P.O. Box 682, Walnut, CA 91788-0682
21201 La Puente Road
Walnut, CA 91789-2018
Telephone (909) 595-7543
FAX (909) 595-6095
www.walnut.org

CITY OF WALNUT

October 11, 2017

VIA EMAIL & HAND DELIVERY
bscroggins@mtsac.edu
cnelson@mtsac.edu

Board of Trustees
c/o Carol Nelson, Executive Assistant
Mount San Antonio College
1100 North Grand Avenue
Walnut, CA 91789

RE: Comments to the Tiered Final Environmental Impact Report for the Mt. San Antonio College West Parcel Solar Project

Dear Members of the Board of Trustees:

The City of Walnut (the "City") has reviewed the Tiered Draft Project EIR for the West Parcel Solar Project, the District's Responses to Comments, Statement of Facts and Findings, and Mitigation Monitoring Program. On the basis of our review, the above-referenced proposed Tiered Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") presented for certification as Action Item No. 2 on tonight's Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda fails to satisfy the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Res. Code §§ 21000, et seq.), and the State of California Guidelines for the California Environmental Quality Act ("Guidelines")(14 Cal. Code Regs. §§15000 et seq.) ("CEQA").

The City acknowledges that Mt. SAC, United Walnut Taxpayers ("UWT") and the City have engaged in substantive settlement negotiations for the last several weeks. In light of the on-going efforts, the City has not previously submitted comments regarding the FEIR. The City urges the Mt. SAC Board of Trustees not to certify the FEIR and to postpone any action relating to the West Parcel pending ongoing settlement efforts and resolution of the FEIR's deficiencies identified in our comments and the comments submitted by UWT.

A matrix that provides both general comments and page/section specific comments addressing the inadequacy of the FEIR is attached. Among our principal findings are the following:

- **Project Segmentation – Inappropriate Piecemealing.** The proposed West Parcel Solar Project described and analyzed in the FEIR is intrinsically related to and dependent on the Mt. SAC Physical Education Project. The grading operations on and export from the PEP site provide the soils import for the grading operation on the

West Parcel. Analysis of the environmental impacts of the grading and hauling operations has been improperly segmented by analyzing these projects separately when Mt. SAC has known all along that the projects were dependent on one another. CEQA is to be interpreted in such manner as to afford the fullest possible protection to the environment within the reasonable scope of the statutory language. Based on this guidance from the California Supreme Court and the policies identified by the Legislature in Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21000, 21001, the term "project" is given a broad interpretation and application to maximize protection of the environment. This broad interpretation ensures that the requirements of CEQA cannot be avoided by chopping up proposed projects into bite-size pieces which, when taken individually, may have no significant adverse effect on the environment. ([*Plan for Arcadia, supra,] 42 Cal. App. 3d 712, 726 ...)* ... ." (*Lake County Energy Council v. County of Lake (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 851, 854 [139 Cal. Rptr. 176]*.)

In addition, as stated in the October 11, 2017 letter submitted by UWT regarding the FEIR, the inclusion and/or approval of a campus-wide mitigation and monitoring reporting program, as attached as an appendix, without the campus-wide projects being addressed or covered in the EIR, is an improper, piecemeal, unsupported, and illegal purported review, consideration and adoption.

- **Omission of CEQA Appendix G Checklist Thresholds.** The FEIR misstates or omits numerous CEQA Checklist threshold questions. For example, the Aesthetics thresholds are narrowly stated to include public views only (e.g. roads) and do not provide analysis of scenic vistas (Ia) or visual character or quality of the project site (Ic) as viewed from private vantage points. Several Air Quality threshold questions are omitted, including conflict with applicable air quality plan (IIIa), violation of air quality standards (IIIb), and cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant (IIIc). Geology and Soils threshold questions related to exposure to strong seismic ground shaking and landslide hazards are omitted. Further analysis of slope failure or landslide issues should be provided in light of public input provided by UWT at the Scoping Session and Comments to the DEIR.

- **Significant Construction Noise Impacts.** Construction Noise impacts to nearby sensitive residential receptors are not adequately addressed. The FEIR understates the impact of these noise levels. The typical average noise levels are 65 to 82 dBA, and Site 3 has a measured Leq level of 46.9 dBA. This means that the backyard of the residence at Site 3 could experience an increase in 35 dBA. This would be perceived as more than 10 times as loud as the initial ambient conditions and would result in extreme annoyance (235/10 = 11.3). Although the noise impact is considered less than significant due to the zoning exemption, recommendations should be made to reduce the noise levels.

  The Noise Analysis states on page 10 that a 10 dBA reduction would not substantially lessen the noise impact. However, a 10 dBA reduction would reduce the perceived loudness at the residences from more than 10 times as loud as the initial conditions to less than 6 times as loud (225/10 = 5.7). With the combination of this recommendation and the NO-01 requirement that all "construction equipment shall use properly operation mufflers", the impact to residences could be significantly

reduced. Other possible recommendations could include portable barriers to enclose noise generating equipment or using alternative methods to backup alarms.

In addition, the Noise Analysis states on page 10 that a 12-foot barrier would reduce the noise about 10 dBA, but the method of insertion loss calculation is not presented. Nor is there information on STC requirements, minimum pound per square foot (surface area) requirements for said barrier needed to achieve the 10 dBA reduction.

- **Additional Information Needed for Geology and Soils.** The City concurs with and incorporates by reference UWT's comments to the Draft EIR and the Terrestrial Solutions Report provided in connection therewith relating to the deficiencies in the geotechnical reports and conclusions contained in the FEIR. Clearly, additional technical background information is needed to support the FEIR's CEQA-related geologic/geotechnical hazards conclusions, including:

    - Provide a discussion on impacts to the adjacent residential buildings due to the proposed removal of approximately the top 55 feet of the hillside.

    - Discuss and provide mitigations for corrosivity potential, collapse potential, and soil erosion or the loss of top soil, if any.

    - Show Boring BH-15 location in relation to the mapped potentially liquefiable area identified in Drawing No. 7 Seismic Hazard Zone Map. Perform liquefaction analysis with boring data located within the mapped potentially liquefiable zones shown in Drawing No. 7, where deeper alluvium and shallow groundwater may be present in the northern portion of the site. Provide recommendation for stabilization of liquefiable soils below fill slope if applicable.

    - Discuss historical high ground water or in-situ groundwater encountered during field exploration at the site and relate to the proposed pad area at elevation 761 feet. Provide a discussion on liquefaction/dry sand settlement after completion of the proposed pad area.

    - Identify approximate geologic contacts (fill, alluvial, colluvial, landslide debris, and bedrock areas) on site plan with boring locations, existing and proposed grades. Also, illustrate approximate geologic contacts on cross sections A-A' through D-D'. Include apparent bedding and fracture orientation on cross sections. Extend cross sections to include at least H/3 or 50 feet, whichever is shorter distance, from the top and toe of slopes. The sections should include recommended keyways and removals.

    - Define existing landslide on-site in plan and cross section, provide any relevant recommendation for stabilization or removal of landslide debris.

    - A significant portion of proposed cut slopes along the west margin of the site may be comprised of alluvial soils according to BH-6 and BH-12. Evaluate and provide recommendation for surficial and global stability of proposed cut slope

shown in Section A-A'. Also, discuss stability analysis of fill slopes along critical steep sloped bedrock contacts.

- **Traffic/Truck Haul Plan.** The City has historically raised concerns regarding the Project's impacts on traffic in the City. We believe the EIR, while improved from the earlier iteration, remains lacking. First, the analysis focuses on haul truck traffic only and fails to account for traffic related to solar facility construction, including trenching, mechanical and electrical equipment delivery, and assembly related trips. In addition, a Saturday analysis and comparison of 2015 and 2017 traffic volumes are needed.

  The City disagrees with the conclusion that the proposed 9,929 truck trips would not cause any damage to streets along the truck haul route to the West Parcel as stated in the EIR. The haul route should be inspected prior to the commencement of hauling to establish a baseline for the road surface condition and at the conclusion of hauling. A mitigation measure should be included to compensate the City for any excessive wear and/or damage to public roads on the haul route.

  The newly proposed separate entrance and exit to and from the West Parcel are noted. However, the City remains concerned that the exit onto Grand Avenue in an area where significant vehicle speeds are the norm remains a significant public safety concern and potential hazard to the motoring public. Like the commitment in TR-36 to post a flag person at locations near a construction site during major truck hauling activities to protect pedestrians from conflicts with heavy equipment entering or leaving the project sites, the mitigation for the Project should include a commitment to post a flag person at the West Parcel to protect and warn other vehicles of trucks leaving the West Parcel.

- **Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** The City supports the comments submitted by the SCAQMD and the modifications to the mitigation measures incorporated in the FEIR. Additional clarification to the analysis in the Technical Report and EIR are needed. Page 3 states that "The project is located in SRA 10. The nearest existing land uses are the residences are at the edge of the project site. If receptors are within 25 meters of the site, the methodology document says that the threshold for the 25 meter distance should be used. Table 2 summarizes the LSTs for construction." For clarity, it should also state that the LSTs are based on a disturbance area of 5 acres.

- **Cultural Resources.** Recommendations in the DEIR Appendix V Cultural Resources Report for **procedures** for discovery of archaeological material and human remains should be identified as mitigation measures in the FEIR. The results of AB 52 Tribal Cultural Resources consultation should be provided.

- **Biological Resources.** Clarifications are needed to correct inconsistencies and inadequacies in the biological information presented in the FEIR:

  - In the methods section, a single site survey is mentioned as occurring on February 17, 2014. The section cites that results of the 2008 and 2012 Master Plan Updates were also consulted for the analysis. The survey dates within these previous

analyses were not listed in the methods section. Listing all of the survey dates for the West Solar Project would be helpful, and the original reports should be provided.

- Within the sensitive plant analysis section (Section 3.2.2), the report states that 33 species are known from the vicinity of Mt. SAC. Of these species, 13 are cited as "not expected to occur" because of being out of range (four species) or lack of habitat (nine species). However, the ensuing description of species not occurring due to lack of habitat cites 12 different species. The report then mentions that 18 sensitive plant species potentially occur (those remaining) and cites Table 2, which also contains 18 sensitive species. The total species analyzed should be 34, rather than 33 as cited in the first sentence of this section.

- Referring to the 18 species in Table 2, the section states that surveys "were done at the appropriate time of year to detect these species and none were observed." Also in Table 2, chaparral sand-verbena is provided with a "presumed absent" rating, with the further note that the species "would have been observed if present." Chaparral sand-verbena is an annual plant whose blooming period runs from June through September. The survey for the project, conducted in February according to the methods section, was therefore outside of this plant's blooming period. The report should also include a soils discussion to support conclusions for plants that require specific soil types.
- Habitat Mitigation Plan contains two sentences that pertain to acreage of area to be restored. In Section 3.1, the report cites a total of 17.04 acres of coastal sage scrub restoration. In actuality, this total is for coastal sage scrub (16.72 acres) and combined riparian restoration (0.32 acre). In Section 3.2, the acreage of CSS to be re-established should be cited as 8.14 acres, not 8.04 acres.

- **Inadequate Alternatives Analysis.** The FEIR violates CEQA by failing to include a statement of project objectives. The purpose of CEQA mandating all environmental impact reports to include an alternatives analysis is to determine whether there is an environmentally superior alternative that will meet most of the Project's objectives. The FEIR fails to adequately discuss the Project's objectives and it is unclear from the FEIR's alternatives analysis whether the alternatives discussed "would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project" (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6). The FEIR's alternatives analysis fails to specifically address whether any of the alternatives discussed "would avoid or substantially lessen" (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6) each of the impacts identified in the FEIR as unavoidable and adverse. The FEIR's conclusion is ambiguous and not adequately supported by substantial evidence as to whether any of the Alternatives are considered the environmentally superior alternative. A comparative analysis of environmental impacts, including but not limited to Construction Noise, Air Quality, Geology and Soils should be included. The FEIR's alternatives analysis also fails to analyze whether the alternatives are potentially feasible, reasonable and realistic. For example, Alternatives 2 and 6 are wholly infeasible and should not even have been included. Alternative 2 is based on the construction of a parking structure in Lot J, which has been abandoned due to litigation efforts of UWT. (FEIR, Vol. 1 at p. 191.)

Alternative 6 is infeasible as a housing project *already rejected* by Mt. Sac several years ago. (FEIR, Vol. 1 at pp. 198-199.)

- **Failure to Satisfy CEQA Tiering Requirements.** The FEIR fails to state where copies of the previous-tiered EIRs can be examined in violation of Public Resource Code § 21094, subd. (e); CEQA Guidelines § 15152, subd. (g).

- **Draft 2017 WPSP Mitigation Monitoring Plan**. This provides a list of mitigation measures only and the **table** is largely blank. Assurance of the ability to implement and enforce these measures is needed. Information needs to be added to each of the remaining columns, including Other Agencies/Firm Involved, Timing, Date Completed, and Responsible Party/Signature.

- **Quality Control**. A proof reading of the document is needed with the Final EIR (i.e. Errata). Most of the exhibits are readable at their current resolution, format and scale, though several legends are not. Pagination is off throughout the document. It is very difficult to locate the individual appendices for review without identifying tabs and/or page numbering.

In addition to the foregoing comments, the City has closely reviewed the comments to the EIR and the subsequent responses prepared by Mt. SAC. The City believes that Mt. SAC has failed to adequately address the comments which accurately reflect the on-going environmental concerns of the City as to the FEIR and the Project. Accordingly, the City adopts the comments of UWT made by letter dated September 8, 2017 and the related attachments and incorporates such comments herein.

In conclusion, the City believes that the proposed FEIR is flawed and fails to satisfy the requirements of CEQA. We urge the Board of Trustees not to take any action tonight in order to allow for ongoing discussions among the parties to the existing litigation and to avoid additional litigation relating to the West Parcel.

Sincerely,

Barbara Leibold, City Attorney

cc: Walnut City Council
Robert M. Wishner, City Manager
Tom Weiner, Community Development Director

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY MATRIX

Comment Number	Page/Section/Paragraph	Comment
--	General Comment	The EIR misstates or omits analyses of numerous CEQA Checklist threshold questions. For example, the Aesthetics thresholds are narrowly stated to include public views only (e.g. roads) and do not provide analysis of scenic vistas (Ia) or visual character or quality of the project site (Ic) as viewed from private vantage points. Several Air Quality threshold questions are omitted, including conflict with applicable air quality plan (IIIa), violation of air quality standards (IIIb), and cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant (IIIc). Geology and Soils threshold questions related to exposure to strong seismic ground shaking and landslide hazards are omitted. Further analysis of slope failure or landslide issues should be provided in light of public input provided by UWT at the Scoping session (Appendix X).
--	General Comment	Construction Noise impacts to nearby sensitive residential receptors are a particular concern. Additional mitigation measures including, but not limited to, noise barriers are needed to reduce substantial temporary impacts.
--	General Comment	The Alternatives Analysis is weakened by its narrow environmental focus on Biological Resources impacts only. A comparative discussion of each Alternative's ability to eliminate or further reduce Noise, Air Quality, Geology and Soils, and Aesthetic/Visual impacts should be provided.
1	Table of Contents	The Table of Contents page numbering does not match the document.
2	1.1 Introduction and Summary	Introduction and Summary. This section describes the current EIR as a Project EIR (CEQA 15161), a Subsequent EIR (15162), and a Tiered EIR (Section 15385) that includes prior information from both the 2015 FMPU/PEP EIR or the 2012 Facility Master Plan SEIR. There is little or no mention of the relationship of this project to the recently certified Final Subsequent Program/Project EIR for PEP (Phases 1,2), a closely related project. A schematic diagram or succinct narrative identifying the relationship of this project and EIR to numerous previous and current plans, projects and EIRs is needed to understand the context and relationship of this EIR to prior environmental documents and plans. (Note: A narrative summarizing the relevant environmental documents is provided in Superior Court Judgment on United Walnut Taxpayers v. Mt. San Antonio College District, et al (3/14/17),

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY MATRIX

Comment Number	Page/Section/Paragraph	Comment
		Section D.1.a, pages 9-20.)
3		Introduction and Summary. 2nd paragraph. This presents an abbreviated summary of Govt. Code Section 53097. The full text of this section as it applies to City ordinances regulating design and construction of onsite improvements which affect drainage, road conditions, or grading, is as follows: ARTICLE 5. Regulation of Local Agencies by Counties and Cities [53097] Notwithstanding any other provisions of this article, the governing board of a school district shall comply with any city or county ordinance (1) regulating drainage improvements and conditions, (2) regulating road improvements and conditions, or (3) requiring the review and approval of grading plans as these ordinance provisions relate to the design and construction of onsite improvements which affect drainage, road conditions, or grading, and shall give consideration to the specific requirements and conditions of city or county ordinances relating to the design and construction of offsite improvements. If a school district elects not to comply with the requirements of city or county ordinances relating to the design and construction of offsite improvements, the city or county shall not be liable for any injuries or for any damage to property caused by the failure of the school district to comply with those ordinances.
4	Exhibit 1.2 2015 Campus Aerial	Recommend adding boundary of proposed project to this photo
5	Exhibit 1.4 Site Topography	The Legend is unreadable. Please enlarge.
6	Exhibit 1.5 Grading Plan	An exhibit with cross-sections and sight lines is needed depicting the relationship and proximity of earthwork to nearby residential uses.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY MATRIX

Comment Number	Page/Section/Paragraph	Comment
7	Exhibit 1.6 Landscape Plan	The Legend is unreadable. Please enlarge.
8	Page 12. 2nd paragraph	The Introduction and Summary should reference recent litigation and Court finding setting aside the prior WPSP Addendum.
9	1.2 Issues to be Resolved. Page 13	1st paragraph. The issues listed here relate to slope stability, truck haul plan and congestion, light and glare impacts, and biological resources. The correct corresponding sections where these issues should be discussed are actually 3.5 Geology and Soils, 3.9 Transportation/Traffic, 3.1 Aesthetics, and 3.3 Biological Resources.
10	1.3 Tiering from Program EIR	Page 13. 3rd paragraph. The relationship between referenced Section 3.9 from the certified Final EIR in December 2013 and the current tiered, WPSP project EIR needs further explanation. Have any of the project characteristics changed? If so, how has this effected project impacts, if at all?
11	1.4 Summary of Impacts	2nd paragraph. Appendix L is Geology Reports
12		Page 17 Note. The 2016 Mitigation Monitoring Program is Appendix AA.
13		Page 17 Project Impacts – Aesthetics. This is a statement of what the project proposes to do, not an impact statement. What is the aesthetic impact?
14		Table 1.4.1. In general, many of the 'Project Impacts' statements in Table 1.4.1 merely state what the project will do or some idealized concept of what mitigation may do to reduce impacts that are not clearly articulated. Also, Biology Mitigation Measures in this table and in Section 3.3 should use mandatory language rather than permissive (i.e. 'shall' rather than 'should'.)

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY MATRIX

Comment Number	Page/Section/Paragraph	Comment
15		Pages 17. 18. Air Quality. AQ-1. Omission or replacement of any BACMs identified in this measure should be subject to additional CEQA review.
16		Page 22. There is no Mitigation Measure BIO-10 here and on page 82).
17	2.3 Project Characteristics	Page 24. BIO-22. This mitigation measure should indicate the project shall comply with terms of the USFWS Section 10 (a) Permit.
18		Page 26. Public Services/Public Utilities. Solar development onsite will increase water usage for both construction, irrigation and regular solar panel washing. Water usage estimates should be identified in this EIR and commitments obtained for construction, operations and maintenance.
19	2.0 Project Description	Page 31. There is no Exhibit 2.1 depicting existing conditions for Hilmer Lodge Stadium.
20		Page 33. Project Characteristics. 4th paragraph. What is the useful life expectancy of the solar project? When will it be decommissioned and what site reclamation plans have been made? The impacts of decommissioning and site reclamation should be addressed in this EIR.
21		Page 34. Table 2.3.1 A similar table or detailed description is needed here for the estimated timing, phasing, overlap and duration of project construction activities including grading, earth import, solar facility construction and tie-in, landscaping and habitat restoration.
22		Page 34. Typo 27.25-acre site
23		Page 34. 3rd paragraph. The estimated number and duration of truck haul trips for imported soil should be identified.
24	3.1 Aesthetics	3.1.2 Project Impacts on Aesthetics. Page 40. Impact Threshold (a) incorrectly combines two distinct threshold questions from the CEQA Checklist (2017): a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY MATRIX

Comment Number	Page/Section/Paragraph	Comment
		not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? Under the CEQA Checklist, impacts to a scenic vista should be addressed irrespective of whether they occur within a designated scenic highway. In this regard, reliance on the fact that Grand Avenue adjacent the project site is not a state-designated scenic highway limits the scope of the scenic vista impact analysis. The scenic value of the WPSP project site from surrounding vantage points should be addressed whether or not included in a viewshed ordinance or ridgeline protection ordinance. The District's reliance on public views only in Threshold Question b) similarly limits the scope of analysis of impact on existing visual character or quality of the site.
25		Pages 41, paragraph 5. This indicates "the proposed solar system, as proposed in Section 2.3, is a ground-mounted fixed and tracked systems with solar panels that does not produce significant glare offsite." The Mt. SAC Glare Analysis (EIR Appendix N; NAM 7/3/2017) indicates the modeled system is for a south facing single axis solar PV system with backtracking. If the system was a fixed system, there would be glare in the homes to the west (observation points 2 and 3) in the early mornings, and without backtracking, there may be minimal glare concerns in the same homes in the early evening. The EIR should specify what project design features or mitigation measures are proposed to eliminate glare at these locations (e.g. single axis solar PV with backtracking only, landscaping, anti-reflective coating of the module, etc.).
26		Page 42, 43. To support the visual impact analyses, cross-sectional diagrams are needed with before and after topography and sight lines extending through the site to surrounding vantage points including Grand Avenue, Regal Canyon Drive and Stoneybrook Drive. The earthwork cross-sections (A, B, C, D) in the Appendix L Converse Consultants report and/or cross-sections from home observation points in the Solar Light and Glare Study could be adapted for this purpose.
27		Page 44. The Level of Significance for Aesthetics Impacts with Mitigation should be identified.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY MATRIX

Comment Number	Page/Section/Paragraph	Comment
28	3.2 Air Quality	3.2.2 Air Quality Impacts. CEQA Checklist impact threshold questions a), b) and c) should be included and addressed. Threshold b) re: violation of air quality standards was identified as less than significant with mitigation in the project Notice of Preparation.
29		Pages 49. 2nd paragraph. This indicates that use of Tier IV equipment and watering three times per day were included in the Peak Construction Emissions Tables 3.2.4 and 3.2.5 that follow. Mitigation Measure AQ-02 indicates all internal combustion engines/construction equipment operating on the project site shall meet EPA-Certified Tier 2 emissions standards, or higher according to the adopted project start date requirements. Mitigation Measure AQ-07R specifies watering at least twice daily during grading and construction. The Mitigation Measures should be revised consistent with the Peak Construction Emissions-With Required Mitigation Measures assumptions.
32	3.3 Biological Resources	Page 74. Indirect Impacts – Biology. Maintenance of native and/or non-native vegetation that may colonize under and between solar panels on the graded pad should be addressed. Will manual, mechanical or chemical methods be used?
35	3.5 Geology and Soils	Page 135. Re: reference to Geology and Soils a) *E7?* This should reference CEQA Checklist a) Landslides.
36		Page 134. 3.5.2 Geology and Soils Impacts. CEQA Checklist impact threshold question a) ii concerning exposure to strong seismic ground shaking should be added.
37		Page 136. Item 6. Waste water from solar panel washings will occur. Panel washings are typically required 2-4 times a year. The disposition of these water discharges should be addressed here and in Section 3.6 Hydrology and Water Quality.
38	3.6 Hydrology and Water Quality	3.6.2 Hydrology/Water Quality Impacts. CEQA Checklist impact threshold questions a), b), c) and e) should be included and addressed.
39		Table 3.6.6 Temporary Sediment Control BMPs. No reasons are stated for BMPs not used.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY MATRIX

Comment Number	Page/Section/Paragraph	Comment
40	3.7 Land Use Planning	Page 153. 2nd paragraph. The project site is identified as Residential Planned Development on the City of Walnut Zoning Map 3.7.2.
41		Page 159. Section 3.7.5. The implementation of PEP Phases 1, 2 is a related project that is likely to occur in phase with proposed construction of the WPSP. Please indicate what commitments or restrictions have been made with regard to the adjacent Retail Zone parcel and development as Christmas tree sales or agricultural/produce sales.
43	3.8 Noise	Page 160. CEQA Checklist impact threshold questions a) and d) should be included and addressed in this section. Question a) asks if the project would result in 'exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other local agencies.' Question d) asks if a 'substantial *temporary* or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project'.
44		Page 161, Paragraph 5 and page 162, last paragraph. A substantial adverse construction noise impact is identified for residences nearest grading of slopes. CEQA requires consideration of all feasible mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts. Feasibility of additional mitigation measures should be addressed, including use of noise barriers, portable barriers to enclose noise generating equipment and alternatives to use of backup alarms.
46	3.9 Transportation/Traffic	Page 170. Construction Traffic. The description appears to include earthwork construction traffic only. Please include traffic from solar facility construction, including trenching, mechanical and electrical equipment deliveries, and assembly-related trips.
47		Page 174. Last paragraph. "....may be would only be...". Please specify which.
48		Page 176. Signage Changes. Please provide the basis for the conclusion anticipating that 9,929 loaded truck trips would not cause any damage to streets along the truck haul route to the West Parcel.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY MATRIX

Comment Number	Page/Section/Paragraph	Comment
49		Page 179. Cumulative Impact Analysis. 4th paragraph. This statement refers only to other projects in the immediate vicinity west of Grand Avenue. The Cumulative Impact Analysis should take into account the closely related PEP Phase 1,2 project immediately east of Grand Avenue.
50		Page 180. Table 3.9.6. The source Draft EIR and reference date of May 2017 is unclear. Is this information from the certified 2015 FMPU/PEP Draft EIR or the 2017 PEP Phases 1,2 Draft Subsequent EIR (2017)?
51	4.0 Effects Found Not to be Significant	1st paragraph. Reference to Section 3.9 is incorrect.
52		Page 181. Aesthetics. Scenic Vista. The CEQA checklist threshold questions do not limit consideration of scenic vistas and scenic quality to only designated state highways. The natural visual character of the undeveloped project site will be permanently altered. The No Impact conclusion with respect to scenic vista and quality is not adequately supported.
53	4.0 Effects Found Not to be Significant	Page 185. Utilities and Service Systems. Re: threshold question d) concerning availability of sufficient water supplies, estimates of the project's water demands during construction and operations are not provided. Water for construction dust control, roadway and vehicle/equipment washdowns, and ongoing solar panel washing should be provided.
54		Page 196. Mandatory Findings of Significance. CEQA Checklist threshold question b) re: cumulatively considerable impacts should be included and addressed.
55	5.0 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	page 188. Unavoidable Adverse Impacts of the Solar Project. 4th paragraph. The stadium has been demolished.
57	6.0 Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Page 189. 5th paragraph. The focus of the alternatives analysis on Biological Resources is too narrow. The analyses should consider whether the alternatives are capable of further reducing significant temporary construction air emissions and/or noise impacts.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY MATRIX

Comment Number	Page/Section/Paragraph	Comment
58		Page 191. 3rd paragraph. The statement that phase out of the solar project in the future is unlikely needs further explanation. Most solar projects are typically planned for decommissioning and site reclamation after 25 to 50 years. A future alternative use for the site should be considered in the EIR.
59		Page 194. Paragraphs 5, 6, and Page 204 Table 6.6.3. On page 194 Alternative 4 is described as the environmentally superior alternatives among the solar project build alternatives, but Table 6.6.3 ranks this alternative behind Alternative 3-Carport in Lot F in terms of Environmental Superiority (after No Project). Please explain this apparent discrepancy.
60		Page 204, Table 6.6.3 Project Alternatives Comparisons. Issue 7 'Adverse Impacts' needs further explanation. What specific environmental impact issues are encompassed by this issue category? In addition to the key Biological Resources issues already included, this summary table should provide a comparison of other significant environmental impacts and identified areas of controversy (i.e. traffic, noise, air quality, geology/soils, aesthetics/views) of the remaining feasible alternatives. Also, please explain why the 2020-21 Students (Headcount) for the No Project Alternative (i.e. No WPSP Project) differs from the other alternatives.
61	7.0 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Energy Supplies and Other Resources	Page 206, 1st paragraph. The identified 50-75 years exceeds the typical life expectancy for a solar facility of this type. Retrofitting or redevelopment for an alternative use in the future should be discussed.
62	10.0 Appendices	It is difficult to identify and locate the individual Appendices. These should be separated by title pages identifying each Appendix to follow (A through BB.) The Mitigation Monitoring Programs (AA and BB) are actually inserted between the air quality, noise and vibration studies.
66	Appendix J. WW Photo Simulations	The selected view from Regal Canyon Drive with foreground vegetation along the roadway may not be representative of views of the project from homes on the east side of this

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY MATRIX

Comment Number	Page/Section/Paragraph	Comment
		roadway. Cross-sectional diagrams with before and after topography and sight lines from surrounding neighborhood vantage points (west, south, southeast) are needed to support the visual analysis.
69	Appendix T. NOP and Environmental Checklist	The 6/14/17 Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form assumes all impacts are either Less than Significant with Mitigation, Less than Significant, or No Impact. No Potential Significant Impacts are identified for evaluation in the EIR.
71	AA. West Parcel Solar Mitigation Monitoring Program	This Draft MMP is largely blank and does not provide enough information to assure that proposed mitigation measures will be implemented and enforced.