveries are improved, as recommended by the Traffic Study. With implementation of these measures, impacts relating to traffic safety would be reduced to **less than significant with mitigation**.

4.1.4 Changes to Section 4

In Section 4.4.3 (on page 4-59 of the Draft EIR), within the discussion of Impact NOI-1, the following changes are proposed to the first paragraph following Figure 4.4-3, as a staff-initiated change to correct a typographical error:

As can be seen from Figure 4.4-3, some areas outside of the SRC property could receive noise levels in excess of the 40 dBA L_{eq} threshold, if Alternative 1 ~~Alternative 3~~ were to utilize HVAC units with a reference sound power rating of 93 dBA (or above). These include areas to the north and east of the campus (e.g., portions of 14505 and 14506 Chester Avenue and the Fellowship Plaza property), which could receive noise levels up to 41dBA. Because noise levels from HVAC units on the proposed buildings could exceed the applicable nighttime threshold from the noise ordinance, the impact of Alternative 1 would be **potentially significant**.

In Section 4.4.3 (on page 4-66 of the Draft EIR), within the discussion of Impact TRA-1, the following changes are proposed to the first paragraph following the subheading “Construction”, in response to SCHMIDEK-D-2.7:

Similar to the Project, construction of Alternative 1 would result in a temporary increase in traffic in the vicinity of the SRC campus due to construction workers commuting to the site and truck trips for soil and demolition debris export and deliveries. Congestion associated with construction traffic and movement of larger construction vehicles such as trucks could potentially create traffic-related hazards. Construction-related traffic would vary depending on the work activity at the site, with four non-overlapping phases of construction. The primary haul truck travel route to the Project site under Alternative 1 would be the same as the proposed Project (i.e., from SR 85 to Saratoga Avenue, Fruitvale Avenue, San Marcos Road, and Odd Fellows Drive). Construction-related traffic under this alternative would affect fewer of the private roadways within the SRC campus than the proposed Project, due to the reduced number of construction zones.

In Section 4.5.3 (on page 4-107 of the Draft EIR), the following staff-initiated change is proposed to the first paragraph under the subheading “Construction” to correct a minor error:

Similar to the Project, ~~Alternative 1~~ Alternative 2 would generate noise during the construction period from sources such as equipment, haul trucks, and worker vehicles traveling to and from the Project site, and heavy machinery and equipment operating on the site. These are addressed in turn, below. Like the proposed Project, construction phases for Alternative 2 would overlap.

In Section 4.6.3 (on page 4-136 of the Draft EIR), the following change is proposed to the first paragraph under the subheading “Impact AES-3: Scenic Quality”, in response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.17:

Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in visual changes to the Project site through the construction of new Buildings A, C, and D, the meeting room, fitness center addition, new cottage, changes to internal campus roads and parking areas, and the removal and/or relocation of trees to facilitate the proposed development. The visual changes under this Alternative would occur in similar locations on campus as the proposed Project, except that visual changes would also occur in the northwest corner of the site (Building D) and further south along West Cottages Drive (new cottage). Alternative 3 would avoid the construction of a new building immediately in front of the Manor Building; but would include modification of the grassed slope in this area to create additional surface parking. Additional trees would be planted along the residential boundary to the west east of Building D to provide screening from the adjacent residence and associated yard.

In Section 4.6.3 (on page 4-176 of the Draft EIR), within the discussion of Impact NOI-2, the following changes are proposed to Table 4.6-7 in response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.26. Note that the full table is reproduced below, even those portions which have not been revised, to provide full context.

Table 4.6-7 Estimated Maximum Vibration at Sensitive Receptors – Alternative 3

Vibration Source	Receptor	Minimum ¹ Distance (feet)	Estimated Max Vibration ² at Receptor (in/sec PPV)	Threshold for Potential Building Damage ³ (in/sec PPV)	Estimated Max Vibration ² at Receptor (VdB)	Threshold for Potential Human Annoyance ⁴ (VdB)
Parking Area	Manor Building	85 feet	0.033	0.2	78	80
	14505 Chester Avenue	75 feet	0.040	0.3	80	80
<i>Building C Construction</i>	<i>Manor Building</i>	<i>35 feet</i>	<i>0.127</i>	<i>0.2</i>	90	80
	<i>Assisted Living Building</i>	<i>20 feet</i>	<i>0.293</i>	<i>0.3</i>	97	80
Cottage Demolition	Manor Building	95 feet	0.012	0.3	70	80
	6016 West Cottage Lane	10 feet	0.352	0.3	99	80
	14622 Burgundy Way	16 feet	0.174	0.3	93	80
	<u>14622 Granite Way</u>	<u>25 feet</u>	<u>0.089</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>80</u>
Building D Construction	6016 West Cottage Lane	10 feet	0.830	0.3	106	80
	14622 Burgundy Way	16 feet	0.410	0.3	100	80
	<u>14622 Granite Way</u>	<u>25 feet</u>	<u>0.210</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>80</u>
Cottage Construction	6118/6120 West Cottage	8 feet	1.160	0.3	109	80
	19300 Chablis Court	16 feet	0.410	0.3	100	80
	<u>19300 Chablis Court</u>	<u>25 feet</u>	<u>0.210</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>80</u>
Meeting Room Addition	<i>Manor Building</i>	<i>3 feet</i>	5.052	0.2	122	80
	<i>6102-6108 West Cottage</i>	<i>50 feet</i>	<i>0.074</i>	0.3	85	80
Fitness Center Addition	<i>Manor Building</i>	<i>360 feet</i>	<i>0.004</i>	0.3	59	80
	<i>6118/6120 West Cottage</i>	<i>50 feet</i>	<i>0.074</i>	0.3	85	80
Building A Construction	<i>Manor Building</i>	<i>50 feet</i>	<i>0.074</i>	0.3	85	80
	<i>6114/6116 West Cottage</i>	<i>75 feet</i>	<i>0.040</i>	0.3	80	80

Source: calculated by AECOM. See **Appendix E**.

Acronyms: in/sec = inches per second; Lv = velocity level in decibels, based on the root mean square velocity amplitude; PPV = peak particle velocity; VdB = velocity decibels.

Notes:

1. Minimum distance measured from edge of proposed construction zone to the closest edge of the nearest receptor.
2. For construction phases, estimated maximum vibration levels calculated using reference value for vibratory roller (0.210 PPV in/sec at 25 feet), adjusted using standard vibration attenuation rate based on specified distances between source and receptors. For demolition phase, estimated maximum vibration levels calculated using reference value for hoe ram or large bulldozer (0.089 PPV in/sec at 25 feet).
3. The threshold for building damage used for the Manor Building is that for a “non-engineered timber and masonry” buildings (0.2 in/sec PPV). For more modern buildings on the SRC campus and adjacent residential properties, the threshold for “Engineered concrete and masonry” buildings (0.3 in/sec PPV) is used.

In Section 4.6.3 (on page 4-177 of the Draft EIR), in the discussion of Impact NOI-2, the following changes are proposed to third, fourth, fifth and sixth paragraphs following Table 4.6-7, in response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.29:

Construction of Building D would cause vibration levels at the adjacent cottage ~~and the nearest neighboring residence~~ that could exceed the 0.3 threshold for potential building damage ~~for both structures~~ (but would not exceed the applicable thresholds for building damage at the Manor Building or at the closest neighboring residence, 14622 Granite Way).

Construction of the new cottage further south on West Cottage Lane would also cause vibration levels at the two adjacent cottages ~~and the neighboring residence~~ that would exceed the applicable threshold for building damage. Vibration levels at the nearest off-site residence (19300 Chablis Court) would not exceed the threshold for building damage).

In addition, construction of Buildings A, C, D, Meeting Room, Fitness Center, and the new cottage and demolition of the existing cottage would also generate levels of vibration that exceed the applicable human annoyance threshold of 80 VdB for some receptors. For the cottage demolition and construction of Buildings D and the new cottage, this would include off-site receptors such as the residences at 14622 Burgundy Granite Way and 19300 Chablis Court.

Because construction of Alternative 3 would result in levels of temporary vibration that could exceed the applicable threshold for building damage at the Manor Building, and three on-site cottages, and two neighboring residential structures, ~~and~~ that would substantially exceed the threshold for human annoyance for several campus residents and neighbors, impacts related to vibration during construction activities of Alternative 3 would be **potentially significant**.

In Section 4.7.1, Environmentally Superior Alternative (on page 4-195 of the Draft EIR), the following changes are proposed to the last paragraph, in response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-19.1:

Because Alternative 2 would avoid the significant and unavoidable impact to the historic resource and would not introduce any additional impacts or require additional mitigation measures, Alternative 2, the Reduced Development Alternative is identified as the City has determined that the next environmentally superior alternative to the No Project Alternative would be Alternative 2, the Reduced Development Alternative.

In Section 4.7 (on pages 4-195 and 4-196 of the Draft EIR), the following changes are proposed to Table 4.7-1, in response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-7.2. Note that the full table is reproduced below, even those portions which have not been revised, to provide full context.

Table 4.7-1 Comparison of Proposed Project and Alternatives

Environmental Impact	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative	Alternative 1: Residents' Alternative	Alternative 2: Reduced Development	Alternative 3: Applicant's Alternative
Impact AES-1: <u>Scenic Vistas</u>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Impact AES-2: <u>Scenic Resources</u>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Impact AES-3: <u>Scenic Quality</u>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Impact AES-4: <u>Light and Glare</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact AIR-1: <u>Air Quality Plan Conflicts</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS-	LTS
Impact AIR-2: <u>Criteria Pollutants</u>	LTSM	NI	LTSM	LTSM-	LTSM
Impact AIR-3: <u>Sensitive Receptors</u>	LTSM	NI	LTSM+	LTSM	LTSM+
Impact AIR-4: <u>Odor and Other Emissions</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact BIO-1: <u>Special-Status Species</u>	LTSM	NI	LTSM+	LTSM	LTSM
Impact BIO-2: <u>Riparian Habitat</u>	NI	NI	LTSM	NI	NI
Impact BIO-3: <u>Protected Wetlands</u>	NI	NI	LTSM	NI	NI
Impact BIO-4: <u>Wildlife Migration/Nursery</u>	LTSM	NI	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM
Impact BIO-5: <u>Policy/Ordinance Conflicts</u>	LTS	NI	LTS-	LTS-	LTS
Impact BIO-6: <u>Habitat Conservation Plans</u>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Impact CUL-1: <u>Historic Resources</u>	S&U	NI	LTS	LTSM	LTSM
Impact CUL-2: <u>Archaeological Resources</u>	LTSM	NI	LTSM-	LTSM-	LTSM+
Impact CUL-3: <u>Human Remains</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact ENE-1: <u>Wasteful Inefficient Use</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact ENE-2: <u>Energy Plan Conflicts</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact GEO-1: <u>Seismic Hazards</u>	LTS	NI	LTSM	LTS	LTS
Impact GEO-2: <u>Soil Erosion</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact GEO-3: <u>Unstable Soils</u>	LTS	NI	LTSM	LTS	LTS
Impact GEO-4: <u>Expansive Soils</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact GEO-5: <u>Septic Suitability</u>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Impact GEO-6: <u>Paleontological Resources</u>	LTSM	NI	LTSM-	LTSM-	LTSM+
Impact GHG-1: <u>GHG Emissions</u>	LTSM	NI	LTSM	LTSM-	LTSM
Impact GHG-2: <u>Plan/Regulation Conflicts</u>	LTSM	NI	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM
Impact HAZ-1: <u>Hazardous Materials</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS+
Impact HAZ-2: <u>Emissions Near Schools</u>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Impact HAZ-3: <u>Contaminated Sites</u>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Impact HAZ-4: <u>Airport Safety/Noise</u>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Impact HAZ-5: <u>Emergency Response</u>	LTSM	NI	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM
Impact HYD-1: <u>Water Quality Standards</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact HYD-2: <u>Groundwater</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact HYD-3: <u>Drainage Patterns</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact HYD-4: <u>Flood/Tsunami/Seiche</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact HYD-5: <u>Water Quality Plans</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Environmental Impact	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative	Alternative 1: Residents' Alternative	Alternative 2: Reduced Development	Alternative 3: Applicant's Alternative
Impact LUP-1: <u>Plan/Policy Conflicts</u>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Impact LUP-2: <u>Division of Community</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact NOI-1: <u>Noise</u>	LTSM	NI	LTSM	LTSM-	LTSM+
Impact NOI-2: <u>Vibration</u>	LTSM	NI	LTSM-	LTSM-	LTSM+
Impact NOI-3: <u>Airport Noise</u>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Impact POP-1: <u>Growth Inducement</u>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Impact POP-2: <u>Displacement</u>	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Impact PSR-1: <u>Public Services</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact REC-1: <u>Deterioration of Existing Facilities</u>	LTS	NI	LTS-	LTS	LTS
Impact REC-2: <u>New Recreation Facilities</u>	LTS	NI	LTS-	LTS	LTS
Impact TRA-1: <u>Plan/Policy Conflicts</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact TRA-2: <u>Vehicle Miles Traveled</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact TRA-3: <u>Traffic-related Hazards</u>	LTSM	NI	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM
Impact TRA-4: <u>Emergency Access</u>	LTSM	NI	LTSM-	LTSM	LTSM
Impact TCR-1: <u>Tribal Cultural Resources</u>	LTSM	NI	LTSM-	LTSM-	LTSM
Impact UTI-1: <u>New/Expanded Services</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact UTI-2: <u>Water Supplies</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact UTI-3: <u>Wastewater Treatment</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact UTI-4: <u>Solid Waste Capacity</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact UTI-5: <u>Solid Waste Regulations</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact WF-1: <u>Emergency Evacuation</u>	LTSM	NI	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM
Impact WF-2: <u>Wildfire Pollutants</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact WF-3: <u>Exacerbation of Fire Risk</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Impact WF-4: <u>Post-fire Impacts</u>	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Agriculture and Forestry Impacts	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Mineral Resource Impacts	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Number of impacts with higher significance level	N/A	0	4	0	0
Number of impacts with lower significance level	N/A	47	1	1	1
Number of impacts with same significance level	N/A	16	58	62	62

Source: compiled by AECOM. For each alternative, the significance determination shown in the table for a particular impact is the most severe of the construction or operational-phase impact.

Acronyms: N/A = Not Applicable; NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than Significant Impact; LTSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation; S&U = Significant and Unavoidable.

Bold indicates that impact is different level of significance than the Project.

- indicates that although the overall level of significance for the Alternative would be the same as the proposed Project, the duration or intensity of the impact would be less, and/or fewer mitigation measures would be required.

+ indicates that although the overall level of significance for the Alternative would be the same as the proposed Project, the duration or intensity of the impact would be greater, and/or additional mitigation measures would be required.

4.1.5 Changes to Section 5

In Section 5.1 (page 5-1 of the Draft EIR), the following changes are proposed to the second paragraph, in response to comment SCHMIDEK-D-19.1:

Most impacts identified related to the Project would be either less than significant or could be mitigated to a less than significant level. However, the Project would also result in one significant impact that cannot feasibly be avoided or mitigated to a less than significant level. Based on the environmental analyses within this EIR, ~~the City has determined that~~ implementation of the Project would result in the following significant and unavoidable impact:

4.2 Global Edits throughout the Draft EIR

In several sections of the Draft EIR, various references to the Santa Clara Valley Water District (e.g., SCVWD or the District) have been updated in response to comment VW-1 to use their new name “Valley Water”.

In several sections of the Draft EIR, various references to Valley Water’s 2016 Alternative Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) have been updated in response to comment VW-3 to refer to Valley Water’s 2021 Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP). In most cases, the updated reference did not require further revisions to the text within which the citation was made, as the content of the 2016 GSP and 2021 GWMP are very similar. The limited cases where updates to the text were required are described within the “Changes to Specific Sections of the Draft EIR” above.

In several sections of the Draft EIR the address of the neighboring property to the west of the northwest corner of the SRC campus has been updated at all occurrences in response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.26, with its correct address of: 14622 ~~Burgundy~~ Granite Way.

In several mitigation measures (MM-AIR-3, MM-BIO-4, MM-CUL-1b, MM-CUL-1c, MM-CUL-2, MM-GEO-6, MM-NOI-1b, MM-NOI-2, C-MM-NOI-1, MM-TRA-3a, C-MM-TRA-4, and MM-GEO-1-ALT1) the terms “the City”, “the City Planning Department”, or “the City Planning Division” have been replaced with “the City Community Development Department”, as a staff-initiated change.

4.3 New or Updated Figures in the Draft EIR

In response to comment BARDIN-T-2.2, Figures 2.3-2 and 2.3-3 on pages 2-15 and 2-17 of the Draft EIR have been swapped so that the captions correctly describe the contents of the figures. The key plans within these figures have also been updated to identify the correct elevations shown in the figure. A copy of the amended figures, with correct captions and key plans are included in Appendix C of this document.

4.4 New or Updated References in the Draft EIR

In response to various changes to the EIR text presented above, additional references were added to the text of the Draft EIR and/or existing references were updated to refer to more updated information. Therefore, the following edits to Section 6, References of the Draft EIR are proposed:

Under the subheading “Biological Resources” (page 6-3 of the Draft EIR):

- Ankrom Moisan Architects, Inc. 2024a. Letter dated January 5, 2024 to Cynthia Richardson, Saratoga Community Development from Chris Dalengas and Joe Tucker, Ankrom Moisan Architects, Inc. Subject: RE: 14500 Fruitvale, Saratoga Retirement Community, Zone Change, Campus Expansion, and New Master Plan. Application Number: PDR 19-0023, ARB 19-0039, GEO 19-0013, AND ZOA 19-004.

Under the subheading “Hydrology and Water Quality” (page 6-9 of the Draft EIR):

- Santa Clara Valley Water District (Valley Water). 2021. *Groundwater Management Plan for the Santa Clara and Llagas Subbasins*. Available online: <https://www.valleywater.org/your-water/where-your-water-comes/groundwater/sustainable>. Accessed August 15, 2023. ~~Santa Clara Valley Water District (Valley Water). 2016. *Groundwater Management Plan/Alternative Groundwater Sustainability Plan*. Available online: <https://www.valleywater.org/your-water/where-your-water-comes-from/groundwater>. Accessed March 24, 2021.~~

4.5 New or Updated Appendices to the Draft EIR

In addition, the following new or updated appendices are proposed to be added to the EIR in support of the edits made in response to comments. Copies of these documents are contained in Appendix D of this Final EIR.

- The City Arborist’s approval report (dated May 16, 2022) contained in Appendix B of the Draft EIR has been updated with a revised version that was issued on July 10, 2023, in response to comment SCVAS-1.5.
- The estimated vibration calculations for Alternative 3 (Applicant’s Alternative) contained in Appendix E of the Draft EIR, have been revised based on the corrected minimum distance of 25 feet to the nearest off-site receptors 16422 Granite Way and 19300 Chablis Court, in response to comment RAVIKUMAR-R-1.29.

5 Additional References

The following additional references are cited within this Final EIR document in support of the discussion herein but are not referenced within the Draft EIR (or proposed to be added to the references in the Draft EIR as described in Section 4.4 above). References detailed in Section 6 of the Draft EIR that are also cited within this Final EIR document are incorporated by reference and not repeated within this section.

Amherst Fire Department. 2024. Website “Apparatus Dimensions”. Available at: <https://www.amherstma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/24306/710L-The-Retreat-Pre-Sub-Fire-Dept-Apparatus-Dimensions>. Accessed January 2024.

Ankrom Moisan. 2023. Letter dated November 10, 2023 to Cynthia Richardson, Saratoga Community Development from Chris Dalengas and Joe Tucker, Ankrom Moisan Architects, Inc. Subject: RE: 14500 Fruitvale, Saratoga Retirement Community, Zone Change, Campus Expansion, and New Master Plan. Application Number: PDR 19-0023, ARB 19-0039, GEO 19-0013, AND ZOA 19-004.

Ankrom Moisan 2024b. Saratoga Retirement Community Planning Commission Study Session Response.

Brown, Jason. 2024. Subject: RE: Inquiry regarding evacuation management in City of Saratoga. Sent to: Emma Rawnsley, AECOM, from Lieutenant Jason Brown #1688, West Valley Patrol Division, County Office of the Sheriff.

City of Saratoga, 2020. City of Saratoga Pedestrian, Equestrian & Bicycle Trails Advisory Committee Special Meeting Agenda. October 27, 2020. Available at: <https://www.saratoga.ca.us/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/10272020-717>.

City of Saratoga, 2023. City of Saratoga General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element. Screencheck Draft – May 2023. Available at: https://www.saratoga.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/2408/Draft-Open-Space-and-Conservation-Element-2023_07_20?bidId=.

City of Saratoga, 2024. City of Saratoga General Plan 2040 Safety Element. Adopted March 20, 2024. Available at: https://www.saratoga.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/4846/Safety-Element_Final_Clean02012024---GP.

City Rent-a-Truck. 2024. Website: “16-Yard Dump Truck”. Available at: <https://www.cityrentatruck.com/trucks-vehicles/dump-trucks/16-yard-dump-truck/>. Accessed January 2024.

Cornell Lab of Ornithology, 2023a. Acorn Woodpecker Overview. Available at: https://www.allaboutbirds.org/guide/Acorn_Woodpecker/. Accessed December 13, 2023.

Cornell Lab of Ornithology, 2023b. Acorn Woodpecker Sightings Map. Available at: https://www.allaboutbirds.org/guide/Acorn_Woodpecker/maps-sightings. Accessed December 13, 2023.

Department of Health Care Access and Information (HCAI). 2023. Guide for Working on Projects under OSHPD Jurisdiction. Revised September 27, 2023. Available at:

https://hcai.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Guide-Working_on_Projects_Under_OSHPD_Jurisdiction-Tips_from_the_Experts-092723-A.pdf.

- Doosan. 2024. Interim Tier 4 and Tier 4 Technologies. Available at: <https://nao-doosan-com.dibhids.net/dice/products/tier4/Tier+4+Technologies.page>, Accessed January 15, 2024.
- Fehr and Peers. 2020a. Saratoga Retirement Community Expansion Transportation Analysis and Site Access/Circulation – Peer Review. September 25th.
- Fehr and Peers. 2020b. Saratoga Retirement Community Expansion Transportation Analysis and Site Access/Circulation – Peer Review. December 22nd.
- Janusevicius, T. and R. Akelaityte. 2015. Speed Bumps Impact on Motor Transport Noise. The Baltic Journal of Road and Bridge Engineering, Vol. 10(2): 191-199. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3846/bjrbe.2015.24>. Accessed January 15, 2024.
- National Council for Air and Stream Improvement, Inc. (NCASI). 2024. Forest Carbon from Young vs. Old Forests. Available at https://www.ncasi.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/NCASI22_Forest_Carbon_YoungVsOld_print.pdf. Accessed January 15, 2024.
- Santa Clara County Fire Department. 2021a. Developmental Review Comments, Saratoga Retirement Community. Plan Review No. 21 1678. Dated May 11, 2021.
- Santa Clara County Fire Department. 2021b. Developmental Review Comments, Saratoga Retirement Community. Plan Review No. 21 1642. Dated July 6, 2021.
- Santa Clara County Fire Department. 2023. Developmental Review Comments, Saratoga CCRC – IL Expansion – BLDG A. Plan Review No. 22 4450. Dated December 12, 2023.
- Stel, Sarah. 2024a. Email dated January 18, 2024. Subject: Re: Question. Sent to: Chris Dalengas and Joe Tucker (Ankrom Moisan), Cynthia Richardson (City of Saratoga) and Brian McLemore (McLemore Development), from Sarah Stel, Saratoga Retirement Community Executive Director.
- Stel, Sarah. 2024b. Email dated February 26, 2024. Subject: Re: EIR Comment – Newly Emerging Spring. Sent to: Chris Dalengas, Ankrom Moisan from Sarah Stel, Saratoga Retirement Community Executive Director.
- Valenzuela, Neil. 2024. Email dated April 19, 2024. Subject: RE: Inquiry regarding evacuation management in City of Saratoga. Sent to: Emma Rawnsley, AECOM, from Captain Neil Valenzuela #1841, West Valley Patrol Division, County Office of the Sheriff.