ORIGINAL

RESOLUTION NO. 14549

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDWOOD CITY MAKING CERTAIN FINDINGS CONCERNING MITIGATION MEASURES, ADOPTING A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM, MAKING FINDINGS CONCERNING ALTERNATIVES, AND ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FOR THE KAISER PERMANENTE REDWOOD CITY MEDICAL CENTER MASTER PLAN PROJECT FOR WHICH AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT HAS BEEN PREPARED

WHEREAS, the City of Redwood City ("City") prepared a Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") for the Kaiser Permanente Redwood City Medical Center Master Plan project ("Project"); and

WHEREAS, in addition to evaluating the Project as proposed by Kaiser Foundation Hospitals ("Kaiser"), the FEIR evaluates the environmental impacts of the Project under a Higher Occupancy Scenario ("Higher Occupancy Scenario") that reflects a more intensive use of the proposed medical office buildings than contemplated by Kaiser; and

WHEREAS, subsequent to the preparation of the FEIR, the City prepared an addendum to the FEIR, dated June 18, 2003, to revise downward the water demand projections for the Project, based on water demand rates that more accurately reflect the amount of water used by Kaiser facilities and other hospitals; and

WHEREAS, on June 24, 2003, after a duly noticed public hearing and an independent review of the FEIR, the Planning Commission of the City of Redwood City certified by recorded vote that the FEIR was completed in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and state and local guidelines and reflected the independent judgment of the City; and

WHEREAS, the Project would include approval by the City of the following: a Precise Plan, pursuant to Article 52 of the Redwood City Zoning Ordinance; a rezoning to Planned Community District (P District) for the area of the Precise Plan; Tentative Map(s), as may be necessary and/or modifications to street right-of-ways; Planned Community (PC) Permits for the development of site, building, landscaping, and signage improvements; Building Permits for the structures; and Tree Removal Permit(s) as required; any necessary agreements for public infrastructure improvement; and
WHEREAS, CEQA requires that, in connection with the approval of a project for which an EIR has been prepared which identifies one or more significant environmental effects, the decision-making agency make certain findings regarding those effects;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDWOOD CITY, AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Council hereby finds and affirms that the FEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; that the City Council has reviewed and analyzed the FEIR and other information in the record and has considered the information contained therein, including the written and oral comments received at the public hearings on the FEIR and the Project, prior to acting upon or approving the Project; and that the FEIR represents the independent judgment of the City of Redwood City; and

2. The Findings and recommendations set forth in Exhibit A, and incorporated herein by reference, are made by this Council as the City's findings under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code § 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., title 14, §15000 et seq.) relating to the Project. The Findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of the Council regarding the Project's environmental impacts, mitigation measures and alternatives to the Project.

3. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 et seq., the City Council of the City of Redwood City adopts and makes the following statement of overriding considerations regarding the remaining unavoidable impacts of the Project and the anticipated economic, social and other benefits of the Project.

   a. Significant Unavoidable Impacts.

      With respect to the foregoing findings, as set forth in Exhibit A, and in recognition of those facts which are included in the record, the City has determined the following:

      • that the Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario would cause significant, unavoidable impacts to noise and to utilities and service systems; and

      • that the Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario would contribute to significant, unavoidable cumulative impacts to transportation and circulation, and to utilities and service systems.

      These impacts cannot be avoided or substantially reduced by feasible changes or alterations to the Project, other than the changes or alterations already adopted.

   b. Overriding Considerations.

      This Council specifically adopts and makes this Statement of Overriding Considerations that this Project includes all feasible measures that would eliminate or substantially lessen the significant impacts of the Project on the environment, and that
the remaining significant, unavoidable impacts of the Project are acceptable in light of the environmental, economic, social and other considerations set forth herein because the benefits of the Project outweigh the significant and adverse impacts of the Project. This Council finds that each of the overriding considerations set forth below constitutes a separate and independent ground for finding that the benefits of the Project outweigh its significant adverse environmental impacts and sets forth an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project. These matters are supported by evidence in the record.

c. Benefits of Proposed Project.

This Council has considered the FEIR, the public record of proceedings on the proposed Project and other written materials presented to the City as well as oral and written testimony at all public hearings related to the Project, and does hereby determine that implementation of the Project as specifically provided in the Project documents would result in the substantial public benefits set forth below.

This Council has weighed the benefits of the proposed Project against its unavoidable environmental risks and adverse environmental effects identified in the FEIR and hereby determines that those benefits outweigh the risks and adverse environmental effects and, therefore, further determines that these risks and adverse environmental effects are acceptable.

(i) **High-Quality Medical Care.** The Project would enable Kaiser to continue to provide high quality, cost effective, accessible health care to Kaiser Permanente’s members and the Redwood City community. One third of the members using the Redwood City campus are residents of Redwood City. The Project would provide a new, state-of-the-art inpatient facility for Kaiser Permanente members in the Redwood City area to meet changing health care demands and practices.

The Project would also allow Kaiser to improve the functional and operational relationship and adjacencies paramount for delivery of quality care. These relationships and adjacencies are based on the need for collaboration and coordination of multiple teams of specialists, to provide the quality outcome necessary to patients in critical conditions and save their lives.

(ii) **Continuity of Care.** The Project would consolidate most of Kaiser Permanente’s Redwood City treatment and support functions at a single Medical Center location. In addition, the Project would maintain the Kaiser Redwood City Hospital ("Redwood City Hospital") at its present regional location, where it serves an important role as a resource for Kaiser Permanente members and to the Redwood City community. Through phasing, the Project would ensure uninterrupted operation of services at the Medical Center during construction.

(iii) **Seismic Safety and Long-Term Services.** The Project would replace the inpatient facility at the Redwood City Hospital in accordance with SB
1953 in order to create a new, seismically safe, inpatient medical facility for Kaiser Permanente members and the Redwood City community. Without the seismic safety improvements, the inpatient facility would be required by law to close by 2013, which would cause a significant adverse impact. Three major phases of the Project will provide replacement facilities. Any significant environmental impacts will only occur in conjunction with the later phases of the Project.

(iv) **Support Redwood City’s Objectives and Design Guidelines for the Downtown Area.** The Project would play an important role in the revitalization and enhancement of Redwood City’s Downtown District due to its proximity to the downtown retail core and its location at a gateway entrance into the downtown at Main Street and Veterans Boulevard, particularly given the size of the Medical Center.

The Project would provide a campus environment that is easy to negotiate for both pedestrians and vehicles, by creating open spaces and pedestrian walkways with clearly recognizable destination points, building entrances, landmarks, and street crossings to orient people to Medical Center programs. The Project would create a friendly environment for a diverse mix of people and uses in the downtown. The Project would establish a central downtown public gathering space that serves as a focal point for the community and, in addition, help to define the downtown area.

(v) **Economic Impacts to the City of Redwood City.** The Project will provide significant market support to downtown businesses and will enhance the City’s ongoing revitalization efforts. The Project will retain Kaiser’s approximately 1,387 employees in the City and will result in additional new employees. These employees are a primary source of potential business, patronizing restaurants, shops and cafes. Out-patient and in-patient visitors coming trips to the campus and Downtown are an additional source of economic activity for Downtown. In addition, Kaiser provides over one million dollars of annual charitable investment in the City.

(vi) **Increase in Number of Jobs.** The economic development goals and policies of the Redwood City General Plan include creating more job opportunities. The Project would promote these goals and policies by ultimately generating approximately 134 additional jobs. The Higher Occupancy Scenario would promote these goals and policies by ultimately generating approximately 626 additional jobs.

(vii) **Smart Growth.** The Project would encourage “smart growth” by intensifying the use of a currently developed site, thereby preserving open space. As discussed above, development would also be in proximity to existing housing and transit opportunities such as Caltrain.
4. The Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Kaiser Permanente Redwood City Medical Center Master Plan is attached to this resolution as Exhibit B and is incorporated and adopted as part of this resolution herein. The Program identifies impacts of the Project, corresponding mitigation, designation of responsibility for mitigation implementation and the agency responsible for the monitoring action.

5. This Council hereby finds and recognizes that the FEIR contains additions, clarifications, modifications and other information in its responses to comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Project ("DEIR") and also incorporates information obtained by the City since the DEIR was issued. This Council hereby finds and determines that such changes and additional information are not significant new information as that term is defined under the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, because such changes and additional information do not indicate that any new significant environmental impacts not already evaluated would result from the Project and do not reflect any substantial increase in the severity of any environmental impact; that no feasible mitigation measures considerably different from those previously analyzed in the DEIR have been proposed that would lessen significant environmental impacts of the Project; and that no feasible alternatives considerably different from those analyzed in the DEIR have been proposed that would lessen significant environmental impacts of the Project. Accordingly, This Council hereby finds and determines that recirculation of the FEIR for further public review and comment is not warranted; and

6. This Council does hereby designate the Planning Director of the City of Redwood City, at his office at 1017 Middlefield Road, P.O. Box 391, Redwood City, California 94064-0391 as the custodian of documents and record of proceedings on which the decision is based; and

7. This Council does hereby make the foregoing findings with respect to the significant effects on the environment of such Project, as identified in the FEIR, with the stipulations that all information in these findings is intended as a summary of the full administrative record supporting the FEIR, which full administrative record should be consulted for the full details supporting these findings, and that any mitigation measures and/or alternatives that were suggested by commenters to the DEIR and were not adopted as part of the FEIR are hereby expressly rejected for the reasons stated in the responses to the comments set forth in the FEIR and elsewhere in the record.

*****
Passed and adopted by the Council of the City of Redwood City at a Special Meeting thereof held on the 25th day of August, 2003 by the following votes:

AYES, and in favor of the passage and adoption of the foregoing resolution,

Council members: Hartnett, Howard, Ira, Pierce, Ruskin, and Mayor Claire

NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Jordan

RICHARD S. CLAIRE
Mayor of the City of Redwood City

Attest:

Patricia Howe
City Clerk of Redwood City

I hereby approve the foregoing resolution this 26th day of August, 2003.

RICHARD S. CLAIRE
Mayor of the City of Redwood City
EXHIBIT A

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE KAISER PERMANENTE REDWOOD CITY MASTER PLAN FEIR

I. LAND USE

The Project (as proposed or as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario) would have no significant or potentially significant impact on land use.

II. VISUAL QUALITY

A. Project Phasing

Potential Impact: The Project (as proposed or as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario) would be implemented in five phases between 2003 and 2025. As portions of the campus could be under construction for lengthy periods of time, parts of the site could be unsightly and create a potentially significant visual impact. (Potentially Significant)

Mitigation: The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the FEIR, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

- Mitigation Measure VQ-5.1

Finding: Mitigation Measure VQ-5.1 is feasible and would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level.

The mitigation measure would reduce the potentially significant impact described above to a less-than-significant level by minimizing or screening the unsightly aspects of construction at the site, by minimizing the presence of debris and idle equipment on the site, by maintaining landscaping within construction zones on site, and by placing and designing fencing at construction zones to promote safety and pedestrian friendliness. The mitigation measure would also minimize the presence of dormant areas on the site by creating attractive and accessible spaces for passive recreation and open space in areas that are not in use as a construction zone for more than six months due to demolition or construction of a structure.

The potential impact of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the potential impact of the Project as proposed, because the external design of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the external design of the Project
as proposed. Likewise, the mitigation measure would be similarly effective with respect to the Project as proposed and the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario.

B. Light and Glare

**Potential Impact:** The proposed project could become a new source of substantial light or glare. (Potentially Significant)

**Mitigation:** The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the Initial Study and the FEIR, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

The project sponsor shall implement, but not be limited to, the following measures that would reduce light and glare effects to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of this measure shall occur prior to issuance of a building permit for each phase of construction proposed by the project sponsor.

The lighting system designer/contractor shall prepare a lighting plan and select light fixtures that meet or exceed industry standards for cutoff performance. This performance standard will minimize the dispersion of light in a manner that reduces the glow or aurora effect.

The lighting system designer/contractor shall be required to install the lights at the proper angle such that spill light is minimized beyond the project site.

**Finding:** The mitigation measure identified above is feasible and would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level.

The mitigation measure identified above would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level, because it would require the designer/contractor to consider light and glare impacts during the design/build process and would allow the City to ensure that measures to reduce light and glare are adequate. Implementation of the performance standard for the dispersion of light would reduce the glow or aurora effect, and installation of lighting at the proper angle would minimize the amount of light spilled beyond the site.

III. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

A. Local Circulation

**Potential Impact:** The Project (as proposed or as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario) would have a potentially significant impact on bus-related traffic flow, bus and shuttle access, site access, and on-site
circulation. However, the Project would not interfere with existing or proposed bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities. (Potentially Significant)

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures, as set forth in the FEIR, are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

- Mitigation Measures TR-3.1, TR-3.2, TR-3.3, and TR-3.4

Finding: Mitigation Measures TR-3.1, TR-3.2, TR-3.3, and TR-3.4 are feasible and would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level.

The mitigation measures would reduce the potentially significant impact described above to a less-than-significant level by maintaining traffic flow along Veterans Boulevard, minimizing roadway conflicts between buses and other vehicles, maintaining pedestrian flow, minimizing roadway and sidewalk conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles, and by implementing a Transportation Demand Management Program.

Frequent and reliable shuttle service would increase the use of Caltrain and bus transit services as an alternative to automobile trips by project employees, particularly if the shuttle service were provided at 15-minute intervals during peak periods and coordinated with the Caltrain schedule.

Because the Project site is close to the downtown core and links to Caltrain and bus services, pedestrian facilities would particularly effective in encouraging campus employees and patients to walk to and between buildings, thereby reducing the number of automobile trips to the campus and between campus buildings. In addition, pedestrian facilities would help to minimize conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians by minimizing and regulating intersections between pedestrian and vehicle routes.

B. Intersection Operations under Cumulative with Project Conditions

Potential Impact: The Cumulative with Project Conditions would result in several intersections (Whipple Avenue/Veterans Boulevard, Hansen Way/Veterans Boulevard, and Woodside Road/Veterans Boulevard) operating at unacceptable levels during various peak periods. However, the proposed project would contribute substantially only to the unacceptable levels of service at the Woodside Road/Veterans Boulevard intersection. (Significant)

Mitigation: The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the FEIR, would potentially reduce the significance of the impact described above to a less-than-significant level, but the measure is not feasible and is therefore not adopted:

- Mitigation Measure TR-7.1
Finding: Mitigation Measure TR-7.1 is not feasible. The impact described above is therefore significant and unavoidable.

The mitigation measure would widen the eastbound approach on Veterans Boulevard to accommodate an additional through lane (with an associated receiving lane on the on-ramp to US 101). Additionally, the southbound right-turn movement would be controlled by a separate phase that would be green while the eastbound left-turn phase occurs. A second receiving lane would have to be added on the US 101 on-ramp, and the ramp would have to be widened to accommodate merging with the ramp connection from eastbound Woodside Road. If the ramp is not sufficiently widened, merging congestion could degrade ramp operations.

The mitigation measure is not feasible, because the on-ramp would need to be widened to accommodate the merging traffic generated by the mitigation measure, and widening the on-ramp to US 101 would require the approval of Caltrans, which is beyond the City's control and unlikely.

Overriding Considerations: The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project override the significant impact described above, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 3 of the Resolution.

C. Intersection Operations under Cumulative with Higher Occupancy Scenario Conditions

Potential Impact: Under the Cumulative with Higher Occupancy Scenario Conditions, the intersections at Maple Street/Marshall Street, Whipple Avenue/Veterans Boulevard, Hansen Way/Veterans Boulevard, and Woodside Road/Veterans Boulevard are projected to operate at unacceptable levels. (Significant)

The following mitigation measures, as set forth in the FEIR, are hereby adopted as modified below and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

- Mitigation Measure TR-10.1 and Mitigation Measure TR-10.3

Finding: Mitigation Measures TR-10.1 and TR-10.3 are feasible and would substantially reduce the cumulative significant environmental impact described above if monitoring determines such an impact.

Mitigation Measure TR-10.1 would include monitoring the Maple Street/Marshall Street intersection to determine when signalization is warranted in the future and installing a traffic signal at the intersection to reduce vehicle delay if the results of the monitoring show that signalization is warranted. As with all mitigation measures, the City may adopt appropriate alternative mitigation in lieu potential signalization.
Mitigation Measure TR-10.3 would include monitoring the Hansen Way/Veterans Boulevard intersection to determine when signalization is warranted in the future is warranted in the future and installing a traffic signal at the intersection to reduce vehicle delay if the results of the monitoring show that signalization is warranted.

The following mitigation measures, as set forth in the FEIR, would potentially avoid or substantially reduce the significance of the impact described above, but are not feasible or would result in unacceptable secondary impacts and therefore are not adopted:

- Mitigation Measures TR-10.2, TR-10.4

**Finding:** Mitigation Measures TR-10.2 and TR-10.4 are not feasible. There are no other feasible mitigation measure available to avoid or substantially reduce the significant environmental impact described above. The impact described above is therefore significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure TR-10.2 would include improvements to the northbound approach to the Whipple Avenue/Veterans Boulevard intersection to widen the roadway. However, widening the roadway is not feasible, because the existing right of way is not wide enough. Widening the approaches to the intersection of Whipple Avenue and Veterans Boulevard would cause unacceptable secondary impacts making the intersection less “pedestrian friendly” by requiring pedestrians to cross additional lanes of traffic.

Mitigation Measure TR-10.4 is not feasible, because the on-ramp from Veterans Boulevard to US 101 would need to be widened to accommodate the merging traffic generated by the mitigation measure, and widening the on-ramp to US 101 would require the approval of Caltrans, which is beyond the City’s control and unlikely.

**Overriding Considerations:** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project override the significant impact described above, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 3 of the Resolution.

D. US 101 Freeway Segments under Cumulative with Higher Occupancy Scenario Conditions

**Potential Impact:** Under the Cumulative with Higher Occupancy Scenario Conditions, the southbound US 101 mixed flow lanes from SR 92 to Whipple Avenue and from Woodside Road to Marsh Road would be significantly affected by Higher Occupancy Scenario traffic. (Significant)

**Mitigation:** The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the FEIR, would potentially avoid or substantially reduce the significance of the impact described above, but is not feasible and therefore is not adopted:
• Mitigation Measure TR-11.1

Finding: Mitigation Measure TR-11.1 is not feasible. There is no other feasible mitigation measure available to avoid or substantially reduce the significant environmental impact described above.

Mitigation of the impact described above to a less-than-significant level would require the addition of another southbound through lane to southbound US 101 from SR 92 to Whipple Avenue and from Woodside Road to Marsh Road. However, freeway widening would require the approval of Caltrans, which is beyond the City's control and unlikely.

Overriding Considerations: The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project override the significant impact described above, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 3 of the Resolution.

E. US 101 Ramp Operations under Cumulative with Higher Occupancy Scenario Conditions

Potential Impact: The Cumulative with Higher Occupancy Scenario Conditions would exceed the capacity of the northbound US 101 off-ramp to Woodside Road during the PM peak hour. (Significant)

Mitigation: The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the FEIR, would potentially avoid or substantially reduce the significance of the impact described above, but is not feasible and therefore is not adopted:

• Mitigation Measures TR-12.1

Finding: Mitigation Measure TR-12.1 is not feasible. There is no other feasible mitigation measure available to avoid or substantially reduce the significant environmental impact described above.

Mitigation of the impact described above to a less-than-significant level would require the addition of another lane on the northbound US 101 off-ramp to Woodside Road. However, freeway widening would require the approval of Caltrans, which is beyond the City's control and unlikely.

Overriding Considerations: The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project override the significant impact described above, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 3 of the Resolution.

IV. AIR QUALITY

A. Construction Dust
**Potential Impact:** Construction activities at the project site, including operation of equipment and movement of construction vehicles, could result in temporary air quality impacts. (Potentially Significant)

**Mitigation:** The following mitigation measures, as set forth in the Initial Study and the FEIR, are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

The project applicant shall implement a construction dust abatement program including the following measures:

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily;
- Water or cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand, or other materials that can be blown away by the wind;
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials, or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard;
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites;
- Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil materials carried onto adjacent public streets;
- Hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas;
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or wash off the tires or tracks of trucks and equipment leaving the site;
- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hours;
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways; and
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

**Finding:** The mitigation measures are feasible and would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level.

The mitigation measures identified would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level, because they would substantially reduce the amount of airborne dust generated at the Project site. Watering the site, covering trucks and stockpiles, hydroseeding or soil stabilizing, and planting vegetation would contain dust on the
ground at the site. Limiting traffic speeds on unpaved roads would reduce the amount of dust lifted into the air by vehicles. Installing sandbags and sweeping would remove exposed dust and silt from streets adjacent to the site.

The potential impact of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the potential impact of the Project as proposed, because the construction activities of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the construction activities of the Project as proposed. Likewise, the mitigation measures would be similarly effective with respect to the Project as proposed and the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario.

V. NOISE

A. Construction Noise and Vibration

Potential Impact: Under the proposed project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario, construction of new facilities at the Project site would temporarily generate noise and vibration levels that would exceed the limits set forth in the City of Redwood City's Noise Ordinance for construction and demolition noise. (Significant)

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures, as set forth in the FEIR, are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

- Mitigation Measures NO-1.1, NO-1.2

Finding: Mitigation Measures NO-1.1 and NO-1.2 are feasible and would substantially reduce most of the potentially significant construction noise impacts. In addition, implementation of the mitigation measures would substantially reduce the effects of vibration on nearby structures and sensitive receptors. However, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. There is no other feasible mitigation measure available to avoid or substantially reduce the significant environmental impact described above.

The mitigation measures would substantially reduce most of the potentially significant construction noise by implementing best management practices. Best management practices would include the use of quiet equipment where possible, muffling and enclosing noisy equipment, a locating equipment away from sensitive receptors. The mitigation measures would substantially reduce most of the potentially significant construction vibration by using techniques to minimize the vibrations from pile-driving equipment.

Overriding Considerations: The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project override the significant impact described above,
as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 3 of the Resolution.

The potential impact of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the potential impact of the Project as proposed, because the construction activities of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the construction activities of the Project as proposed. Likewise, the mitigation measure would be similarly effective with respect to the Project as proposed and the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario.

B. Mechanical Noise

Potential Impact: Under the proposed Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario, mechanical equipment associated with the new buildings may exceed the noise limits in Redwood City's Noise Ordinance. (Potentially Significant)

Mitigation: The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the FEIR, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

- Mitigation Measure NO-2.1

Finding: Mitigation Measure NO-2.1 is feasible and would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level.

The mitigation measure would reduce the significant impact described above to a less-than-significant level by installing shielding and placing equipment, at the direction of an acoustical engineer, so as to muffle noise and distance equipment from sensitive receptors. In addition, the acoustical engineer may require Kaiser to take additional steps to ensure that mechanical noise emissions are reduced sufficiently to avoid a significant impact.

The potential impact of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the potential impact of the Project as proposed, because the mechanical equipment associated with the new buildings of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the mechanical equipment associated with the new buildings of the Project as proposed. Likewise, the mitigation measure would be similarly effective with respect to the Project as proposed and the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario.

C. Loading and Trash Compaction Noise

Potential Impact: Under the proposed Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario, noise generated by activities at the loading docks and
during trash compaction and collections could potentially impact off-site receptors. (Potentially Significant)

**Mitigation:** The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the FEIR, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

- Mitigation Measure NO-3.1

**Finding:** Mitigation Measure NO-3.1 is feasible and would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level.

The mitigation measure identified above would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level by ensuring that loading docks, trash compaction, and storage facilities and compressors associated with new buildings on the Project site are located so that the building itself serves as a noise buffer or, alternatively, so that adequate noise buffers are constructed.

The potential impact of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the potential impact of the Project as proposed, because the loading docks and during trash compaction and collections of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the loading docks and during trash compaction and collections of the Project as proposed. Likewise, the mitigation measure would be similarly effective with respect to the Project as proposed and the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario.

**VI. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

A. Construction-Related Hazardous Materials Disturbance

**Potential Impact:** Under the proposed Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario, project-related demolition or renovation could disturb hazardous materials in existing building components and thereby cause adverse health or safety effects. (Potentially Significant)

**Mitigation:** The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the FEIR, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

- Mitigation Measure HM-1.1

**Finding:** Mitigation Measure HM-1.1 is feasible and would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level.
The mitigation measure identified above would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level by ensuring that existing building areas subject to demolition or renovation are inspected prior to the demolition or renovation for the presence of asbestos, PCBs, mercury, lead, or other hazardous materials. If hazardous materials are found at levels that require special handling, the materials will be managed in accordance with state and federal regulations and guidelines to reduce any potential hazard.

The potential impact of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the potential impact of the Project as proposed, because the project-related demolition or renovation of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the project-related demolition or renovation of the Project as proposed. Likewise, the mitigation measure would be similarly effective with respect to the Project as proposed and the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario.

B. Exposure to Contaminated Soil and/or Groundwater

**Potential Impact:** Under the proposed Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario, excavation and construction of proposed basement and building foundations could expose construction personnel and the public to existing contaminated soil and/or groundwater (Potentially Significant)

**Mitigation:** The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the FEIR, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

- Mitigation Measure HM-2.1

**Finding:** Mitigation Measure HM-2.1 is feasible and would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level.

The mitigation measure identified above would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level by establishing a Site Health and Safety Plan with policies and procedures to protect workers and the public from potential hazards posed by residual contamination issues at the site.

The population that would be present at or adjacent to the Project site after construction would include workers employed at the site, patients and visitors at the Medical Center, and off-site residents. In the future, potential health effects could occur if any of these individuals were exposed to elevated levels of contaminants in the soil or groundwater. Exposure could occur through inhalation of soil and groundwater vapors that have migrated to the surface. Direct contact
with soil or groundwater would be unlikely because the site is and would remain mostly paved.

The Site Health and Safety Plan would include procedures to identify contaminants and potential hazards, procedures for handling materials, measures for suppressing dust, specifications for personal protection clothing and devices, measures to control access to the site, requirements for health and safety training, specifications for monitoring equipment used during construction to verify the health and safety of workers and the public, emergency response procedures, and other measures to protect public health and safety. If petroleum hydrocarbons are present in the soil and/or groundwater proposed for the use of backfill or disposal, the handling and disposal of the contaminated soil and groundwater would be governed by the applicable local and federal hazardous materials regulations.

Worker and public health/safety requirements would apply during remediation activities. Potential adverse impacts of remediation would be mitigated almost entirely by legally required safety and hazardous waste handling precautions. For hazardous waste workers, Cal/OSHA regulations mandate an initial 40-hour training course and subsequent annual training review. Additionally, site-specific training would be required for some workers. These measures, along with application of cleanup standards subject to review by responsible agencies, would serve to protect human health and the environment during site remediation, thus minimizing impacts.

The potential impact of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the potential impact of the Project as proposed, because the excavation and construction of proposed basement and building foundations of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the excavation and construction of proposed basement and building foundations of the Project as proposed. Likewise, the mitigation measure would be similarly effective with respect to the Project as proposed and the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario.

VII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

The Project (as proposed or as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario) would have no significant or potentially significant impact on population and housing.

VIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

The Project (as proposed or as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario) would have no significant or potentially significant impact on public services.
IX. UTILITIES AND SERVICES

A. Water Supply

Potential Impact: The Water Supply Assessment required by SB 610 shows Redwood City would not have sufficient water supply to meet the projected future demands of the proposed Project or the Higher Occupancy Scenario. (Significant)

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures, as set forth in the FEIR, are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

- Mitigation Measures UT-1.1 and UT-1.2

Finding: Mitigation Measures UT-1.1 and UT-1.2 are feasible and together could reduce the significant water supply shortage to a less-than-significant effect if the recycled water program contemplated in UT-1.1, and which was approved by this Council on August 11, 2003 is implemented and operational. If the recycled water program tentatively contemplated in UT-1.1 is not implemented by the City and Kaiser does not obtain an alternative water supply from a third-party water supplier, the Project would have a significant and unavoidable impact on water supply. There is no other feasible mitigation measure that would avoid or substantially lessen the impact of the Project on water supply.

The projected average daily water demand for the proposed Project at buildout, calculated based on City standards, is 0.209 mgd (234 AF/Y), per the revised July 3, 2003 study which adjusts and updates the initial estimates shown in the DEIR and WSA, absent mitigation measures. The projected average demand, absent mitigation measures, is about 3 times the current average demand, which is .0665 mgd (74.58 AF/Y). The Project-related increase in water demand, absent mitigation measures, would be approximately 0.143 mgd (159.7 AF/Y).

The projected demand is based on a study of water demand at comparable facilities. The results of the study are summarized in the Addendum to a City of Redwood City Final Environmental Impact Report for the Kaiser Permanente Redwood City Medical Center Master Plan dated June 18, 2003.

Redwood City currently exceeds its allotment for water supply by approximately 927 AF/Y. Because Redwood City already exceeds its allotment for water supply, any increase in water demand would exacerbate the existing shortfall.

In conjunction with the South Bayside System Authority, the City has adopted plans for a recycled water treatment, storage, pumping and distribution system that would be used for landscape irrigation and other
industrial uses. If implemented, this system will provide a means of meeting water demands that would otherwise be met from potable water sources. The system would, at full utilization, deliver up to 1,995 AF/Y, thereby reducing existing and future demands on City’s potable water supply.

Mitigation Measure UT-1.1 requires Kaiser to contribute its fair share to the cost of implementation of the recycled water system and to comply with all applicable current and future City water demand performance standards, including standards in the City of Redwood City Urban Water Management Plan, the City’s recycled water project, and the City’s water conservation program. If the recycled water program is not implemented, Kaiser would be responsible for obtaining water supply from a third-party water supplier, if feasible. Mitigation Measure UT-1.2 requires Kaiser to include methods of water conservation in Medical Center buildings and landscaping.

The Precise Plan incorporates Mitigation Measures UT-1.1 and UT-1.2 by requiring necessary infrastructure to allow the use of recycled water for irrigation and make a financial contribution to the implementation of a recycled water program, if implemented; dual plumbing for recycled water for internal uses, such as toilets, to the extent approved by DHS, if necessary; recycled water project infrastructure for all landscaped areas and for internal uses. These mitigation measures will substantially reduce the Project’s demand for potable water supply. If the adopted recycled water program is fully implemented the water supply demand could be reduced to a less-than-significant level. If not, the demand would be reduced but would remain significant.

**Overriding Considerations:** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project override the significant impact described above, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 3 of the Resolution.

B. Water Distribution and Emergency Storage System

**Potential Impact:** The proposed Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario may adversely affect the water distribution and emergency storage system around the Project site. (Potentially Significant)

**Mitigation:** The following mitigation measures, as set forth in the FEIR, are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

- Mitigation Measures UT-2.1 and UT-2.2

**Finding:** Mitigation Measures UT-2.1 and UT-2.2 are feasible and would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level.
The area surrounding the Project site is served by several old 10-inch and 12-inch water mains. Water distribution lines around the Medical Center may not be adequately sized to handle the increased demand in flow and pressure from the proposed Project. The system around the Kaiser site is complex and its flows would be altered by the new building components and project phasing. While the City believes there is sufficient existing water pressure and supply under normal service conditions, increased demand from expansion of the Medical Center (under either Kaiser's projected employment figures or the Higher Occupancy Scenario), coupled with emergency service conditions, would likely exceed the capabilities of the water distribution and emergency storage system in the project vicinity.

The mitigation measures would reduce the potential impact described above to less than significant levels by using the City's water distribution model and design standards to evaluate the effect of each new building on pipe capacities, water storage tank requirements, and pump station capacity. To avoid any impacts on the City's water distribution and emergency storage system, Kaiser would be responsible for the cost of analysis, design, and construction of all necessary upgrades and new water transmission and distribution systems in accordance with City Engineering Policy Standards and Guidelines to adequately serve the project. In addition, Kaiser would be responsible for the cost of analysis, design, and construction of a new water tank and pump station in accordance with City Engineering Policy Standards and Guidelines to adequately serve the proposed project during emergency service conditions.

The potential impact of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the potential impact of the Project as proposed, because the layout of the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario would be similar to the layout of the Project as proposed. Likewise, the mitigation measure would be similarly effective with respect to the Project as proposed and the Project as contemplated in the Higher Occupancy Scenario.

C. Wastewater Collection System, Transmission System and Treatment Capacity

Potential Impact: The proposed Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario would result in increased wastewater flows from the project site. While there is sufficient capacity at the wastewater treatment plant to accommodate the additional flows from the Master Plan, the number of buildings, their locations, and their sequencing may adversely affect the local wastewater collection system and transmission system. (Potentially Significant)

Mitigation: The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the FEIR, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:
Mitigation Measure UT-3.1

Finding: Mitigation Measure UT-3.1 is feasible and would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level.

The projected average daily water demand for the proposed Project at buildout, calculated based on City standards, is 0.209 mgd (234 AFY), absent mitigation measures. Therefore, based upon Redwood City Engineering Policy Standards and Guidelines, the projected average daily wastewater flow for the proposed Project will be some factor less than the average daily water demand. The treatment plant currently has the permitted treatment capacity to handle the projected demand from the proposed Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario at buildout based on the projected average daily water demand.

The wastewater treatment plant has sufficient existing capacity to accommodate the proposed Project or the Higher Occupancy Scenario at buildout. However, the sewer collection and transmission systems are currently functioning at maximum capacities. In some cases, the pipes are functioning under surcharged conditions. The South Bayside System Authority’s Maple Street Sanitation Pump Station and transmission pipe from Maple Pump Station to the treatment plant are at capacity during wet weather flow conditions. Because sewer collection and transmission systems are currently functioning at maximum capacities, any increase in wastewater flow could exceed capacity.

To reduce the impact of the proposed Project or the Higher Occupancy Scenario on the wastewater collection system to less than significant levels, Mitigation Measure UT-3.1 requires Kaiser to be responsible for the cost of analysis, design, and construction of all necessary upgrades to or replacement of sewer collection and transmission to adequately serve the project. The proposed Precise Plan incorporates Mitigation Measures UT-3.1 by requiring necessary infrastructure or a financial contribution to collect, transmit, and treat wastewater. Wastewater calculations will be derived from the water demand projections. Any necessary infrastructure improvements to sewer collection and transmission systems, treatment and capacity will be evaluated at the time an application is submitted for each PC permit.

D. Cumulative Wastewater and Storm Drain System

Potential Impact: The proposed Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario, in conjunction with other pending and future development, could have potentially significant wastewater and storm drainage impacts. (Potentially Significant)

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures, as set forth in the FEIR, are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:
Mitigation Measures UT-5.1 and UT-5.2

Finding: Mitigation Measures UT-5.1 and UT-5.2 are feasible and would reduce the impacts of the Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario related to increased wastewater flows and storm water runoff to less-than-significant levels.

The City of Redwood City possesses an option to purchase an additional 2.685 mgd from the Stage II expansion of the South Bayside System Authority's water treatment facility to accommodate wastewater flows from Kaiser and other cumulative development. Currently, approximately 2.08 mgd of the 2.685 mgd sewer treatment capacity rights are available for purchase. This additional capacity is sufficient to accommodate the projected wastewater flow from the proposed Project or the Higher Occupancy Scenario. However, under the proposed Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario, development would occur at the Project site over a 20+ year horizon. Depending on the schedule of construction at the Project site, the remaining reserve capacity could be exhausted, and development and purchase of additional wastewater treatment capacity as part of a Stage III expansion would be necessary. In addition, the local sewer collection system and the South Bayside System Authority's sewer transmission facilities would need to be upgraded.

The Storm Drain Sub-basin, in which the Project site is located, is relatively small and serviced by the Maple Street Storm Drain Pump Station and the (K-Mart) Pump Station at Steinberger Creek, as shown in the FEIR. Although the effects of the proposed Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario on storm water volumes is expected to be less than significant, the storm drains may already be at capacity. Cumulative development may therefore adversely affect the piping system and the pump stations at Maple Street and at Steinberger Creek. The contribution of the proposed Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario to this cumulative effect is anticipated to be less than significant; this assumption shall be confirmed as Kaiser requests subsequent approvals for phases of the Project.

Mitigation Measures UT-5.1 and UT-5.2 would reduce the cumulative impact of the proposed Project or the Higher Occupancy Scenario on wastewater treatment and the storm drain system to a less-than-significant level by providing funding for increased wastewater treatment and the storm drain system capacity. If additional wastewater treatment capacity rights are needed at the South Bayside System Authority's wastewater treatment facility due to the increase of flows from any future phases of the proposed Project or the Higher Occupancy Scenario, Kaiser would provide its fair share of funds for South Bayside System Authority's Stage II, or future stages of expansion of rights. If additional storm drain collection capacity or pump station capacity is needed due to the increase of storm water flows from any future phases of the Master Plan, Kaiser would provide its fair share of funds for improvements to the storm drain facilities.
E. Cumulative Water Supply

**Potential Impact:** The proposed Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario, in conjunction with other pending and future development, would create significant cumulative water supply impacts. (Significant)

**Mitigation:** The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the FEIR, will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

- Mitigation Measure UT-1.1

**Finding:** Mitigation Measure UT-1.1 is feasible and would substantially lessen the significant impact of the proposed Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario on cumulative water demand. However, the proposed Project or the Higher Occupancy Scenario would have a significant impact on water supply, absent mitigation measures, because the City has already exceeded its entitlement to Hetch Hetchy water from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. With other future development projects, the potential lack of available water supply would worsen unless the City implements the approved recycling program. Accordingly, cumulative development, including the proposed Project or the Higher Occupancy Scenario, would have significant cumulative water supply impacts.

**Overriding Considerations:** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project override the significant impact described above, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 3 of the Resolution.

F. Sanitary Sewer System-Construction Impacts

**Potential Impact:** If improvement to the sanitary system is necessary under the proposed Project or the Higher Occupancy Scenario, the following construction impacts could result: traffic could be inconvenienced and require detours; air quality standards could be exceeded if bare soil was left exposed and construction vehicles were in operation; and community noise standards may be exceeded during operation of construction vehicles and equipment. (Potentially Significant)

**Mitigation:** The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the Initial Study and the FEIR, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

The project sponsor would be responsible for implementing the following mitigation measures to reduce construction impacts during improvement of the sewer system and replacement of distribution facilities, which were included in the 1989 Proposed Second Amendment to the City of Redwood City Redevelopment Plan for Redevelopment Project #2 Draft EIR to reduce the severity of these impacts (the numbers represent the Mitigation Measure
numbers from the 1989 Proposed Second Amendment to the City of Redwood City Redevelopment Plan for Redevelopment Project #2 Draft EIR).

- All sanitary improvements, relocations, or additions proposed should be designed and constructed to meet all criteria and standards established by the Redwood city Community Development Department.
- Unpaved construction sites should be sprinkled with water at least twice per day.
- Stockpiles of soil, sand, and other such materials should be covered (Air Quality Mitigation Measure 2).
- Trucks hauling debris, soil or other such materials should also be covered.
- Streets surrounding demolition and construction sites should be swept at least once per day.
- Paving and planting should be done as soon as possible.
- Construction equipment engines should not be kept idling when not in use and should receive periodic maintenance. This would reduce emission of air pollutants associated with their use and, consequently, reduce the likelihood of spot violations of the CO standards and odor complaints (Air Quality Mitigation Measure 5).
- Construction activities should be limited to daylight hours and construction equipment should be muffled or controlled to State standards shown in Table 16, page 4G-9 of the 1980 Draft EIR (Noise Mitigation Measure 1).

Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would reduce the impacts of the Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario to less-than-significant levels.

The mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact on air quality by minimizing the amount of exposed soil and dust and by maintaining equipment engines in good condition. The mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact on noise by reducing engine noise and by limiting construction activities to times of day when receptors are less sensitive.

G. Water Main

Potential Impact: If improvement to the water main is necessary under the proposed project, the following construction impacts could result:
Traffic could be inconvenienced and require detours; air quality standards could be exceeded if bare soil was left exposed and construction vehicles were in operation; and community noise standards may be exceeded during operation of construction vehicles and equipment. (Potentially Significant)

**Mitigation:** The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the Initial Study and the FEIR, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

The project sponsor would be responsible for implementing the following mitigation measures to reduce construction impacts during improvement of the water main and replacement of distribution facilities, which were included in the 1989 Proposed Second Amendment to the City of Redwood City Redevelopment Plan for Redevelopment Project #2 Draft EIR to reduce the severity of these impacts (the numbers represent the Mitigation Measure numbers from the 1989 Proposed Second Amendment to the City of Redwood City Redevelopment Plan for Redevelopment Project #2 Draft EIR).

- Water system improvement projects should be designed and constructed to meet all criteria and standards established by the Redwood City Community Development Department, the Redwood City Fire Department, and the California Water Works Standards.

- The City should continue to impose its Water Conservation Ordinance during periods of severe drought to maximize the use of the City's water allocation from the San Francisco Water Department's Hetch Hetchy aqueduct system, and to conserve the City's finite water resources.

- Water services to the Amendment Area should meet the criteria and standards used by the Redwood City Fire Department to determine adequate fire protection in the Amendment Area. The specific project requirements for fire protection shall be determined during the plan check process.

- Air Quality Mitigation Measures 1 to 5 of the 1989 Proposed Second Amendment to the City of Redwood City Redevelopment Plan for Redevelopment Project #2 Draft EIR

- Noise Mitigation Measure 1 of the 1989 Proposed Second Amendment to the City of Redwood City Redevelopment Plan for Redevelopment Project #2 Draft EIR
Finding: The mitigation measure is feasible and would reduce the impacts of the Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario to less-than-significant levels.

The mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact on air quality by minimizing the amount of exposed soil and dust and by maintaining equipment engines in good condition. The mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact on noise by reducing engine noise and by limiting construction activities to times of day when receptors are less sensitive.

H. Drainage Facilities

Potential Impact: If improvement to the drainage system is necessary under the proposed project, the following construction impacts could result: traffic could be inconvenienced and require detours; air quality standards could be exceeded if bare soil was left exposed and construction vehicles were in operation; and community noise standards may be exceeded during operation of construction vehicles and equipment.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the Initial Study and the FEIR, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

The project sponsor would be responsible for the following mitigation measures to reduce the severity of the construction impacts related to drainage improvements to less than significant:

- The storm drainage improvement projects proposed under the Second Amendment to the City of Redwood City Redevelopment Plan for Redevelopment Project #2 should be designed and constructed to meet all criteria and standards established by the Redwood City Community Development Department.

- Air Quality Mitigation Measures 1 to 5 of the 1989 Proposed Second Amendment to the City of Redwood City Redevelopment Plan for Redevelopment Project #2 Draft EIR

- Noise Mitigation Measure 1 of the 1989 Proposed Second Amendment to the City of Redwood City Redevelopment Plan for Redevelopment Project #2 Draft EIR

- No schedule for implementation of new storm water drainage facilities proposed for the Redevelopment Project #2 Area has been adopted. It is expected that those improvements will occur concurrent with development in the
Redevelopment Project #2 Area. Kaiser would be expected to contribute funds in the construction of these proposed improvements.

**Finding:** The mitigation measure is feasible and would reduce the impacts of the Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario to less-than-significant levels.

The mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact on air quality by minimizing the amount of exposed soil and dust and by maintaining equipment engines in good condition. The mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact on noise by reducing engine noise and by limiting construction activities to times of day when receptors are less sensitive biological resources.

I. Construction Impacts- Nesting Birds

**Potential Impact:** Existing trees on the site may provide habitat for nesting birds typically found in urban settings. Proposed project related removal of trees currently existing on the site during nesting season could affect these birds. (Potentially Significant)

**Mitigation:** The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the Initial Study and the FEIR, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

*Protection of Nesting Birds.* To avoid disturbance to birds, their eggs, or their young, the construction contractor shall schedule all tree removal to occur between August 31 and February 1 during the period when birds are not nesting. If this is not feasible, the California Department of Fish and Game would require a pre-construction survey for nesting birds to be conducted no earlier than 45 days and no later than 20 days prior to the removal of any trees or shrubs on the project site. In the event that an active nest is located in trees or shrubs to be removed, clearing and construction within 100 feet (or as determined on a case-by-case basis) shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and a qualified wildlife biologist has determined that juveniles have fledged (typically 3-4 weeks for most small birds) and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting.

**Finding:** The mitigation measure identified above is feasible and would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level.

The mitigation measure identified above would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level by scheduling tree removal during the seasons when birds are not nesting.
X. CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. Archaeological Resources

Potential Impact: There is a potential to discover currently unknown archaeological resources during excavation activities for the proposed project. (Potentially Significant)

Mitigation: The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the Initial Study and the FEIR, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

The project sponsor shall prepare a Cultural Resources Management Plan that will take into account the following:

Monitoring by Qualified Archaeologist. Due to the high potential for the discovery of cultural resources, a qualified archaeologist (hired by the project sponsor) shall be present prior to and during site preparation stages to monitor all excavation activities. If any resources are discovered, the work shall be halted or deferred, as directed by City staff and for such periods as directed by City staff (e.g., disturbances of the soil during the excavation activities).

Donation of Artifacts. Any artifacts found during excavation shall be turned over by the project sponsor immediately to a designated repository to ensure that they will be made available for public display. Identified cultural resources shall be recorded on DPR 422 forms (for archaeological sites) and DPR 523 forms (for historic resources). Similar forms acceptable to the State Office of Historic Preservation can also be used.

Cessation of Excavation Work. The following instructions shall be followed if, during excavation or site preparation, any human remains are discovered:

- The project sponsor shall stop work immediately and contact the San Mateo County Coroner.
- The Coroner has two working days to examine the remains after being notified by the person responsible for the excavation. If the remains are Native American, the Coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission.

Designation of Qualified Observers. Designated observers by staff, taking into consideration the recommendations of the Redwood City Historic Resources Advisory Committee (HRAC), utilizing a member of the HRAC, when possible (as appointed by the HRAC) shall be authorized onsite by the project sponsor (prior to and during excavation activities) to observe, record, and recommend to the site archaeologist and help retrieve (if applicable) any artifacts
identified onsite. The project sponsor shall accordingly prepare a hold harmless agreement.

The project sponsor's excavation contractor shall coordinate and cooperate with the archaeologist and/or observer(s) during excavation. The contractor shall utilize careful grading practices in order to allow the adequate identification of all resource/artifacts by the archaeologist and observer(s). The archaeologist shall then develop a list of recommended mitigation measures to be submitted to staff for consideration.

_Evaluation of Cultural Resource_. The following criteria shall be applied in evaluating a cultural resource:

- that the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and

- that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

- that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

- that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represents significant and distinguishable entry whose components may lack individual distinction; or

- that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information in pre-history or history.

_Security_. The project sponsor shall take the following security measures:

- Fencing with locked gates must go up as soon as possible; fencing sections must be securely fastened together to prevent gaps.

- At least three gate keys are to be provided to the City — two for HRAC staff liaison and one gate key for the Redwood City Police Captain who is in charge of the patrolling officers assigned to this area. This is so they can have after-hours access to the site should it be necessary to go on site to check for trespassers.
• "NO TRESPASSING" signs are to be posted on all sides of the perimeter fencing as soon as it goes up. A sign must be posted adjacent to or on all gates.

**Finding:** The mitigation measure identified above is feasible and would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level.

The mitigation measure identified above would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level by ensuring that the Project site is monitored by qualified personnel to identify, evaluate, and conserve any cultural resources found during excavation activities.

**XI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

**A. Soil Erosion**

**Potential Impact:** Some localized soil erosion could occur during construction of the project. The eroded materials could reach Redwood Creek, which ultimately flows to San Francisco Bay, and thus, could result in storm water pollution. (Potentially Significant)

**Mitigation:** The following mitigation measure, as set forth in the Initial Study and the FEIR, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

*Soil Erosion Control.* The project sponsor shall implement the following BMPs, or similar measures, to reduce the potential soil erosion impacts to a less-than-significant level:

- Train contractors, subcontractors, and construction employees about the possible best management practices. Inform contractors and subcontractors about the new storm water requirements and their responsibilities.

- Schedule excavation and grading activities for dry weather periods as much as possible. Plant temporary vegetation or place other erosion controls before rain begins.

- Place silt fences, hay bales, or other erosion controls around graded areas to minimize off-site sediment transport in storm water.

- Locate and protect storm drains in the vicinity of the site with berms or filters during wet weather periods.
• Control the amount of runoff crossing the site (especially during excavation) by using berms or temporary or permanent drainage ditches to divert water flow around the site. Reduce storm water runoff velocities by constructing temporary check dams or berms where appropriate.

• Keep materials out of the rain -- prevent runoff contamination at the source. Cover exposed piles of soil or construction materials with plastic sheeting or temporary roofs.

• Water or cover exposed soils twice daily to minimize wind erosion.

Finding: The mitigation measure identified above is feasible and would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level.

The mitigation measure identified above would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level by implementing best management practices to reduce potential soil erosion by minimizing the amount of soil exposed to wind and stormwater runoff.

B. Stormwater Quality

Potential Impact: The proposed project would contain typical urban activities (such as landscaping, vehicle parking, and maintenance activities) that could affect the stormwater quality. (Potentially Significant)

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures, as set forth in the Initial Study and the FEIR, are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program:

Implement BMPs and NPDES Measures During Operation. The project sponsor shall implement, but not be limited to, the following BMPs or specific measures in the NPDES permit, whichever is more comprehensive, that would reduce the potential degradation of water quality in San Francisco Bay to a less-than-significant level:

• Install oil and grease separators or fossil fuel filters in the drains to filter out automotive pollutants.

• Cover areas where potential pollutants such as trash, grease, chemicals, paints, and hazardous and biological wastes are stored or collected.

• Seal leaking dumpsters or storage areas immediately.
Transfer hazardous materials and wastes in such a way as to prevent leaks, spills, or accidental releases. Clean up immediately once they occur.

Sweep parking lots and outdoor storage areas. Pick up and dispose of debris, never sweep into drain. Never hose off paved areas.

Maintain landscape properly. Pick up and properly dispose of trimmings and clippings. Do not dispose into storm drain. Avoid over-irrigation and overapplication of herbicides and pesticides.

Recycle or dispose automotive pollutants, solvents, or cleaners, or dispose them as hazardous materials.

Wash vehicles and equipment in designated areas only.

Stencil storm drain inlets to alert employees and Kaiser members that no dumping is allowed.

Prevent accumulated pollutants from washing down storm drains by inspecting monthly or more often as needed, and removing and properly disposing of any debris.

Educate employees and Kaiser members to implement stormwater pollution prevention practices. Post notices of appropriate prevention practices, provide convenient disposal containers, and train employees to implement these pollution prevention practices.

*Implement BMPs and NPDES Measures During Construction.* During the construction period, the project sponsor shall implement, but not be limited to, the following BMPs or specific measures in the NPDES permit, whichever is more comprehensive, that would reduce the potential degradation of water quality in San Francisco Bay to a less-than-significant level:

- BMPs listed under Item VI(b) of this Initial Study (Soil Erosion Control).

- When breaking up paving, be sure to pick up all the pieces and dispose properly.

- Do not mix up more fresh concrete or cement than will be used in a day.

- Recycle large chunks of broken concrete at a landfill.
• Dispose of small amounts of excess dry concrete, grout, and mortar in the trash.

• Set up and operate small mixers on tarps or heavy plastic drop cloths.

• When cleaning up after driveway, or sidewalk construction, wash fines onto dirt areas, not down the driveway or into the street or storm drain.

• Designate one completely contained area for auto parking, vehicle refueling, and routine equipment maintenance. The designated area should be well away from streams or storm drain inlets, and bermed if necessary. Make major repairs off site.

• Clean up leaks, drips and other spills immediately so they do not contaminate soil or groundwater or leave residue on paved surfaces. Use dry cleanup methods whenever possible. If you must use water, use just enough to keep the dust down. Cover and maintain dumpsters. Check frequently for leaks. Place dumpsters under roofs or cover with tarps or plastic sheeting secured around the outside of the dumpster. A plastic liner is recommended to prevent leakage of liquids. Never clean out a dumpster by hosing it down on the construction site.

• Make sure portable toilets are maintained in good working order by the leasing company and that wastes are disposed of properly. Check toilets frequently for leaks.

• Practice source reduction. Minimize waste when you order materials. Order only the amount you need to finish the job.

• Use recyclable materials whenever possible. Arrange for pick-up of recyclable materials such as concrete, asphalt, scrap metal, solvents, degreasers, cleared vegetation, paper, rock, and vehicle maintenance materials such as used oil, antifreeze, batteries, and tires. Materials and debris that cannot be recycled must be taken to an appropriate landfill or disposed of as hazardous waste. Never bury waste materials or leave them in the street or near a creek or streambed.

Finding: The mitigation measure identified above is feasible and would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level.
The mitigation measure identified above would reduce the potentially significant environmental impact described above to a less-than-significant level by implementing best management practices and NPDES practices during construction and operation to minimize the amount of debris and contaminants potentially exposed to stormwater runoff.

XII. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Implementation of the proposed Project or the Higher Occupancy Scenario in conjunction with other City-approved projects would have a significant, unavoidable cumulative impact on transportation and circulation and on construction noise and could have a significant, unavoidable cumulative impact on water supply. These impacts are discussed more fully in Sections III, V, and IX, above.

The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project override the significant cumulative impacts of the proposed Project and the Higher Occupancy Scenario, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 3 of the Resolution.
FINDINGS CONCERNING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

An EIR must describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or the location of the project, which would feasibly obtain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. Even if a project alternative will avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the project, the decision-maker may reject the alternative if it determines that specific considerations make the alternative infeasible. The findings with respect to alternatives identified in the FEIR are described below.

I. NO-PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Description of Alternative: Under the No-Project Alternative, no new development would occur at the project site. None of the campus buildings would be developed. The existing outdated inpatient and outpatient facilities would continue to operate at the Medical Center campus. The consolidation of existing medical offices from elsewhere in Redwood City to the Medical Center would not take place and Kaiser would be unable to provide additional inpatient and outpatient services at the campus. The projected increase in Kaiser members in the Redwood City area would occur with or without the proposed project. However, Kaiser would not be able to meet the increase in demand for services at the existing Medical Center. Per California Senate Bill 1953, the Hospital would need to close by 2013.

Finding: The No-Project Alternative would have the same or less impact on land use, transportation and circulation, air quality, noise, hazardous materials, population and housing, and utility and service systems than the Project. The No-Project Alternative would avoid the less-than-significant impacts of the Project on visual quality, but would be inconsistent with many of the City policies to promote beautification and revitalization of the downtown area. The No-Project Alternative would have a significant adverse impact on public services relative to the Project, because the inpatient facilities at the site would be required by law to close by the year 2013. State law (SB 1953) requires Kaiser to implement seismic safety improvements at the existing inpatient facilities by 2013 or else close the facility. The Project includes seismic safety improvements that would allow the inpatient facilities to remain open after 2013, but the seismic safety improvements would not be implemented under the No-Project Alternative. Therefore, under the No-Project Alternative, the inpatient facilities would be required to close by 2013. Closing the inpatient facilities would eliminate 209 beds, 25 provider offices, and 772 staff, thereby significantly adversely affecting public services in the City.

The No-Project Alternative would fail to satisfy the following objectives of the Project, as identified in the FEIR:
- To provide a new, state-of-the-art inpatient facility for Kaiser Permanente members in the Redwood City area by replacing existing technology and equipment in a practical and cost effective manner.

- To consolidate most of Kaiser Permanente’s Redwood City treatment and support functions at a single Medical Center location.

- To provide facilities to meet changing health care demands and practices.

- To replace the inpatient facility at the Redwood City Hospital in accordance with SB 1953 in order to create a new, seismically safe, inpatient medical facility for Kaiser Permanente members and the Redwood City community.

- To provide the functional and operational relationship and adjacencies paramount for delivery of quality care. These relationships and adjacencies are based on the need for collaboration and coordination of multiple teams of specialists, to provide the quality outcome necessary to patients in critical conditions and save their lives.

- To maintain Kaiser’s Redwood City Hospital at its present regional location, where it serves an important role as a resource for Kaiser Permanente members and to the Redwood City community.

- To provide a campus which is compatible with Redwood City’s objectives and design guidelines for the downtown area.

- To provide a campus environment that is easy to negotiate for both pedestrians and vehicles, by creating open spaces and pedestrian walkways with clearly recognizable destination points, building entrances, landmarks, and street crossings to orient people to Medical Center programs.

- To provide a minimum project footprint of 140,000 square feet.

- To establish a central downtown public gathering space that serves as a focal point for the community;

- To create and define an accessible, safe, attractive and convenient downtown; and
To focus the location and orientation of new Kaiser Campus buildings towards the Downtown District and to strengthen pedestrian connections from the Kaiser campus to the Downtown through thoughtful site planning.

Based on the foregoing, the City finds that, on balance, the Project is preferable to the No-Project Alternative and that the No-Project Alternative is not a feasible alternative to the Project as that term is defined in CEQA.

II. WALNUT STREET CLOSURE ALTERNATIVE

Description of Alternative: The Walnut Street Closure Alternative includes many features similar to the proposed project. The major difference between this alternative and the proposed project is a larger footprint for the replacement Hospital that would span Walnut Street requiring its closure. Under this alternative, the Hospital would be located further west on Veterans Boulevard, and Walnut Street would be closed between Veterans Boulevard and Bradford Street. The replacement Hospital would be constructed adjacent to Parking Structure B resulting in an uninterrupted building length of approximately 570 feet (approximately the length of two full city blocks). The height of the replacement Hospital would be reduced from ten stories under the proposed project to six stories under this alternative. With the exception of the enlarged configuration (massing and bulk) of the replacement Hospital, the phasing, siting, and overall square footage of proposed buildings and parking structures are similar to the proposed project.

Finding: The Walnut Street Closure Alternative would meet most of the objectives for the Project, but would have a more adverse impact on land use, visual quality, and transportation and circulation than the Project.

The Walnut Street Closure Alternative would conflict with the Redevelopment Plan for Redevelopment Project #2 policies relevant to improving circulation within the redevelopment area and linking circulation. In addition, closure of Walnut Street would partially divide businesses and communities on the northeast side of Veterans Boulevard from the City's downtown area.

The Walnut Street Closure Alternative would reduce the height of the hospital to six stories, compared to ten stories under the Project, but the siting, massing, bulk, and overall length of the hospital and the adjacent parking structure would significantly increase. As seen from Veterans Boulevard, the Walnut Street Closure Alternative eliminates the distant view of the western hills, reduces the sky plane, and introduces a large-scale structure than its particularly visually dominant because of the lengthy facade.

The closure of Walnut Street would alter existing and future traffic patterns in the area. Under cumulative conditions, the Walnut Street Closure
Alternative would have a more adverse impact on the intersection of Maple Street and Marshall Street than the Project. Under cumulative conditions with the Walnut Street Closure Alternative, the intersection would operate at unacceptable levels during the PM peak hour.

In addition, the City is unlikely to be able to make the findings necessary to authorize the closure of Walnut Street, because Walnut Street is part of the City's downtown street system, and closure of a portion of the downtown street system for the benefit of a private party to the detriment of the larger public good is generally not warranted.

The impact of the Walnut Street Closure Alternative on air quality, noise, hazardous materials, population and housing, public services, and utilities and service systems would be the same as the impact of the Project.

Based on the foregoing, the City finds that, on balance, the Project is preferable to the Walnut Street Closure Alternative and that the Walnut Street Closure Alternative is not a feasible alternative to the Project as that term is defined in CEQA.

III. REDWOOD CITY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Description of Alternative: The general layout of the Medical Center campus under the Redwood City Preferred Alternative is similar to that of the proposed project. The replacement Hospital and MOBs would contain the same amount of floor space under this alternative as under the proposed project. The Redwood City Preferred Alternative would not have exact footprint or building width requirements for any buildings at the campus. However, parking structures would not be constructed taller than the adjacent MOB or Hospital and could require partial undergrounding. Active building space would occupy prominent corner parcels and parking structures would be located mid-block behind active building space.

Major differences between this alternative and the proposed project include the size of the campus plaza area, the location of Parking Structure B, and the use of the site currently proposed for Parking Structure B. Under this alternative, Parking Structure B would be located to the west of the replacement Hospital where the proposed project would include an expanded plaza area along Veterans Boulevard. This plaza is also an area for potential future expansion of the replacement Hospital with the proposed project. The Redwood City Preferred Alternative proposes a mixed-use building at the Main Street gateway site.

Finding: The Redwood City Preferred Alternative was developed to promote the objective of siting and designing campus buildings to more closely adhere to the goals of the draft Downtown Area Plan. In particular, the Redwood City Preferred Alternative proposes a mixed-use building at the Main Street
gateway site. The mixed-use building would be designed to create a sense of entry into the downtown and would complement similar retail/office-type buildings located along downtown Main Street.

The objectives of the Redwood City Preferred Alternative have been incorporated into the Project through the Precise Plan in a manner which meets the goals of both the City and the project sponsor. As now reflected in the Precise Plan, the Project meets the objectives of the Redwood City Preferred Alternative by emphasizing the importance of Main Street as a primary pedestrian corridor and secondary gateway to the downtown core.

The Redwood City Preferred Alternative would have the same impacts on air quality, noise, hazardous materials, population and housing, public services, and utilities and service systems as the Project. In addition, the Redwood City Preferred Alternative would have the same less-than-significant impacts on land uses as the Project. The Redwood City Preferred Alternative would have the same trip generation characteristics as the Project, but the location and accessibility of site driveways would be different, which could change vehicle circulation in the immediate vicinity of the Project site.

IV. MARSHALL STREET HOSPITAL ALTERNATIVE

Description of Alternative: The Marshall Street Hospital Alternative represents a site plan developed jointly by Kaiser and the City of Redwood City early in the planning phase for the proposed Medical Center. The major difference between Marshall Street Hospital Alternative and the Project is the location of the replacement hospital. Rather than constructing the replacement Hospital on Veterans Boulevard as under the proposed project, the hospital would be constructed on the northwest corner of Marshall Street and Maple Street. The replacement hospital would be seven stories, rather than ten under the proposed project.

The Marshall Street Hospital Alternative also includes a medical office building at the southeast corner of Veterans Boulevard and Walnut Street. The medical office buildings to be located along Veterans Boulevard would be five stories tall, similar to those in the Project. However, the medical office building to be located at the northeast corner of Marshall Street and Maple Street would be five stories tall, rather than the four-story medical office building included in the Project. The Marshall Street Hospital Alternative also places the plaza area within the center of the campus.

Under this alternative, a portion of the existing surface parking lot located at the northwest corner of Main Street and Bradford Street would remain. Parking structure C would contain nine parking levels as opposed to six levels for Parking Structure D under the proposed project. Parking Structure B would contain six levels as opposed to five under the proposed project. However, this
option would contain only three parking structures rather than the five parking structures under the proposed project.

Phasing for the Marshall Street Hospital Alternative differs slightly from the proposed project. Rather than construct the replacement Hospital in Phase 2, MOB 2 and Parking Structure B would be constructed in Phase 2. The replacement Hospital would be constructed during Phase 3.

Finding: The Marshall Street Hospital Alternative would have the same impacts on air quality, noise, hazardous materials, population and housing, public services, and utilities and service systems as the Project. In addition, the Marshall Street Hospital Alternative would have the same less-than-significant impacts on land uses as the Project. The Marshall Street Hospital Alternative would have the same trip generation characteristics as the Project, but the location and accessibility of site driveways would be different, which could change vehicle circulation in the immediate vicinity of the Project site. The Marshall Street Hospital Alternative would slightly reduce the visual quality impacts related to mass and scale in comparison to the Project.

The Marshall Street Hospital Alternative would conflict with certain policies of the Downtown Area Plan. For example, the Marshall Street Hospital Alternative would include a surface parking lot at the Main Street/Bradford Street gateway parcel and a surface parking lot behind an administrative clinic at the Main Street/Veterans Boulevard Gateway parcel. These parking lots would be inconsistent with the objective of developing the gateway parcels to define and enhance the City's downtown and to establish Main Street as a primary pedestrian corridor.

The Marshall Street Hospital Alternative would also conflict with the project objectives of providing facilities to meet changing health care demands by limiting Kaiser's flexibility with regard to the design and layout of subsequent phases of development at the Project Site.

Based on the foregoing, the City finds that, on balance, the Project is preferable to the Marshall Street Hospital Alternative and that the Marshall Street Hospital Alternative is not a feasible alternative to the Project as that term is defined in CEQA.

V. ALTERNATIVE LOCATION

Full or partial relocation of the hospital and the medical office buildings would be cost-prohibitive and inconsistent with the project objectives. Relocation would be cost-prohibitive because it would require the acquisition of a new site. In addition, it would be difficult to find another site within Redwood City that would allow a campus-style layout and that would meet the project objectives of establishing a central downtown public gathering space that serves
as a focal point for the community and creating and defining an accessible, safe, attractive and convenient downtown.

Selection of an alternative site outside of Redwood City would conflict with the project objectives of providing a resource for Kaiser Permanente members in the Redwood City community, providing a campus which is compatible with Redwood City’s objectives and design guidelines for the downtown area, establishing a central downtown public gathering space that serves as a focal point for the community, and creating and defining an accessible, safe, attractive and convenient downtown. Partial relocation to an alternative site would also conflict with the project objectives of consolidating most of Kaiser Permanente’s Redwood City treatment and support functions at a single Medical Center location, providing the functional and operational relationship and adjacencies paramount for delivery of quality care, and providing a campus environment that is easy to navigate for both pedestrians and vehicles, by creating open spaces and pedestrian walkways with clearly recognizable destination points, building entrances, landmarks, and street crossings to orient people to Medical Center programs.

Based on the foregoing, the City finds that, on balance, the use of an alternative site is not a feasible alternative to the Project as approved.