

5 RESPONSES TO VERBAL COMMENTS

The City of Oakland Planning Commission held a public hearing on January 5, 2005, to provide the public an opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR. No members of the public made comments at the hearing. The following comments, presented in summary form, were received from members of the Planning Commission.

Comment

COMMISSIONER LEE stated that she likes the project and feels the architect has done a good job.

Response

This is a comment on merits and features of the proposed project, not on the adequacy of the Draft EIR. No response is required.

Comment

COMMISSIONER LIGHTY stated that it is a good idea to ensure that the EIR answers all questions, since the lack of an answer can create the perception of a problem. He cited the need for the project applicant to work with City engineers to determine that the project would not cause any hydrological impacts downstream and quantify the amount of storm water runoff from the proposed project.

Response

As described on pages 143 through 145 and 212 through 213 of the Draft EIR, and in response to Comment C-4, above, the final storm water calculations will be made based on final grading and drainage plans that have not yet been completed. However, when these plans are finalized, they will be reviewed by the City of Oakland Public Works Agency to ensure that the project would not have significant impacts on downstream storm water infrastructure.

Comment

COMMISSIONER LIGHTY requested clarification regarding the reduction of internal noise in the proposed units generated by traffic on Interstate 580.

Response

As described in Mitigation Measure NOISE-4 on page 175, the project would be required to comply with both the State Building Code and the City's Noise Element to ensure that interior noise in the proposed units is reduced below 60 dBA. This will require the use of sound-rated building construction. The specific treatments will be developed as part of the final construction drawings for the project, but are likely to include sound rated windows and doors in all rooms along the perimeter of the site.

Details such as the thickness of the panes of the windows, type of window sash and window perimeter, and thickness and material of doorways have not yet been finalized. However, these details must be shown in the final drawings of the project. In addition, the applicant must submit an acoustical study as part of the final plan check before a building permit is issued. Both the drawings and the acoustical study must confirm that interior noise levels will be below acceptable limits.

Comment

COMMISSIONER LIGHTY commented that the environmental review of the project should address cumulative impacts and ensure that they are mitigated to the extent that the project contributes.

Response

The cumulative impacts of the proposed project in conjunction with other possible development in the surrounding area are discussed on pages 229 through 231 of the Draft EIR. This discussion concludes that cumulative traffic impacts would be significant, but that these impacts would be mitigated by Mitigation Measure TRAF-1. Potential impacts to biological, geological, noise and utilities would not be significant enough to contribute to a cumulative impact over a larger area, and would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels by the relevant mitigation measures included in this EIR. Potential air quality and hydrology impacts from the proposed project may have the potential to contribute to a cumulative impact, but these impacts

have already been analyzed in the General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element EIR, which included an assumption of development on the project site at a density higher than that of the proposed project. Commissioner Lighty's comment did not indicate that the Siena Hill Draft EIR or the General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element EIR contain inadequate analysis of cumulative impacts. No further response is needed.

Comment

COMMISSIONER JANG pointed out that the cumulative impact analysis in the Traffic section of the Draft EIR considered impacts from development of the former Oak Knoll Naval Hospital site, even though there is currently no specific proposal for that site. In light of the uncertainties about the extent and timing of future development in the area, he asked when the proposed project would participate in traffic mitigation measures (such as Mitigation Measure TRAF-1.

Response

The proposed project's participation in Mitigation Measure TRAF-1 will be in the form of payment of a proportional share of the improvement costs of the Mountain Boulevard/Keller Avenue intersection, according to the Leona Quarry Traffic Improvement Program and Traffic Improvement Fee (TIP/TIF). The TIP/TIF has already been approved as part of the Leona Quarry project and the improvements will be implemented within the next five to ten years as the Leona Quarry project is built. The developers of the Leona Quarry project have agreed to complete the payments for these improvements prior to the occupancy of the last unit at Leona Quarry. The proposed project's share of the cost of improvements will be based on the number of trips generated by the Siena Hill project, as a ratio of the total number of trips generated by both Siena Hill and Leona Quarry. The applicant for the Siena Hill project will be required to pay the project's proportional share when the City issues a certificate of occupancy for each phase of the project.

SIENA HILL
FINAL EIR
RESPONSES TO VERBAL COMMENTS