

Section 1

Introduction

1.1 BACKGROUND

A Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) was prepared to disclose potential environmental effects of the Kaiser Permanente San Leandro Medical Center/Mixed-Use Retail Development Project (proposed project). The Draft EIR included a description of the proposed project, an assessment of its potential effects, a description of possible mitigation measures to reduce significant effects that were identified in the Draft EIR, and a consideration of alternatives that could address potential impacts.

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Draft EIR was distributed for public review and comments. The public review period for the Draft EIR began on January 25, 2010, and ended on March 10, 2010, and written comments were accepted through the end of the comment period, in accordance with State law. During this time frame, the document was reviewed by various State and local agencies, as well as by interested organizations and individuals. A public hearing was also held in the City of San Leandro before the Planning Commission on February 18, 2010, to obtain further comments on the Draft EIR.

This document responds to comments on the Draft EIR that were raised during the public review period, and contains revisions intended to correct, clarify, and amplify the Draft EIR. The responses and revisions in this document substantiate and confirm the analyses and conclusions contained in the Draft EIR. No new substantial environmental impact and no increase in the severity of an earlier identified impact have surfaced in responding to the comments.

In addition, this document includes revisions to the traffic analysis that arose during the comment period. In response to the concerns raised by various commentors, the traffic impacts on Marina Boulevard and Merced Street were further evaluated and errors in the analysis were identified and corrected. As a result, the revised traffic analysis indicates that the peak hour queuing impacts on Marina Boulevard and Merced Street were less significant than previously identified and the revised traffic analysis summarizes these changes in Section 2, Summary of Revisions to the Traffic Analysis, and also in Section 3, Responses to Comments. No new substantial environmental impact and no increase in the severity of an earlier identified traffic impact have resulted from these revisions. City staff initiated text changes to the Draft EIR related to these revisions as well as errata and minor corrections and clarifications are shown in Section 4, Revisions to the Draft EIR.

Together, the previously released Draft EIR and this document constitute the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR). The Planning Commission and the City Council of the City of San Leandro must review the Final EIR and the City Council must certify the Final EIR before action can be taken on the project. Certification requires that the lead agency make findings that the Final EIR complies with CEQA.

1.2 HOW TO USE THIS REPORT

This Final EIR addresses substantive comments received during the public review period and consists of four sections: (1) Introduction; (2) Summary of Revisions to the Traffic Analysis; (3) Comments and Responses; and (4) Revisions to the Draft EIR. Section 1 reviews the purpose and contents of the Final EIR. Section 2 provides a summary of revisions to the traffic analysis that have occurred in response to comments. Section 3 contains each comment letter received during the public review period for the Draft EIR, the transcripts of speakers at the public hearing on the Draft EIR, and the responses to these comments. Section 4 includes City staff-initiated text changes to the Draft EIR and changes made in response to comments.

Every comment letter is reproduced in Section 3, Comments and Responses, in its entirety. Specific comments from each comment letter have been enumerated in the margin of each letter, which is reproduced in Section 3 of this document. Comments are denoted using a numbering system that identifies the comment letter and the comment number within the comment letter. As an example, Comment 9-2 refers to the second comment in Comment Letter #9. Responses to each of these comments follow each comment letter and use the same numbering scheme. Thus, Response 9-2 addresses Comment 9-2. This same numbering scheme is used to identify and respond to the oral comments received during the public hearing. A two-letter code (PH) is used as a prefix for each comment/response to designate the comments received during the public hearing. A separate two-letter code (PC) is used as a prefix for each comment/response provided by the Planning Commissioners who commented on the Draft EIR at the public hearing.

For the most part, the responses provide explanation or additional discussion of text in the Draft EIR. In some instances, the response supersedes or supplements the text of the Draft EIR for accuracy or clarification. New text that has been added to the Draft EIR is indicated with underlining. Text that has been deleted is indicated with ~~striketrough~~. Changes to the Draft EIR are summarized in Section 4, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR.

1.3 LIST OF COMMENTORS

Twelve comment letters on the Draft EIR were received during the comment period. Six comment letters were from public agencies, four were from businesses, and two were from individuals, as listed below.

Public Agencies

0. Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit, Scott Morgan, Acting Director (letter dated March 11, 2010)
1. California Department of Transportation, Local Development – Intergovernmental Review, Lisa Carboni, District Branch Chief (letter dated March 10, 2010)

2. California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, Sandy Hesnard, Aviation Environmental Specialist (letter dated March 2, 2010)
3. Alameda County Transit (AC Transit), Nancy Skowbo, Deputy General Manager for Service Development (letter dated March 10, 2010)
4. Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA), Diane Stark, Senior Transportation Planner (letter dated March 10, 2010)
5. East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD), William R. Kirkpatrick, Manager of Water Distribution Planning Division (letter dated February 25, 2010)

Businesses

6. Ron Musgrove, CEO and Jeff Musgrove, President, Applied Fusion, Inc. (letter dated February 18, 2010)
7. Cedric Young, Vice President, Bayfair Center (letter dated March 10, 2010)
8. Dana G. Parry, President and CEO, Reynolds & Brown (letter dated March 10, 2010)
9. Jeffrey A. Goldfarb, Attorney, Rutan and Tucker, LLP (letter dated March 10, 2010)

Individuals

10. Gary E. Kruger, T.E., (letter dated March 4, 2010)
11. Yoon Lee, General Manager, Hilton Garden Inn/San Leandro and Audrey L. Velasquez, General Manager, San Leandro Marina Inn (letter dated March 4, 2010)

Public Hearing Comments

Oral comments were received from one individual at the Public Hearing held during the Planning Commission Meeting on February 18, 2010. A written comment was also submitted during the public hearing and included in the public record. (Note this letter also appears as Comment Letter #6.) These comment are listed below.

PH 1. Cedric Young, Vice President, Bayfair Center

PH.2 Ron Musgrove, CEO and Jeff Musgrove, President, Applied Fusion, Inc.

The four Planning Commissioners present at the Public Hearing also commented on the Draft EIR. Their comments have been numbered as follows:

PC 1. Commissioner Collier

PC 2. Commissioner Reed

PC 3. Commissioner Brannan

PC 4. Chair Dlugosh

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK.