Attachment E-1
According to the development data provided by the Project Sponsor, the proposed Fountain Head Montessori Preschool will have 72 students and 8 staff. The school currently operates at 490 Gold Club Road Pleasant Hill. The proposed site at 1715-1720 Oak Park Boulevard is currently vacant but was previously occupied by another preschool with 72 students and a single-family home. The proposed school will demolish the existing school building and the single-family home on the site and replace them with a better organized single building for the proposed school.
The proposed Fountainhead Preschool will operate between 7:00 am and 6:00 pm with various class schedules catering to different age groups. Table 1 shows the operational characteristic and arrival and departing schedules of the proposed Fountainhead Preschool.

Table 1 School Operation Characteristics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fountainhead Pre-School Traffic Impact Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrival Schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-8:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-9:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departing Schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fountainhead Preschool. School official indicated that arrival and departing schedules are not fixed but are generally flexible and sporadic, consistent with most preschool/daycare facility operation.

Site Access

Access to the previous preschool was via an entrance driveway from Oak Park Boulevard and an exit driveway to Eccleston Avenue. The current proposal would reverse the previous access scheme; school traffic will instead access the site via an entrance driveway at Eccleston Avenue and exit to Oak Park Boulevard. This access scheme would eliminate the potential of school traffic impeding traffic on Oak Park Boulevard when parents making a right-turn into the site, which is an arterial street with high through traffic volumes. The plan also proposes to relocate its current entrance driveway, at about 100 feet east of the Monticello Avenue, to align with the Oak Park Boulevard and Monticello Avenue intersection, and convert it to an exit only driveway. This changes the current 3-way intersection to a 4-way intersection and would eliminate a potential conflict point on Oak Park Boulevard. Figure 1 shows the current site and Figure 2 shows the proposed site plan and access scheme.
Figure 1 Current Project Site

Figure 2 Proposed Site Plan and Access (Source: AD Architects)
Study Area Description

Oak Park Road is an east-west arterial road connecting Pleasant Hill Road in the west and Oak Road in the east just east of Interstate Freeway I-680 in Walnut Creek. It has one lane in each direction and the posted speed limit near the Project is 30 mph. There are bike lanes on both sides of Oak Park Boulevard near the Project site. Monticello Avenue is a two-lane north-south street providing access to and from Pleasant Hill Middle School. There is no posted speed limit sign on Monticello Avenue near the Project site. The Oak Park Boulevard and Monticello intersection currently is signalized 3-way intersection. Land use in the immediate vicinity of the Project site is mostly residential on the south side of Oak Park Boulevard and mostly institutional (Library Administration, School District Administration) and County Park just to the north across the street from the proposed site. Land use along Eccleston Avenue is residential and the posted speed is 25 mph.

Project Traffic Generation Analysis

As a preschool with 72 students, the site is expected to generate 58 trips during both morning drop-off and afternoon pickup hours. On a 24 hour basis, the school is expected to generate 315 trips. These estimates are developed based on the latest trip rates for daycare centers and preschools from the Institute of the Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual. Table 1 shows a detailed trip generation analysis for the proposed Fountain Head preschool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Trips</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td>Outbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 student-Freschool (ITE land use code 565)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Trips estimated based on ITE land use code 565 "Trip Generation Manual 9th Edition"

Trip Rates:
- Daily 4.38/student (315 trips, 50% in and 50% out).
- AM Peak 0.80/student, 53% in, 47% out.
- PM Peak 0.81/student 47% in 53% out.

The Fountainhead preschool is likely to generate fewer peak-hour trips due to the highly stagger arrival and departing schedules as shown in Table 1. However, the traffic LOS and impact analysis used the above higher trip estimates to assume a more conservative analysis.
Traffic Operation (LOS) and Project Impact Analysis

PHA conducted traffic operation analysis for the Oak Park Boulevard and Monticello Avenue intersection, first to determine current traffic LOS to establish a baseline, then, evaluate intersection traffic LOS with the added preschool traffic assuming various intersection configurations. PHA conducted peak-hour traffic count for the intersection on August 29, 2017, while school is in session.

The intersection currently has three one-lane approaches from the north, east and west directions. Under the project scenario, the exit driveway will convert the intersection to a 4-way intersection. Four traffic scenarios were evaluated for the intersection:

**Evaluation Scenario:**

1. Current conditions (baseline) as a 3-way signalized intersection without school driveway and traffic.
2. Project conditions as a 4-way intersection plus the proposed preschool traffic and a right-turn-only exit driveway.
3. Current conditions as a 4-way signalized intersection plus the proposed preschool exit driveway with left-thru-right-turn movements.
4. Current conditions as a 3-way signalized intersection plus a right-turn-only exit driveway without signal control.

The results of the analysis indicated the added Project traffic and the exit driveway would not have a significant impact on the current study intersection operation under all study scenarios. The traffic operation would remain unchanged except a few seconds of additional delays. Table 3 shows the traffic operation analysis results indicating the average per vehicle delays at the intersection and corresponding Level-of-Service (LOS). Table 4 shows the criteria used in the evaluation. The City of Pleasant Hill considers LOS A – D as acceptable conditions.

Of the above Project scenarios evaluated, PHA considers both scenarios 2 and 3 would work, but scenario 3 is more efficient as it would allow site traffic to travel west without having to go around the block. In any event, the current traffic signal needs to be modified for the 4-way operation. Scenario 4 with an uncontrolled driveway should not be considered due to traffic safety concerns.
### Table 3 Traffic Operation Analysis
Fountain Head Pre-School Traffic Impact Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oak Park Boulevard/Monticello Intersection Study Scenarios</th>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Traffic Operation Delays (seconds)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Signalized 3-way Intersection</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Signalized Right-Turn Only Driveway</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Signalized Left/Thru/Right-Turn Driveway</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unsignalized Right-Turn Only Driveway</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: LOS Calculations were conducted with SYNCHRO Computer Software V. 10 based on 2010 HCM Manual Method for signalized intersections. PHA staff conducted traffic count for the analysis on August 30, 2017, Wednesday when schools are in session. The intersection is currently controlled by a 2-phase traffic signal operation. For scenario 4 the LOS and delays are for the driveway approach only, not the intersection.

### Table 4 Intersection Traffic LOS Evaluation Criteria
Fountainhead Pre-school Traffic Impact Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Average Delay (Seconds/Vehicle)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Signalized Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Little or no delay</td>
<td>0.0-10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Short traffic delay</td>
<td>10.1-20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Average traffic delay</td>
<td>20.1-35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Long traffic delay</td>
<td>35.1-55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Very long traffic delay</td>
<td>55.1-80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Extreme traffic delay</td>
<td>&gt;80.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Highway Capacity Manual 2000, 2010. Control delay includes delays of initial deceleration, move-up-time in the queue, stops, and re-acceleration. For signalized intersections, the LOS was calculated for the entire intersection as a whole. For non-signalized intersections, the LOS was calculated for individual traffic movements.
On-site Circulation and Parking

The Project site plan as proposed would provide adequate on-site circulation with an exit driveway on Oak Park Boulevard entrance driveway on Eccleston Avenue. Driveway and parking design and requirement should follow City's design standard and requirements.

The staff parking as shown on the site plan may encroach on the pedestrian sidewalk and the traffic lane on Eccleston Avenue during when staffs back out their vehicles out from the parking stalls. City review and approval for this would be needed. The shrubbery and any structure at the northeast corner of the site should be kept under three feet high as they may restrict the sight distance for motorists exiting from Eccleston Avenue and between the right-turning motorists from Oak Park Boulevard and staff backing their vehicle to the traffic lane on Eccleston Avenue.

Conclusion

In summary, our evaluation indicated the proposed Fountainhead preschool would not create a significant traffic impact on the Oak Park Boulevard and Monticello intersection traffic operation. The intersection would operate at the same LOS B and A for morning and afternoon peak hours. However, the current traffic signal at the intersection needs to be modified to provide for 4-way traffic operation to accommodate the added Project exit driveway. The site plan as proposed would function well. The shrubbery at the northeast corner of the site as shown should be kept below to provide adequate sight distance for motorists turning in and out of the Oak Park Boulevard and Eccleston Avenue intersection.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide the about review. Please call or email me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Pang Ho, AICP
Principal
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Newell Arnerich  
3738 Mt. Diablo Blvd.  
3rd Floor, Suite 310  
Lafayette, CA 94549

SUBJECT: Report on trees at 1715 and 1725 Oak Park Boulevard, Pleasant Hill, their condition, proposed grading, construction and drainage at the site, with expected resulting impacts and measures to reduce impacts on those trees.

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

Pleasant Hill requires a survey and construction protection/management plan for native trees nine inches or larger in trunk diameter, and nonnative trees 18 inches or larger in trunk diameter, on or adjacent to construction sites, which triggers the need for this document.

This report includes all such trees on this lot or immediately on neighboring properties. The purpose of this report is to identify each of these trees, describe their condition, and provide probable impacts that will occur to them as a result of the proposed construction, as well as general measures for managing and reducing impacts to trees that will be preserved, to hold impact levels to those described.

SUMMARY

You proposed to remove existing buildings and construct a new one, with associated flatwork. This report considers 17 trees, eleven on your property and six overhanging from neighboring properties.

The lot on which you intend to build is level. One of the trees on the lot is to be preserved, a London plane in good condition and outside grading or sidewalk replacement. All others will be removed, either because they are in the building or parking footprint or because they are small and in relatively poor condition, and do not justify modification to the proposed improvements for their preservation. Neighboring trees may be impacted by the construction of a driveway on the west and south sides of the property, with impacts ranging from slight to moderate.

Of the 17 trees, ten will be removed. Five removals are poorly maintained nursery stock with potential for serious problems in the future.

POTENTIAL DISTURBANCE TO TREES

Damage to trees may occur directly, from mechanical injury to roots, trunks or limbs, or more indirectly, if soil characteristics such as density, soil atmosphere or moisture content are altered. Manifestations of these injuries may occur immediately, or may be delayed for a number of years, resulting in progressive decline.
Many tree roots on most sites, including this one, may be in the top 18 inches of soil, a zone which is easily altered by even minor grading, trenching, or material storage. Further such alterations may occur during demolition, grading, construction, and landscaping activities. Soil may become further compacted, soil oxygen may then become easily depleted, drainage patterns upon which trees have become dependent may be altered, so that trees become drought stressed. Any changes in grade, increase or decrease, compaction, or pavement may have this effect. Where cuts must be made for utilities or other reasons, the soil may quickly dry out from the side of the cut and kill roots.

Awareness of these concepts is key to tree management on construction sites. It is less important to avoid encroachment under tree canopies, which may be acceptable, than it is to dedicate a reasonable and necessary area under the tree as a protected root zone, and assure that this area remains dedicated to the needs of the roots.

If such an area cannot be dedicated to a given tree, or the condition of that tree is such that it may not contribute into the future, the tree should be removed.

SITE MAP
The site map is based on the map provided by Newell Arnerich, architect, and modified by me. It is included with this report as a 20 scale 11 x 17 inch PDF. If later plans require comments from me I will provide them as addenda to this report.

Trees are numbered on the drawing, corresponding to the table in this report and to tags placed on the tree trunks. I measured tree canopies and placed them on the drawings as required by the city. Such canopy outlines are intended as a guideline to establishing tree protection zones, that is, protecting a sufficiently large root area to assure survival of the tree. As noted in the previous section encroachment into the canopy is acceptable depending on the vigor of the tree and degree of protection for roots in the area remaining in the tree protection zone outside the encroachment.

Typical location for temporary protective fencing is shown. Final location will be set on-site, prior to construction, as acceptable to both the project arborist for root protection and the grading contractor for access.

HOW TO READ THE TABLE OF TREES
The specific information for each of the six trees assessed is found in the table attached to this report, at the end.

The Species of each tree or shrub is noted in the second column, by common name.

The Diameter of the trunk, or trunks, in inches, is given in the third column, measured at 54 inches, or at the best representative height. If there are several trunks, each is listed.

The Health of the tree and the Structure are rated in the next two columns. Both are rated on a scale of 0-5, with 5 being the most favorable. Health is a measure of the vigor of the tree. Lower ratings, (below 3) indicate that a tree is seriously declining in health.
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Joseph McNeil

Construction impacts on this project range from:

- "None".
- "Minimal". There may be some root injury which should not be manifest in the appearance of the tree if construction techniques are careful and the root zone is protected.
- "Slight". There is slightly more injury, and there may be some subtle injury response, but not to a serious degree.
- "Moderate". There may be visible signs in the tree canopy that root injury has occurred.

Structure is a measure of the mechanical form and arrangement of the trunk and limbs. Trees with low structure ratings may have codominant limbs or included bark (factors that could contribute to mechanical failure), or may have failed mechanically in the past, or are for other reasons at higher risk to do so in the future than trees with higher (better) structure rating.

Suitability is an assessment of how desirable the retention of this tree is, independently of proposed design or site alterations. This rating is based on intrinsic features of the tree itself. It is a combination of:

- Species. Oaks are generally highly desirable. Redwood are less so in Contra Costa County, as they are water-demanding.
- Health and Structure. Trees with defects or health problems do not warrant special effort to retain.
- Nearby trees. If trees are crowded some may be less desirable.
- Size. Even highly desirable species in good condition can be replaced if they are small enough. Their suitability rating is thus lower.

Generally, trees with a suitability rating of 4 or 5 are worth extra effort to preserve. This does not mean that they must be preserved, or that it is inappropriate to remove them or permit activities that may affect them. Realistic use of the lot may require construction near, or removal of otherwise desirable trees. The best use of the land may require removal of or impact on even trees with the highest suitability.

Trees with a rating of 3 should be considered for retention.

For trees with a suitability of 1 or 2, no effort should be made to preserve. This does not mean they should not be retained, only that, unless there are other considerations, the project should not be specially altered to accommodate them.

Trees with a suitability of zero are generally incapable of providing benefit in the developed setting and should usually be removed.

Construction Impact is an estimate of the probable effects of proposed construction. It assumes that all possible care will be exercised in fencing, protection, traffic prevention, material storage, landscaping, and other phases of demolition and construction, within constraints of the proposed project.

Construction impacts on this project range from:

- "None".
- "Minimal". There may be some root injury which should not be manifest in the appearance of the tree if construction techniques are careful and the root zone is protected.
- "Slight". There is slightly more injury, and there may be some subtle injury response, but not to a serious degree.
- "Moderate". There may be visible signs in the tree canopy that root injury has occurred.
Existing interior fencing, AC and PCC flatwork, and existing sheds and compost bins near trees #975, #990 and #986 through #989 must be removed before the TPZ can be fenced. This work must be done from outside the zone that will later be fenced. Do not enter the TPZ with wheeled or tracked equipment. Instead, use an excavator bucket to demolish from outside the TPZ, including picking back flatwork.

Fencing to protect retained trees should be in place as shown before any grading, construction or other site work begins. Fencing should remain in place during the entire demolition, grading or construction phases and should not be moved by any subcontractor for any reason, without approval of the project arborist.

ORDER OF DEMOLITION, PLACEMENT OF TEMPORARY FENCING
Existing interior fencing, AC and PCC flatwork, and existing sheds and compost bins near trees #975, #990 and #986 through #989 must be removed before the TPZ can be fenced. This work must be done from outside the zone that will later be fenced. Do not enter the TPZ with wheeled or tracked equipment. Instead, use an excavator bucket to demolish from outside the TPZ, including picking back flatwork.

Impact assessment at the time of this report are based on assumptions of construction as illustrated in the drawings or otherwise discussed in this report and an assumption that recommendations of the arborist are followed.

The Comments column contains general observations about each tree.

TEMPORARY PROTECTIVE FENCING, TREE PROTECTION ZONES
To assure against intrusion into root zones by material storage or construction equipment, temporary protective fence is shown on the referenced drawing. This is intended to provide sufficient room for construction activity while protecting root zones, and will define the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ).

No grading or trenching for irrigation, planting or lighting should occur within these zones without review and approval of the project arborist. Landscape plant types (groundcovers or turf) will be limited in these zones and must be reviewed by the arborist.

There may be no temporary storage of construction materials within this zone. There must be no disposal of waste or equipment washout that could drain into the protected zone.

The fencing should be minimum five foot chain link securely fastened to the ground or on driven posts, to prevent casual displacement by site workers who may not understand its purpose. The location shown on the drawing should be reviewed on-site to the satisfaction of both the arborist and the general contractor or site supervisor.

Each fence section must have 8 1/2 by 11 inch plasticized signs fastened every 50 feet, reading, “THIS FENCE MAY BE MOVED ONLY WITH PERMISSION OF THE PROJECT ARBORIST”. A template sign is attached to this report.

Fencing to protect retained trees should be in place as shown before any grading, construction or other site work begins. Fencing should remain in place during the entire demolition, grading or construction phases and should not be moved by any subcontractor for any reason, without approval of the project arborist.

Impact assessment at the time of this report are based on assumptions of construction as illustrated in the drawings or otherwise discussed in this report and an assumption that recommendations of the arborist are followed.

The Comments column contains general observations about each tree.

TEMPORARY PROTECTIVE FENCING, TREE PROTECTION ZONES
To assure against intrusion into root zones by material storage or construction equipment, temporary protective fence is shown on the referenced drawing. This is intended to provide sufficient room for construction activity while protecting root zones, and will define the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ).

No grading or trenching for irrigation, planting or lighting should occur within these zones without review and approval of the project arborist. Landscape plant types (groundcovers or turf) will be limited in these zones and must be reviewed by the arborist.

There may be no temporary storage of construction materials within this zone. There must be no disposal of waste or equipment washout that could drain into the protected zone.

The fencing should be minimum five foot chain link securely fastened to the ground or on driven posts, to prevent casual displacement by site workers who may not understand its purpose. The location shown on the drawing should be reviewed on-site to the satisfaction of both the arborist and the general contractor or site supervisor.

Each fence section must have 8 1/2 by 11 inch plasticized signs fastened every 50 feet, reading, “THIS FENCE MAY BE MOVED ONLY WITH PERMISSION OF THE PROJECT ARBORIST”. A template sign is attached to this report.

Fencing to protect retained trees should be in place as shown before any grading, construction or other site work begins. Fencing should remain in place during the entire demolition, grading or construction phases and should not be moved by any subcontractor for any reason, without approval of the project arborist.
Consider using Ecclestion Avenue for demolition access routes via the southeast corner of the property, as to avoid encroaching on root zones of trees #975 and #990 prior to fencing the TPZ.

We have not yet reviewed removal or abandonment in place of underground utilities to the existing building, or utilities to be installed to the new one. To the extent these may extend within the Tree Protection Zone of tree #975 we may request modification, or use of special installation or trenching techniques.

Fencing location for tree #991 will be determined in the field during a pre-construction meeting. Fencing location for tree #990 will be determined in the field during excavation; I expect to be on-site for this phase of construction.

When the area is cleared the fencing must be installed immediately, as shown in the drawing.

**MULCHING UNDER TREES**

Four inches of mulch in areas of bare soil is highly beneficial for trees being preserved. Because most such trees are on neighboring properties I expect to make recommendations for mulching at the time the project is underway. The ideal, and by far the most beneficial mulch for the trees, is chips from a tree service. This mulch can be a permanent feature of the landscape, and a maintained depth of two to four inches is probably the single most effective measure that can be taken to assure health of the trees.

Mulch should gradually recede in depth from four inches to zero, beginning three feet out from the trunk as to not place mulch directly against tree trunks. Decorative mulch may be used instead of the natural mulch, but is far less effective in maintaining tree health, and typically much more expensive.

**TREE #990**

This mulberry tree is relatively close to excavation for the driveway and parking section. Excavation for this section immediately east of the tree will start three feet east of the back of curb shown on the “Proposed Conditions” drawing, and will be done under my on-site supervision.

Depending on roots encountered, the excavation will gradually be moved west until, in my judgment, the excavation cannot be carried further west, closer to the tree or until the excavation is to the required location behind the back of curb as shown in the drawing.

The result may be that the driveway can be built as shown, or it may be that the curb must be “wowed” out in an arc so that it is two feet further east of the tree than shown. At most it could be three feet, although this is unlikely, in my opinion. If it is necessary to wow the curb around the root zone one parking space will be sacrificed. I recommend, after excavation and curb construction is complete, installing a root barrier to a minimum depth of 18 inches from the top of back of curb, along the west side of the driveway, 15 feet north and 15 feet south of tree #990. If, in my judgement the tree will be seriously injured or its stability called into questions by moving the curb as much as
three feet east it may be necessary to consider removing the tree. In my opinion this is unlikely to be the case.

TASKS TO BE COMPLETED

- We have yet to determine management of the mulberry tree, #990, as described above.
- I expect to meet on-site with the contractor prior to commencement of site layout and grading, to confirm temporary fence location to their satisfaction.
- I expect to be on-site for the excavation near tree #990.
- I expect to review landscape design, if any is planned under the trees, such as #990 and #975 and in that instance meet with the landscape contractor prior to installation.
- I expect to review removal of existing underground utilities to existing building and installation of new underground utilities associated with new buildings within TPZ of trees #990 and #975.

LIMITING CONDITIONS OF THIS REPORT

The observations and recommendations in this report are limited to current conditions, for the site, as described in the report. There appeared to be no indication for laboratory diagnostics, or extensive basal or aerial inspection and this report does not contain them.

This report relies upon representations by Newell Americh concerning property and easement boundaries and proposed construction.

My comments on the health, structure, and potential of these trees are restricted to the condition of the trees if the general specifications in this report and specific recommendations in any future reports are observed and followed.

This report can be reproduced by you as necessary, in its entirety only. Portions of this report may not be reproduced.

It is outside the scope of this or the final report to suggest suitability of design or land use.

CERTIFICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

I certify that the observations and recommendations in this document are complete and correct, to the best of my knowledge and belief, and are made in good faith. Please contact me as further questions arise.

Sincerely,

Todd McNeil
Certified Arborist #WE-11635A
ISA Qualified Tree Risk Assessor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Number</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Suitability</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Construction Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>975</td>
<td>London Plane</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Under high voltage, topped by utility</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>976</td>
<td>Plum (Prunus sp.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sunscald on south side of trunk 0-2.5'</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>977</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>9 @ 3'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Flush cut topping, 4&quot; diameter</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>978</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>979</td>
<td>Plum (Prunus sp.)</td>
<td>10 @ 2'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Topped at nursery, multiple attachments and sunscald</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>Plum (Prunus sp.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Crack at base, through ~75% of trunk. REMOVE.</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>981</td>
<td>Plum (Prunus sp.)</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>In parking</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>982</td>
<td>Jane magnolia</td>
<td>5,4,3,3,3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multiple stems at base</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>983</td>
<td>Elm, sp.</td>
<td>31 @ 1'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Buried, in concrete walkway.  Codominant at 3'</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>984</td>
<td>Elm, sp.</td>
<td>32 @ 1'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Codominant at 5' and 10', topped at 20'</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>985</td>
<td>Monterey Pine</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Suffering from pitch canker</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986</td>
<td>Elm, sp.</td>
<td>~28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neighbor tree, no tag</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>987</td>
<td>Coast redwood</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neighbor tree, no tag</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>988</td>
<td>Coast redwood</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neighbor tree, no tag</td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>989</td>
<td>Pear</td>
<td>~20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neighbor tree, no tag</td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>990</td>
<td>Mulberry</td>
<td>~28 @ 1'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neighbor tree, no tag</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>991</td>
<td>Plum (Prunus sp.)</td>
<td>~14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neighbor tree, no tag</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THIS FENCE MAY BE MOVED ONLY WITH PERMISSION OF THE PROJECT ARBORIST
This letter report is to summarize the results of a cultural resources evaluation of Fountainhead Montessori School’s property at 1715 and 1725 Oak Park Boulevard in Pleasant Hill, CA. Fountainhead Montessori plans to redevelop the property, including demolition of the two existing buildings.

Both existing buildings are one-story, three-bedroom ranch houses with attached garage built in 1951, and later converted for use as a daycare facility. Since the buildings are over 50 years old, Contra Costa County requires that project proponents demonstrate that their proposed projects will not have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource (as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5) before issuing a demolition permit.

Archival Research

In August 2017 a record search for the project area and a 1/8-mile radius was requested from the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), California Historical Resources Information System (NWIC File #17-0168). One previous study has been completed within this radius, an initial study of six parcels on Oak Park Boulevard (Report #S-017700). That study did not identify any cultural resources. The project area has not been previously evaluated for cultural resources, and no cultural resources are known within 1/4 mile of the project area. See Attachment A for record search results.

A/HC staff also reviewed the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources, California Historical Landmarks, and the California Inventory of Historical Resources to determine whether any previously recorded cultural resources exist within the project area. In the scope of that review, none were found. For a full list of sources consulted, see the bibliography attached to the DPR 523 forms below.

Field Survey and Recording

Dr. Daniel Shoup (Archaeologist and Historian) visited the project area on August 8, 2017 and recorded 1715 and 1725 Oak Park Boulevard. A California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Form 523 was prepared (Attachment B), which provides in-depth description, historic context, and evaluation of the buildings on site. Dr. Shoup also conducted an archaeological survey
The house at 1715 Oak Park Boulevard is over 50 years old, and thus meets the California Register of Historic Resources criterion for age. The house has experienced major alterations and a change of use from residential to educational, which has compromised its historic integrity. Even if the house retained a higher level of historic integrity, it is one of many homes built on the same or similar plan within the El Dorado Park Subdivision, most of which retain their original use as single-family homes. It is not an exceptional or distinguished example of the Ranch Style house in Contra Costa County, and therefore does not appear to be eligible under California Register Criterion 3. The house also does not appear to have significant associations with local themes or cultural patterns of significance, and therefore does not appear to be eligible for the California Register under Criterion 1. Historical research did not indicate that the early owners of the house – Everett Bosworth or Walter Levings – were significant figures in local history, thus the house does not appear to be significant under California Register Criterion 2. Archaeological survey did not identify the area as sensitive for historic or prehistoric archaeological sites, making the property not significant under Criterion 4. The house is also not a contributing resource to a California Register-eligible historic district.

**Evaluation of 1715 Oak Park Boulevard**

1715 Oak Park Boulevard was extensively remodeled in 1989 for use as an early childhood education facility. The exterior of the house is in good to excellent condition, but lacks the original steel sash casement windows visible in contemporary houses built nearby. While the shutter boards match the period of the house, they were added later; County Assessor’s photos show them present in 1998. Major exterior modifications include the storage closet added to the northwest corner of the house and the large rear addition, which required reconstruction of the roof at a different pitch. Several ramps and external doors have also been added, along with the rear porch. Inside, the condition of the walls, floors, ceilings, and windows is fair to good. The building mostly lacks original interior features, except the fireplace and mantel, and perhaps the baseboard moldings. In 1989 the floorplan was extensively changed, windows replaced, the kitchen gutted and remodeled, and the garage rebuilt as a multi-purpose room. Due to these changes, the building lacks historic integrity because it no longer suggests its original use as a single-family residence.

The house at 1715 Oak Park Boulevard is over 50 years old, and thus meets the California Register of Historic Resources criterion for age. The house has experienced major alterations and a change of use from residential to educational, which has compromised its historic integrity. Even if the house retained a higher level of historic integrity, it is one of many homes built on the same or similar plan within the El Dorado Park Subdivision, most of which retain their original use as single-family homes. It is not an exceptional or distinguished example of the Ranch Style house in Contra Costa County, and therefore does not appear to be eligible under California Register Criterion 3. The house also does not appear to have significant associations with local themes or cultural patterns of significance, and therefore does not appear to be eligible for the California Register under Criterion 1. Historical research did not indicate that the early owners of the house – Everett Bosworth or Walter Levings – were significant figures in local history, thus the house does not appear to be significant under California Register Criterion 2. Archaeological survey did not identify the area as sensitive for historic or prehistoric archaeological sites, making the property not significant under Criterion 4. The house is also not a contributing resource to a California Register-eligible historic district.

**Evaluation of 1725 Oak Park Boulevard**

1715 Oak Park Boulevard was extensively remodeled in 1989 for use as an early childhood education facility. The exterior of the house is in good to excellent condition, but lacks the original steel sash casement windows visible in contemporary houses built nearby. While the shutter boards match the period of the house, they were added later; County Assessor’s photos show them present in 1998. Major exterior modifications include the storage closet added to the northwest corner of the house and the large rear addition, which required reconstruction of the roof at a different pitch. Several ramps and external doors have also been added, along with the rear porch. Inside, the condition of the walls, floors, ceilings, and windows is fair to good. The building mostly lacks original interior features, except the fireplace and mantel, and perhaps the baseboard moldings. In 1989 the floorplan was extensively changed, windows replaced, the kitchen gutted and remodeled, and the garage rebuilt as a multi-purpose room. Due to these changes, the building lacks historic integrity because it no longer suggests its original use as a single-family residence.
casements, fireplace and mantel, built-in shelving in the hallway, and perhaps the kitchen cabinets, baseboard moldings, and chair rails. However, the building no longer suggests its original use as a single-family residence, due to extensive alterations to the floor plan. Due to these changes, the building lacks historic integrity.

The house at 1725 Oak Park Boulevard is over 50 years old, and thus meets the California Register of Historic Resources criterion for age. The house has experienced major alterations and a change of use from residential to educational, which has compromised its historic integrity. Even if the house retained a higher level of historic integrity, it is one of many homes built on the same or similar plan within the El Dorado Park Subdivision, most of which retain their original use as single-family homes. It is not an exceptional or distinguished example of the Ranch Style house in Contra Costa County, and therefore does not appear to be eligible under California Register Criterion 3. The house also does not appear to have significant associations with local themes or cultural patterns of significance, and therefore does not appear to be eligible for the California Register under Criterion 1. Historical research did not indicate that the original owner of the house – Gavin or Edwina Tefs – was a significant figure in local history, thus the house does not appear to be significant under California Register Criterion 2. Archaeological survey did not identify the area as sensitive for historic or prehistoric archaeological sites, making the property not significant under Criterion 4. The house is also not a contributing resource to a California Register-eligible historic district.

In conclusion, neither 1715 or 1725 Oak Park Boulevard appear eligible for the CRHR because they do not meet any of the criteria for significance. Nor are the buildings a contributing resource to a California Register-eligible historic district. As a result, the project area does not appear to contain historical resources as defined in CEQA §15064.5.

Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions or comments on this letter or the attached evaluation.

Yours truly,

Daniel Shoup
Principal
Attachment A: Northwest Information Center Search Results