

## SECTION 5: ERRATA

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

### 5.1 - Changes to Draft EIR Text

#### Section 1, Introduction

##### **Page 1-3, Environmental Issues Determined Not To Be Significant**

The list of checklist items scoped out to Section 7, Effects Found Not To Be Significant has been amended to strike sensitive receptors and add wildland fires.

In addition, certain subjects with various topical areas were determined not to be significant. Other potentially significant issues are analyzed in these topical areas; however, the following issues are not analyzed:

- Scenic Vistas (Section 3.1, Aesthetics)
- ~~Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Pollutant Concentrations (Section 3.2, Air Quality)~~
- Riparian Habitat or Other Sensitive Natural Community (Section 3.3, Biological Resources)
- Federally Protected Wetlands (Section 3.3, Biological Resources)
- Native Resident or Migratory Fish or Wildlife Species (Section 3.3, Biological Resources)
- Habitat, Natural Community, or Other Conservation Plan (Section 3.3, Biological Resources)
- Septic or Alternative Wastewater Disposal Systems (Section 3.5, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity)
- Exposure of Schools to Hazardous Materials (Section 3.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials)
- Airports (Section 3.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials)
- Wildland Fires (Section 3.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials)
- Private Airstrips (Section 3.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials)
- 100-Year Flood Hazards (Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality)
- Levee or Dam Failure (Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality)
- Seiches, Tsunamis, or Mudflows (Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality)
- Division of an Established Community (Section 3.8, Land Use)
- Conservation Plans (Section 3.8, Land Use)
- Aviation Noise (Section 3.9, Noise)

- Displacement of Persons or Housing (Section 3.10, Population and Housing)
- Air Traffic Patterns (Section 3.13, Transportation)

**Section 2, Project Description**

**Page 2-62, Discretionary and Ministerial Actions**

The list of discretionary and ministerial actions has been amended to specifically note the changes to the San Ramon Zoning Ordinance that would occur in conjunction with adoption of the North Camino Ramon Specific Plan.

Discretionary approvals and permits are required by the City of San Ramon for implementation of the proposed project. The proposed project would require the following discretionary approval and action:

- Specific Plan Adoption – Planning Commission and City Council (Includes associated text amendments and map changes to the San Ramon Zoning Ordinance)

**Section 3.2, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

**Page 3.2-43, Table 3.2-10**

A typographical error was corrected in Table 3.2-10.

2010 Clean Air Plan Control Strategy	Supporting North Camino Ramon Plan Policy or Measure
ECM 4: Shade Tree Planting	The Specific Plan Sustainability Guidelines include designing bio-retention swales into the parking lot landscaping as part of the exterior water management and shading strategies. In addition, the project would comply with the City of San Ramon’s Landscape Design Standards, which require landscaping plans. In parking lots, canopy <del>trees</del> <u>trees</u> are required to be provided throughout the parking area at the equivalent of one tree for every four spaces to provide shade.

**Page 3.2-43, Last Paragraph, Last Sentence**

A typographical error was corrected in the last paragraph.

ABAG is responsible for making long-term forecasts for population, housing, and employment for the nine-county Bay Area. The forecast are published in Projections 2009, which contains the most current forecast. In recent updates to the Projections, the forecasts have presented a realistic assessment of growth in the region, taking into account trends in markets and demographics, and local policies that promote more compact infill- and transit-oriented development. In the summer of 2006, ABAG contacted every city and county in the region to acquire the current version of its General Plan and other available planning documents. The short-term forecasts rely heavily on the local plans. As the forecasts move into the long-term, policy-based assumptions come into greater play. ABAG assumes that cities will update their plans to provide for ~~fore~~ more growth.

### Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality

#### Page 3.7-2, First Paragraph

The following correction was made at the request of Contra Costa County Flood Control & Water Conservation District.

#### **Watersheds and Drainage**

The Specific Plan boundaries are located within both the San Ramon Creek watershed and the Watson Canyon Drainage watershed. Norris Canyon Road ~~Crow Canyon Road~~ serves as the natural boundary between the two watersheds, although man-made diversions have resulted in some parcels north of Norris Canyon Road draining towards Watson Canyon Drainage. Each watershed is discussed below.

### Section 3.9, Noise

#### Page 3.9-48, Impact NOI-2 Impact Statement

The Impact NOI-2 impact statement has been revised to correct an erroneous reference to General Plan 2030.

#### **Vibration**

---

**Impact NOI-2: Development and land use activities contemplated by the Specific Plan ~~General Plan 2030~~ would not expose persons to excessive vibration levels.**

---

### Section 3.11, Public Services and Recreation

#### Pages 3.11-4 and 3.11-5, Table 3.11-4

Table 3.11-4 and the preceding text have been revised, based on comments submitted by the San Ramon Valley Unified School District.

Table 3.11-4 summarizes the three ~~four~~ schools that currently serve the Specific Plan area based on information provided by the California Department of Education for the 2010–2011 academic year.

**Table 3.11-4: School Summary (2010–2011)**

School	Grades	Enrollment	Full-Time Equivalent Teachers	Pupil-Teacher Ratio
<del>Bollinger Canyon Elementary</del>	K-5	546	<del>25.2</del>	21.7
Twin Creeks Elementary	K-5	519	24.3	21.4
Iron Horse Middle	6-8	957	36.7	26.1
California High	9-12	2,472	99.6	24.8
Source: California Department of Education, 2012.				

**Section 3.13, Utility Systems****Page 3.13-2, Second Paragraph**

The following deletion was made at the request of East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD), and a typographical error has been corrected.

Raw water from Pardee Reservoir is transported approximately 91 miles to EBMUD water treatment ~~plans~~ plants and terminal reservoirs through the Pardee Tunnel, the Mokelumne aqueducts, and the Lafayette aqueducts. ~~Water flowing by gravity from Pardee Reservoir takes 30 to 45 hours to reach the East Bay.~~

**Page 3.13-5, Recycled Water Supply Projections**

The following correction was made at the request of EBMUD.

Table 3.13-2 summarizes DERWA demand and supply projections between 2010 and 2030, as contained in the DSRSD 2010 ~~2005~~ Urban Water Management Plan.

**Page 3.13-14, Fourth Paragraph**

An incorrect sentence was deleted from this paragraph.

As identified in the Specific Plan, development within the plan boundaries would be required to comply with the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, which requires that plans and water usage estimates for landscape irrigation be submitted prior to the issuance of ministerial permits. ~~This has been incorporated as a mitigation measure.~~

**Section 5, Alternatives to the Proposed Project****Page 5-9, Aesthetics, Light and Glare**

A typographical error was corrected in the paragraph regarding Aesthetics, Light, and Glare.

**Aesthetics, Light, and Glare**

The Office/Retail Intensification Alternative would result in 125,300 more commercial square footage and 377 more residential dwelling units than would be permitted under the proposed project. The proposed project's impacts on State Scenic Highways and visual character were found to be less than significant and did not require mitigation. The Office/Retail Intensification Alternative would also have less than significant impacts on these areas, since the additional commercial and residential dwellings would not be more visible from offsite than those in the proposed project, due to the two-story limit on building height. The Office/Retail Intensification Alternative would result in more new sources of light and glare than the proposed project, and mitigation similar to the proposed project would be required to reduce this impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the Office/Retail Intensification Alternative ~~No Project Alternative~~ would have greater aesthetics, light, and glare impacts than the proposed project.