

---

## AGENDA

---

**CITY OF SAN PABLO  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA  
Tuesday, January 5, 2016**

**City Hall Council Chambers  
6:00 P.M.  
13831 San Pablo Avenue  
ONE ALVARADO SQUARE  
SAN PABLO, CA 94806**

Planning Commissioners  
Rita Xavier, Chairperson  
Yuhong Shi, Vice Chair  
Cheremay Sutton  
Yuhong Shi  
David Alvarado

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

3. **ROLL CALL**

4. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The public is welcome at this time to address the Planning Commission on any non-agenda item. Comments are limited to three minutes per speaker. Any public comments made at this time regarding an item pending before the Commission do not go into the public record of that item. Comments on Public hearing items will be heard by the Planning Commission when that item is opened to the public.

5. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN PABLO RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPTION OF A EIR ADDENDUM AND APPROVAL OF A GENERAL PLAN AND SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS INCLUDING REDESIGNATION TO COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE FOR AN EXISTING 12.5 ACRE PARCEL LOCATED AT 2000 VALE ROAD (FORMER DOCTORS MEDICAL CENTER) (ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER 417-190-019).

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 16-01 and Exhibit 1 to adopt the EIR Addendum, approve the general plan and specific plan amendments for PLAN1512-0007 subject to the findings.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

## **NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC**

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, PERSONS REQUIRING ASSISTANCE OR AUXILIARY AIDS IN ORDER TO PARTICIPATE SHOULD CONTACT THE PLANNING DIVISION AT ONE ALVARADO SQUARE, SAN PABLO AS SOON AS POSSIBLE PRIOR TO THE MEETING. THE CITY WILL GIVE SUCH REQUIREMENTS PRIMARY CONSIDERATION, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT UNDUE FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE BURDENS OR FUNDAMENTAL ALTERATIONS IN THE CITY SERVICE, PROGRAM OR ACTIVITY.

SPEAKERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON A SPECIFIC AGENDA ITEM SHOULD FILE A FORM WITH THE RECORDING SECRETARY INDICATING THE AGENDA ITEM. THE PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIRPERSON WILL INVITE YOU TO SPEAK AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME WHEN THE MATTER IS BEING CONSIDERED. IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK ON A NON-AGENDA ITEM WITHIN THE SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION, YOU MAY SPEAK UNDER AGENDA NO. 5, "PUBLIC COMMENT". PLEASE FILE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS WITH THE RECORDING SECRETARY ON FORMS PROVIDED.

COPIES OF THIS AGENDA AND NON-EXEMPT RECORDS RELATING TO AN OPEN SESSION ITEM ON THIS AGENDA WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW AT THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE, 13831 SAN PABLO AVENUE, BUILDING 1, AT THE SAME TIME THEY ARE DISTRIBUTED OR MADE AVAILABLE TO THE COMMISSION.

## **FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION**

Following **ROLL CALL** and the **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** the Planning Commission Chair will open the meeting to the Public Hearing. The Public Hearing enables persons requesting a special permit or allowance that is not routinely allowed by the Zoning Ordinance or not covered by the Municipal Code. The Planning Chair initiates the **PUBLIC HEARING** process by **REQUESTING A STAFF REPORT**; City Staff will give a description, location and explanation of the request. Following an evaluation and analysis of the request, City Staff will make a recommendation of disapproval or approval with or without conditions. Once Staff has made its recommendation, the Chair will ask Commissioners if they have any questions for staff. Then the Chair will open the hearing in the following manner: (Note: Throughout the Hearing the Planning Commissioners may ask questions of those persons participating in the Public Hearing.)

1. The applicant will be invited to further elaborate upon his/her request, make comments, clarifications and/or modifications to the Staff Report.\*
2. Persons either for or against the special request will be invited to elaborate and argue points made and reasons why or why not this request should be allowed.\*
3. Applicant and persons for the request are given the opportunity for rebuttal.\*
4. Persons opposed to the request are given the opportunity for rebuttal.\*
5. The Public Hearing will be closed by the Chair.
6. The Planning Commissioners will review and consider all those options, findings, and new perspectives expressed by each side. Following a thorough study of all Staff information, public comment and site location, the Planning Commission will vote to approve, deny, approve subject to conditions, or based on unknown existing or potential conditions, find that the applicant needs further review and continue it to a later hearing.

**\*Persons addressing the Planning Commission are required to limit their remarks to five (5) minutes, unless an extension of time is granted by the Chair subject to approval by the Planning Commission members.**

**Appeal Period and Final Permit:** Both the applicant and the public may appeal the Planning Commission decision to the City Council. Appeals must be filed in writing to the City Clerk within five (5) days following the Planning Commission action.

**Note:** Any questions related to the Planning Commission hearing, Zoning, or related planning activities can be directed to the San Pablo City Planning Division at (510) 215-3031.

**Planning Commission Staff Report**

**PREPARED BY:** Michele Rodriguez, Development Services Manager

**DATE:** December 22, 2015

**SUBJECT:** Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of San Pablo recommending to the City Council adoption of the EIR Addendum and approval of a General Plan and San Pablo Specific Plan amendments including redesignation to commercial mixed use for an existing 12.5 acre parcel located at 2000 Vale Road (APN 417-190-019-6) (former Doctor’s Medical Center).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Adopt Resolution 16-01, which includes Exhibit 1 (together as Exhibit A to the staff report) recommending that the City Council approve an EIR Addendum (Exhibit B) and General Plan and San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Amendments for PLAN1512-0007, subject to findings.

**BACKGROUND**

<b>Owner</b>	West Contra Costa Healthcare District
<b>Applicant:</b>	City of San Pablo
<b>Location:</b>	2000 Vale Road
<b>Parcel Numbers:</b>	APN 417-190-019-6
<b>General Plan:</b>	Public / Institutional
<b>Specific Plan:</b>	Public/ Institutional

**Surrounding Zoning and Land Uses:**

North: Public Institutional / Medical Office  
South Entertainment Overlay/ Casino  
East: C-1 (Casino)  
West: One-Family Residential - City of Richmond

The full operation of the Doctors Medical Center (“DMC”) ceased on April 21, 2015 (Exhibit C) despite significant efforts by the City to provide operating funds to the West Contra Costa Health Care District through land purchases. The property is currently for sale and the West Contra Costa Healthcare District Board is entertaining purchase options. The City of San Pablo is proposing to amend the General Plan and the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan (“Specific Plan”) to change the land use designation for the approximately 12.5-acre parcel on which the DMC is located. The purpose of this action is to exercise the City’s land use authority to determine the best land use for this property. The modification of the land use designations and the CEQA analysis can help to facilitate future occupation of the existing building or the re-use of the site.

**ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION**

The project description for the purposes of environmental analysis includes 10.0 acres of the site to be redeveloped with commercial mixed uses. The 2.5-acre balance of the site is developed as a parking lot. This 2.5-acre portion has been leased by the City to the adjacent San Pablo Lytton Casino for use as additional parking. Therefore, it is not considered to be available for redevelopment as part of the City’s current proposed actions. Hence, while the General Plan and Specific Plan amendments to change the land use designation apply to the entire 12.5 acre site, the potential environmental impacts of the City’s proposed actions are related to proposed redevelopment of the remaining 10.0 acre portion of the site.

An Addendum to the 2011 San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR (EIR) has been prepared pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines section 15164 to meet the City’s obligation to comply with the CEQA prior to considering the proposed General Plan and Specific Plan amendments. The proposed project effects would be no greater than the baseline DMC effects as assumed in the environmental setting; substantial changes have not occurred to the environmental and regulatory conditions assumed in Specific Plan EIR at the time it was certified in 2011; no new significant impacts or more severe impacts than identified in the specific plan EIR. Therefore preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration is not necessary. The San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR is identified as State Clearinghouse #201011206. The City has also posted the EIR Addendum (Exhibit B) on its website <http://www.sanpablocal.gov/DoctorsMedicalCenter> and copies are available for viewing at the Development Services Department and San Pablo Public Library.

**PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE**

Notices were mailed to owners of property owners within a 300-foot radius of the site. The notices were mailed on Tuesday, December 22, 2015. In addition, a Public Hearing Notice was delivered to the West County Times newspaper on Wednesday, December 16, 2015, to be published on Saturday, December 26, 2015. The Public Hearing Notice was also distributed to the Association of Bay Area Governments, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, adjoining municipalities, public utilities (e.g., water, waste, energy), and California Native American tribes. Government Code 65452.3 requires local governments to consult with California Native American tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the purpose of protecting, and/or mitigating impacts to cultural places (Exhibit C). A letter was sent to required tribes on August 18, 2015 notifying them of their opportunity to consult. As of the date of this staff report no tribe has requested consultation (Exhibit D).

**GENERAL PLAN AND SPECIFIC PLAN MODIFICATION**

The current General Plan and Specific Plan designation for the site are Public/Institutional. This designation is consistent with uses such as hospitals, post offices, fire stations, and schools. The proposed Commercial Mixed-Use designation is similar to designations in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The commercial mixed-use designation includes office, retail, institutional, and hotel uses with a typical height of two to three stories, with a maximum allowable height of 40 feet (Exhibit F).The specific modifications to the text and map are detailed in Exhibit A. No zoning is proposed because the San Pablo Specific Plan Land Use Diagram, Classifications and Standards

apply, no separate zoning designation applies.

The City has continued to support health care for the San Pablo community by purchasing the property to allow Lifelong Brookside to continue to operate and provide urgent health care services to the community; by funding anti-childhood obesity efforts; and by working with the Contra Costa Fire Department to enhance and subsidize emergency services through County Fire Station #70 for basic and advanced life support services in the absence of a critical care emergency department.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 16-01 to adopt the EIR Addendum and approve the General Plan and Specific Plan amendments for PLAN 1512-0007 subject to the findings.

If the Planning Commission desires to recommend approval of this project to the City Council, it should:

1. Open the Public Hearing and take testimony;
2. Approve Resolution 16-01 and Exhibit A to :
  - a. Adopt the EIR Addendum.
  - b. Approve the General Plan and Specific Plan Amendment.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Exhibit A: Resolution 16-01 and Exhibit 1 for adoption of an EIR Addendum and approval of a General Plan and Specific Plan Amendments.

Exhibit B: EIR Addendum by EMC Planning Group dated December 21, 2015.

Exhibit C: Media Advisory Contra Costa County Health Services dated April 20, 2015.

Exhibit D: Native American Heritage Commission letter dated July 23, 2014 (2 pages).

Exhibit E: Letter to Native tribes notifying of opportunity to consult.

Exhibit F: Commercial Mixed-Use, page 2-12, San Pablo Specific P178 an.

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN PABLO RECOMMENDING ADOPTION OF AN ADDENDUM TO THE SAN PABLO SPECIFIC PLAN EIR AND APPROVAL OF GENERAL PLAN AND SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS INCLUDING REDESIGNATION TO COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE FOR AN EXISTING 12.5 ACRE PARCEL LOCATED AT 2000 VALE ROAD (FORMER DOCTORS MEDICAL CENTER) (ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER 417-190-019-6).

**WHEREAS**, in 2014, staff received a Kennedy Wilson Brokerage Group flyer “Hospital for SALE \$30,000,000” regarding the Doctors Medical Center located at 2000 Vale Road, San Pablo, California; and,

**WHEREAS**, on April 21, 2015, the West Contra Costa Health Care District (“District”) ceased operations of the Doctors Medical Center despite the City’s efforts to assist the District with its financial challenges including purchasing District property adjoining the DMC site that allows the continuation of urgent health care services to the San Pablo community; and

**WHEREAS**, with the closure of DMC, it is appropriate for the City to consider what the best uses are for the site, particularly given the commercial development surrounding it and the City’s long-standing efforts to plan for the San Pablo Avenue Corridor which is the key gateway into the City including the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan adopted in 2011 (“Specific Plan”), pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR (“Specific Plan EIR”); and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council adopted Resolution 2015-185 appropriating General Fund Designated Reserves / Economic Development to fund land use and legal consulting agreements to complete the CEQA review for any proposed land use policy changes, PLAN1512-0007, on November 2, 2015; and,

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to Government Code 65352.3 the City of San Pablo requested to consult with California Native American tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission and the City received no requests for consultation; and,

**WHEREAS**, staff proposes that the General Plan and Specific Plan be amended including redesignating the former DMC property as Commercial Mixed-use; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Guidelines section 15164, the effects of the proposed General Plan and Specific Plan amendments would be no greater than the baseline DMC effects as assumed in the environmental setting for the 2011 Specific Plan EIR; substantial changes have not occurred to the environmental and regulatory conditions assumed; no new significant impacts or more several impacts than identified in the Specific Plan EIR were identified. Therefore it was determined that preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration is not necessary; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission has reviewed the EIR Addendum, and intends to take action on the project in compliance with CEQA and state and local guidelines implementing CEQA (attached as Exhibit B of the accompanying Planning Commission Staff Report); and,

**WHEREAS**, the project will result in land use consistency between the General Plan and the San Pablo Specific Plan; and,

**WHEREAS**, the San Pablo Specific Plan Guiding Principles include Walkability and High-Intensity Mix of Uses, where vertical mixes of uses is encouraged or required in an effort to create self-supporting districts. The vision of San Pablo Avenue is a regional thoroughfare to become a vibrant, accessible, and sustainable mixed-use corridor

**WHEREAS**, this action is consistent with General Plan Policy ED-I-26: Undertake strategic initiatives to attract new retail and commercial development; and,

**WHEREAS**, this action is consistent with General Plan land use framework intended for high density mixed use development allowing office, retail, commercial, and residential uses.

**WHEREAS**, requiring consistency with the adjoining casino class I and II use is necessary to ensure compatibility between said uses; and

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing notice has been posted at City Hall has been given by mail to the applicant, local affected agencies and to all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property, the California Native American Tribes on December 21, 2015; and was published in the West County Times on December 26, 2015, in accordance with the requirements of Government Code Section 65091;

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Planning Commission of the City of San Pablo recommends adoption of the Addendum to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR and makes the following findings:

1. The Planning Commission has considered the EIR Addendum together with the Specific Plan EIR. The EIR Addendum reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Commission and the City, as lead agency for the project, has been completed in compliance with CEQA and state and local guidelines implementing CEQA, and is adequate for this proposal.
2. On the basis of the whole record, including the EIR Addendum, the Planning Commission finds on the basis of the whole record, there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment greater than the baseline DMC effects as assumed in the environmental setting for the 2011 Specific Plan EIR; substantial changes have not occurred to the environmental and regulatory conditions assumed; no new significant impacts or more several impacts than identified in the Specific Plan EIR were identified; and therefore preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration is not necessary; and,
3. The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Development Services Manager of the City of San Pablo, located at 13831 San Pablo Avenue, San Pablo, CA, 94806;

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Planning Commission of the City of San Pablo finds that the amendments to the General Plan, and Specific Plan are appropriate and desirable to further the public welfare because the The West Contra Costa County Healthcare District has ceased hospital operations and placed the property up for sale, and if sold, the land use designations will provide better guidance to future property owners as to the types of commercial development the City believes would best implement the City's goals and policies for the area as set forth in the General Plan and San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Planning Commission of the City of San Pablo hereby recommends adoption of the Addendum to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR and approval the General Plan and Specific Plan Amendments regarding the 12.5-acre parcel at 2000 Vale Road formerly known as the Doctors Medical Center, attached hereto as Exhibit 1, including the redesignation of the property to Commercial Mixed-use for PLAN1512-0007, based upon the accompanying Staff Report and its exhibits, which are hereby incorporated by reference.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the foregoing recitations are true and correct, and are included herein by reference.

\*\*\*\*\*

Adopted this 5<sup>th</sup> day of January 2016, by the following vote to wit:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS:  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS:  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS:  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS:

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

---

Michele Rodriguez  
Secretary

---

Rita Xavier  
Chairperson

**RESOLUTION 16-01 EXHIBIT "1" FOR PLAN 1512-0007**

**Text Amendments**

**GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS**

**General Plan Page 2-12 (Economic Development Element) Hotels and Gaming:** revise the sentence as follows:

“...The City could build on the casino’s presence by considering future uses complementary to or supportive of the existing Class II gaming operations, and by adding more family-friendly uses, which would draw in a greater variety of visitors and augment the City’s image as an entertainment destination.”

**General Plan Page 3-10 (Land Use & Physical Design Element):** revise the paragraph as follows:

*“Commercial Mixed Use.* This is a mixed-use designation that includes office, retail, commercial and public uses. Typical height is expected to be two to three stories. The maximum permitted FAR is 1.5. The residential buildout is assumed at 20 units per gross acre and the non-residential buildout is assumed at a FAR of 0.50, except for 2000 Vale Road (APN 417-190-019, the Doctors Medical Center site), where a FAR of less than 0.50 is permitted. Residential uses are allowed only when the commercial FAR is 0.50 or greater. No on-site parking to support any future off-site Class III Indian gaming is allowed in absence of amendment to City-Tribe Municipal Services Agreement.”

**General Plan Page 3-1 (Land Use & Physical Design Element)**

Modify Land Use Diagram to change site to Commercial Mixed Use. Add asterisk within boundary of the site.

Add footnote to Land Use Diagram which reads:

“\*Development capacity for the Doctors Medical Center site is limited to a maximum capacity such as the equivalent of: a 100-room hotel with restaurant, 50,000 square feet of retail, and 50,000 square feet of office uses per the City’s approval of General Plan Amendment # Plan 1512-0007 for this site. Other uses of equal or lesser development capacities may be allowed as set forth for the Commercial Mixed Use designation. Increased development capacity is possible with further evaluation and CEQA review.”

**General Plan Page 3-16 (Land Use & Physical Design Element)**

Modify table 3.2-2 to add 12.5 acres of Commercial Mixed Use and remove 12.5 acres of Public Institutional acreage. Modify land use designation percentages accordingly.

**General Plan Page 3-22 (Land Use & Physical Design Element):** revise the paragraph as follows:

“In the General Plan, mixed uses are planned along San Pablo Avenue and 23rd Street to capitalize on accessibility to public transportation. A Commercial Mixed Use area is also designated at the

Doctors Medical Center site. The allowable use and typical density depend on the type of mixed uses and may vary greatly depending on location and the characteristics of the area. General Plan goals for mixed use areas support complementary uses, mitigate potential conflict, and promote pedestrian-oriented amenities.”

**General Plan Page 3-23 (Land Use & Physical Design Element):** revise the section as follows:

“LU-I-23 Require that a minimum of non-residential uses be developed in conjunction with any proposed residential development on Commercial Mixed Use sites.

*The minimum FAR for non-residential development needed on these sites is 0.5. The exception is the Doctors Medical Center site where a minimum FAR of less than 0.5 is permitted.”*

**General Plan Page 3-27 (Land Use & Physical Design Element):** revise the section as follows:

“LU-I-37 Allow commercial or employment generating uses to replace medical offices on sites previously zoned public/institutional, including the Doctors Medical Center on Vale Road and medical offices opposite the Doctors Medical Center on Vale Road, if existing medical offices relocate in the future. With regard to the nearby San Pablo Lytton Casino, use of the Doctors Medical Center site shall be limited to uses complementary to, or supportive of, Class I and/or Class II gaming only. Uses complementing or supporting any future off-site Class III gaming are not allowed in absence of an amendment to City-Tribe Municipal Services Agreement.”

## **SAN PABLO AVENUE SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS**

### **Specific Plan Page 2-7 (Land Use)**

Modify Table 2-1 to remove 12.5 acres from Public Institutional and add to Commercial Mixed Use (Other sites) and modify land use designation percentages.

### **Specific Plan Page 2-8 (Land Use)**

Modify Figure 2-4 to change Doctors Medical Center site land use to Commercial Mixed Use. Add asterisk (\*) within boundary of the site.

Add footnote to the Land Use Diagram which reads:

“\*Development capacity for the Doctors Medical Center site is limited to a maximum capacity such as the equivalent of: a 100-room hotel with restaurant, 50,000 square feet of retail, and 50,000 square feet of office uses per the City’s approval of General Plan Amendment # Plan 1512-0007 for this site. Other uses of equal or lesser development capacities may be allowed as set forth for the Commercial Mixed Use designation. Increased development capacity is possible with further evaluation and CEQA review.”

**Specific Plan Page 2-9 (Land Use)**

Modify pic chart to reflect Table 2-1 changes.

**Specific Plan Page 2-12 (Land Use):** revise the paragraph as follows:

*Commercial Mixed Use.* This is a mixed-use designation that includes office, retail, commercial, residential, and public uses. Active uses are required for frontage along San Pablo Avenue, and residential uses are allowed only when the commercial FAR is 0.5 or greater. This designation applies primarily to the gateway area at the southern end of the corridor, the Doctors Medical Center site, and near the intersection with Church Lane in the central portion of the corridor. With regard to the nearby existing San Pablo Lytton Casino, use of the Doctors Medical Center site shall be limited to uses complementary to, or supportive of, Class I and/or Class II gaming only, and/or ancillary uses that support these classes of gaming, including uses designated as Recreation-Amusement and/or ancillary uses that support these gaming classes. Uses complementing or supporting any future off-site Class III gaming are not allowed in absence of amendment to City-Tribe Municipal Services Agreement to protect the City’s interests. Typical height is expected to be two to three stories, with a maximum allowable height of 40 feet. The maximum FAR is 1.5 and the maximum density is 50 units per gross acre.”

**Specific Plan Page 2-16 (Land Use):** revise Table 2-2 as follows and add footnote 8:

<b>Permitted Uses</b>	<b>Residential (Medium/High)</b>	<b>Residential Mixed Use</b>	<b>Mixes Use Center</b>	<b>Commercial Mixed Use</b>	<b>Commercial (Neigh/Regional)</b>
<b>Recreation</b>	<i>See Sub-classifications below</i>				
<b>Amusements</b>	-	-	-	U-(8)	U-(8)

“8. Use Permit required, including for on-site parking to support off-site Class I and/or Class II Indian gaming. No on-site parking to support off-site Class III Indian gaming is allowed in absence of an amendment to the City-Tribe Municipal Services Agreement.”

**Specific Plan Page 2-20 (Land Use)**

Modify Table 2-5 to add footnote (\*) to the Commercial Mixed Use designation:

\*No residential development capacity is assumed for the Doctors Medical Center site per General Plan Amendment # Plan 1512-0007.

**Specific Plan Page 2-21(Land Use)**

Modify Table 2-7 to add footnote (\*) to Other Areas column heading:

\*Buildout summary data is modified by General Plan Amendment # Plan 1512-0007 for the Doctors Medical Center site.

**Specific Plan Page 2-23 (Land Use):** revise this section as follows:

“2-I-12 Allow commercial uses to occupy the Public/Institutional area on the north side of Vale Road if medical office facilities vacate and to occupy the Public Institutional area on the south side of Vale Road if the Doctors Medical Center vacates.



*Planning for Success.*

EIR ADDENDUM

DOCTORS MEDICAL CENTER  
GENERAL PLAN/SPECIFIC PLAN  
AMENDMENTS AND REZONING

PREPARED FOR

City of San Pablo

December 21, 2015

EMC PLANNING GROUP INC.  
A LAND USE PLANNING & DESIGN FIRM



EIR ADDENDUM

DOCTORS MEDICAL CENTER  
GENERAL PLAN AND  
SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS

PREPARED FOR  
Michele Rodriguez  
Development Services Manager  
13831 San Pablo Avenue  
San Pablo, CA 94806  
Tel 510.215.3031

PREPARED BY  
EMC Planning Group Inc.  
301 Lighthouse Avenue, Suite C  
Monterey, CA 93940  
Tel 831.649.1799  
Fax 831.649.8399  
[sissem@emcplanning.com](mailto:sissem@emcplanning.com)  
[www.emcplanning.com](http://www.emcplanning.com)

December 21, 2015

This document was produced on recycled paper.





# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE .....	1-1
2.0 PROPOSED PROJECT .....	2-1
3.0 DECISION TO PREPARE AN EIR ADDENDUM .....	3-1
4.0 ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY .....	4-1
4.1 Analysis Approach .....	4-1
4.2 Baseline Development Conditions Assumed for the Site .....	4-2
5.0 PROPOSED PROJECT EFFECTS .....	5-1
5.1 Proposed Project Effects Analysis .....	5-1
5.2 Conclusion – EIR Addendum as Appropriate CEQA Documentation .....	5-16
6.0 REFERENCES .....	6-1
6.1 Documents Cited.....	6-1
6.2 EIR Addendum Preparers.....	6-2

## **Appendices**

Appendix A	Proposed General Plan and Specific Plan Amendments
Appendix B	Trip Generation Assessment Memorandum

**Figures**

Figure 1 DMC Site Location ..... 1-3  
Figure 2 Existing GP ..... 2-3  
Figure 3 Specific Plan LU ..... 2-5  
Figure 4 Proposed GP ..... 2-7  
Figure 5 Proposed Specific Plan LU ..... 2-9

**Tables**

Table 1 Project Site Proposed Development Capacity ..... 2-11

# I.0

## BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The San Pablo City Council adopted the *San Pablo General Plan 2030* (hereinafter “general plan”) in April 2011 after certifying the *San Pablo General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report* (hereinafter “general plan EIR”). In September 2011, the City adopted the *San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan* (“specific plan”) after certifying the *San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report* (hereinafter “specific plan EIR”). The general plan EIR evaluated the potential effects of implementing the general plan and the specific plan EIR evaluated the potential effects of implementing the specific plan.


The specific plan includes policy direction for increasing development intensity on underutilized parcels and policy direction for new construction on vacant parcels within the boundary of the specific plan. Land development resulting from these policies was the primary source of potential direct and indirect environmental impacts associated with implementing the specific plan. Specific plan Table 1-7, San Pablo Avenue Potential Buildout Summary, identifies 1,360 existing residential units and potential capacity for an additional 739 residential units within the specific plan boundary, for a total of 2,100 units. A total of 1,600,000 square feet of existing non-residential building capacity and 815,000 square feet of new non-residential building capacity are also identified for a total of 2,415,000 square feet of building capacity.

The City of San Pablo (“City”) is proposing to amend the general plan and the specific plan to change the land use designation for the approximately 12.5-acre parcel on which the Doctors Medical Center (DMC) is located. The DMC closed on April 21, 2015. Figure 1, DMC Site Location, shows the location of the 12.5-acre site in relation to the boundaries of the specific plan. The term “site” is used in this EIR addendum to refer to the 12.5-acre parcel. Other general plan and specific plan text and figure amendments are proposed as described in Section 2.0, Project Description. Amendments to the general plan are proposed to ensure consistency between the specific plan and general plan and to achieve the City’s economic development goals for the site. With the proposed change in land use, the land use and zoning standards that implement the proposed land use designation would apply to future development within the site.

The DMC facility was constructed in the 1950s. The facility has been used since that time as a medical center. Over time, the cost to operate the facility has exceeded the revenue/funding available to support its operation. In 2014, the facility board of directors issued a notice of closure to Contra Costa County which signaled the board's intention to close the facility. The DMC was then closed on April 21, 2015. The City is proposing the general plan/specific plan amendments to proactively plan for the future development of a portion of the site with new uses.

As identified in Section 2.0, Project Description, the City is proposing that approximately 10.0 acres of the site be redeveloped with commercial mixed uses. The 2.5-acre balance of the site is developed with parking facilities. This 2.5-acre portion has been leased by the City to the adjacent Lytton Casino for use as additional parking. Therefore, it is not considered to be available for redevelopment as part of the City's current proposed actions. Hence, while the general plan/specific plan amendments to change the land use designation and the corresponding development standards apply to the entire 12.5-acre site, the potential environmental impacts of the City's proposed actions are related to proposed redevelopment of the remaining 10.0-acre portion of the site. This 10.0-acre portion is hereinafter referred to as the "project site".

This addendum to the specific plan EIR (hereinafter "EIR addendum") has been prepared pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines section 15164 to meet the City's obligation to comply with CEQA prior to considering the proposed general plan and specific plan amendments.



0 1,250 feet

-  Doctors Medical Center Site
-  San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area
-  Tribal Trust (Reservation) Lands
-  Tribal Fee Lands
-  San Pablo City Limits

Source: City of San Pablo 2010,  
Lytton Rancheria of California 2011

Figure 1

## DMC Site Location



*This side intentionally left blank.*

## 2.0

# PROPOSED PROJECT

### ***General and Specific Plan Amendments***

The 12.5-acre site is currently designated Public/Institutional in both the general plan and the specific plan. The City is proposing a general plan amendment to change the general plan land use designation to Commercial and a specific plan amendment to change the land use designation to Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) for the entire 12.5-acre site.

The specific plan describes the CMU land use designation as follows:

Commercial Mixed Use. This is a mixed-use designation that includes office, retail, commercial, residential, and public uses. Active uses are required for frontage along San Pablo Avenue, and residential uses are allowed only when the commercial FAR is 0.5 or greater. This designation applies primarily to the gateway area at the southern end of the corridor, and near the intersection with Church Lane in the central portion of the corridor. Typical height is expected to be two to three stories, with a maximum allowable height of 40 feet. The maximum FAR is 1.5 and the maximum density is 50 units per gross acre.


The overarching purpose of the City's proposed actions is to facilitate a transition in land use from Public/Institutional to commercial mixed uses that promotes compatibility between future on-site development and existing adjacent uses. The City believes that future uses such as retail, office, and hotel uses as permitted per the CMU land use designation would complement the intent of the City to support entertainment type uses that are planned within the Entertainment Overlay District designated in the specific plan. The site is not within the Entertainment District Overlay boundary, but the boundary is contiguous to the northern and eastern boundary of the site and includes the adjacent Lytton Casino property.

The full set of proposed general plan and specific plan amendments are included in Appendix A. For the most part, the amendments identify the proposed changes in land use and clarify the relationship between future use of the project site and the adjacent Lytton Casino (a “Class II” gaming use). Additional amendments reflect the proposed development intensity and development capacity for the project site as described below. Together, these actions and the potential future development that could occur as a result of the actions are referred to as the “proposed project”.

General plan land use designations and surrounding uses are depicted in Figure 2, Existing General Plan Land Use Designations, and in Figure 3, Existing Specific Plan Land Use Designations. Figure 4, Proposed General Plan Land Use Designation, and Figure 5, Proposed Specific Plan Land Use Designation, illustrate how land use would change with the proposed project. Land use development standards, and land use density and intensity standards for land use classifications in the specific plan are identified in Tables 2-2 and 2-3 of the specific plan, respectively. Standards for the CMU land use designation shown in these tables would apply to future redevelopment within the site. The 12.5-acre site to which the land use and zoning standards would apply is identified as the “Amendments Boundary” on these figures and the “redevelopment project site” corresponds to the 10.0-acre project site that is available for redevelopment.

### **Proposed Development Scenario**

As a basis for meeting its CEQA compliance obligations as the lead agency, the City has defined a future maximum development scenario for the 10.0-acre portion of the site. This scenario serves as the basis for assessing the environmental effects of the proposed land use changes. Table 1, Project Proposed Development Capacity, shows the assumed types and intensities of a representative future CMU development scenario. This EIR addendum identifies the potential impacts associated with development per this development scenario. Existing DMC facilities include approximately 303,000 square feet of building. The proposed development scenario includes approximately 175,000 square feet of building, a reduction of 42 percent. It is assumed that the 2.5-acre balance of the 12.5-acre site has no future expanded development capacity given its current and planned continued use as a parking lot that is leased by the City to the adjacent Lytton Casino. Any future proposal to redevelop this 2.5-acre portion of the site would require additional CEQA documentation.



Mixed Use Centers
  Commercial Mixed Use
  Regional Commercial
  High Density Residential
  Medium Density Residential
  Public/Institutional
  Air Quality Health Risk Overlay Zone

Amendments Boundary
  Redevelopment Project Site


Source: Contra Costa County 2010, City of San Pablo 2010

E
M
C

Figure 2  
**Existing General Plan Land Use Designations**

Doctors Medical Center General Plan/Specific Plan Amendments EIR Addendum

*This side intentionally left blank.*




Specific Plan Boundary	Medium Density Residential	Mixed Use Center South	Commercial Mixed Use	Regional Commercial	Entertainment Overlay District	Public/Institutional	Parks/Recreation	Activity Center	
	0 325 feet	Redevelopment Project Site	Amendments Boundary						

Source: City of San Pablo 2010, Dyett & Bhatia 2010



Figure 3  
Existing Specific Plan Land Use Designations

*This side intentionally left blank.*



Mixed Use Centers
  Commercial Mixed Use
  Regional Commercial
  High Density Residential
  Medium Density Residential
  Public/Institutional
  Air Quality Health Risk Overlay Zone

Redevelopment Project Site
  Amendments Boundary


Source: Contra Costa County 2010, City of San Pablo 2010

Figure 4  
**Proposed General Plan Land Use Designations**

Doctors Medical Center General Plan/Specific Plan Amendments EIR Addendum



*This side intentionally left blank.*



Source: City of San Pablo 2010, Dyett & Bhatia 2010



# Figure 5 Proposed Specific Plan Land Use Designations

Doctors Medical Center General Plan/Specific Plan Amendments EIR Addendum

*This side intentionally left blank.*

**Table 1 Project Site Proposed Development Capacity**

Use Type	Development Capacity (square feet)
Retail	50,000
Office	50,000
Hotel (100 rooms)	75,000 <sup>1</sup>
Building Square Footage Subtotal	175,000
Redevelopment Site Area (10.0 acres)	435,600
Floor to Area Ratio	0.40

*Source:* City of San Pablo 2015, EMC Planning Group 2015

*Note:* <sup>1</sup>Based on 750 square feet per room, which includes ancillary hotel support uses.

The proposed development scenario was influenced in significant part by the City's desire to enable new development whose environmental effects are largely within the scope and intensity of those generated by DMC operations in 2011 when the specific plan EIR was certified. As described in Section 4.2 below, DMC facilities and operations were included as part of the existing environmental conditions/setting described in the specific plan EIR. Hence, DMC operations at that time are assumed to be the "baseline" for its operational effects.

The environmental effects of the baseline DMC use are a function of the intensity of its operations in 2011. Its intensity of use is considered to be equivalent to the percentage of its 189 bed capacity that was in use at that time. This usage level is characterized in an appraisal of the DMC facilities that was conducted in June 2011. At that time, the hospital was operating at 45 percent of its total 189-bed capacity. This operational level is assumed to constitute the baseline DMC intensity of use. The appraisal is available for review at the City of San Pablo Development Services Department, 13831 San Pablo Avenue, Building 3, San Pablo, California, 94806.

The proposed development scenario was especially influenced by a goal that the peak hour traffic volumes and daily traffic volume it generates not exceed those of the baseline DMC use in 2011. To identify the traffic generation characteristics of the baseline DMC use, a traffic evaluation was conducted. An iterative process was then used to select a combination of retail, office, and hotel uses whose traffic generation characteristics fall within the DMC baseline volumes. The proposed development scenario shown in Table 1 meets this criterion. The traffic evaluation is included in this EIR addendum as Appendix B and is discussed further in Section 5.0.

Amendment of general plan policy LU-I-23 is proposed to reflect that development capacity within the 10.0-acre project site would be limited to 175,000 square feet of building as reflected in Table 1. This policy identifies floor to area (FAR) ratio requirements for CMU land uses. The FAR is the total floor area (building square footage) of all buildings on a site, divided by the total area (area square footage) of that site. Policy LU-I-23 reads as follows, with the proposed amendment to the policy (as listed in Appendix A), shown as underlined text:

LU-I-23     Require that a minimum of non-residential uses be developed in conjunction with any proposed residential development on Commercial Mixed Use site.

*The minimum FAR for non-residential development needed on these sites is 0.5. The exception is the Doctors Medical Center site where a minimum FAR of less than 0.5 is permitted.*

As can be seen in Table 1, the non-residential FAR of 0.40 for the proposed development scenario is below the minimum target of 0.5 identified in policy LU-I-23. The proposed FAR is equivalent to 175,000 square feet of building capacity divided by 435,600 square feet (equivalent to 10.0 acres). Amendment of this policy enables this FAR exception only for the proposed project. The City would consider future development proposals for the project site that meet or exceed a FAR of 0.40 for non-residential uses. However, such proposals would require a general plan amendment and additional CEQA review.

Because a specific development project is not currently proposed for the project site, a conceptual site plan has not been prepared. However, as identified on page 2-12 of the specific plan under the discussion of the CMU land use designation, and summarized in Table 2-2 and Table 2-3 of the specific plan, development standards for CMU uses include building heights of two to three stories, a maximum allowable height of 40 feet, a maximum FAR of 1.5 and a maximum residential density of 50 units per gross acre. The proposed development capacity is below the minimum allowable development capacity. Hence, it is possible that future development under the proposed development scenario would not reach the maximum building height permitted and may have a physical footprint that is below that permitted.

### **Employment Characteristics**

The proposed project would generate new employment opportunities. The following employment densities as derived from the *Employment Density Study Summary Report* (Southern California Association of Governments 2001) were used to identify total project employment generation from redevelopment of the 10.0-acre project site with 175,000 square feet of CMU uses as described in Table 1: 1) 1 employee/2,000 square feet of hotel use or 38 employees; 2) 1 employee/600 square feet of retail use or 83 employees; and 3) 1 employee/500 square feet of office use or 100 employees. Approximately 221 jobs would be created.

## **Existing Building Demolition/Reuse**

For purposes of evaluation in this EIR addendum, it is assumed that in a worst-case, most if not all of the existing DMC structures would be demolished and removed to enable redevelopment of the project site with CMU uses. This is considered worst-case from an environmental review perspective because it is possible that a future developer could propose to reuse all or some of the existing buildings.

## ***Land Use and Development Standards***

Table 34-V, Commercial and Industrial Districts: Development Standards found in Section 17.34.040 Development Standards in the City of San Pablo Zoning Ordinance indicates that for properties within specific plan area SP2 (the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan), development and design standards contained in the specific plan apply. The City of San Pablo Zoning District Map shows that development within the specific plan area (identified as SP2 in the Zoning District Map legend) is subject to development standards contained in the specific plan. Development and intensity standards for the proposed CMU land use classification are identified in specific plan Table 2-2, Land Use Standards by Classification, and in Table 2-3, San Pablo Specific Plan Land Use Density and Intensity Standards. Future commercial mixed-use development within the project site would be subject to these standards.

*This side intentionally left blank.*

## 3.0

# DECISION TO PREPARE AN EIR ADDENDUM

The proposed project is a “project” as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15378. Therefore, the proposed project must be evaluated for its potential impacts pursuant to CEQA.

As discussed previously, the proposed project represents a change from the land use scenario and development capacity scenario evaluated in the specific plan EIR. CEQA Guidelines sections 15162 and 15163 define the conditions under which a subsequent EIR or negative declaration may be prepared for a project that has already been addressed in a prior EIR or negative declaration. Section 15162 states:

(a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

(b) If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under subdivision (a). Otherwise the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, an addendum, or no further documentation.

The purpose of this EIR addendum is to determine whether or not the proposed project meets any of the conditions specified in CEQA Guidelines section 15162 or 15163 such that preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR or a negative declaration tiered from the specific plan EIR should be prepared. The project analysis provided in Section 5.0, Proposed Project Effects, is used to make this determination.

## ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

### 4.1 ANALYSIS APPROACH

The following methodological steps were taken to determine whether the proposed project would trigger the need for a subsequent EIR or negative declaration:

1. Review the specific plan EIR to identify significant impacts of implementing the specific plan. Especially for environmental effects whose significance is not based on quantitative thresholds of significance (e.g. visual resources) or quantitative analysis, determine whether the proposed project may have new or more intense impacts than were identified in the specific plan EIR. This determination is made based on whether or not general plan policies, specific plan policies, and/or uniformly applied regulations identified in the specific plan EIR would be sufficient to reduce related impacts of the proposed project to less than significant.

The general plan and specific plan contain a multitude of policies that direct future development within the City and within the specific plan boundary, respectively. The specific plan EIR identifies a range of significant effects of implementing the specific plan that are reduced to less than significant through implementation of general plan and specific plan policies. In this respect, the specific plan is largely “self-mitigating”. Because the policies apply to all new development within the specific plan boundary, the policies would apply to the proposed project. The proposed project must be in substantial conformance with the policies. Consequently, general plan and specific plan policies have potential to reduce potentially significant impacts of the proposed project to less than significant. Similarly, the proposed project must comply with uniformly applied standards and regulations identified in local, state, and/or federal regulatory programs, including the City of San Pablo Municipal Code (“municipal code”). Such compliance is also referenced in the specific plan EIR as a basis for reducing related significant impacts where appropriate.

If general plan or specific plan policies or regulatory standards are sufficient to reduce significant impacts to a less-than-significant level, the proposed project would not create new or intensified environmental impacts relative to those assumed in the specific plan EIR, and a subsequent EIR or negative declaration would not be required.

2. For environmental effects whose significance is based in part or in whole on quantitative thresholds of significance (e.g. air quality and traffic) or quantitative analysis: 1) identify the baseline DMC operations in 2011 when the specific plan EIR was certified and quantify effects of its operation at that time, 2) quantify the related effects of the proposed project, and 3) compare baseline DMC operations effects to the proposed project to determine if the proposed project would generate effects that were not already assumed in the specific plan EIR existing conditions in 2011.

If the proposed project does not create new or intensified environmental impacts relative to those assumed in the specific plan EIR, the proposed project would not require preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration; an EIR addendum would; therefore, be appropriate CEQA documentation.

## **4.2 BASELINE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS ASSUMED FOR THE SITE**

To undertake the analysis described in item #2 in the analysis methodology above, several environmental effects of the DMC baseline use in 2011 must be characterized. The specific plan assumed that the DMC was part of the existing setting within the specific plan boundary at the time the specific plan EIR certified in 2011. Specific plan Table 1-7, San Pablo Avenue Potential Buildout Summary, shows that 1,600,000 square feet of non-residential building existed within the specific plan boundary at that time. The site contained approximately 303,000 square feet of building in 2011, which was assumed to be part of the existing total building square footage reported in specific plan Table 1-7.

The specific plan EIR was prepared as a program EIR that evaluated the effects that could occur with specific plan implementation. As a programmatic document, the EIR did not assess the contribution of existing development or planned development on individual sites within the specific plan boundary to the impacts of implementing the specific plan as a whole per se. To determine the contribution of baseline DMC operations to environmental setting conditions in 2011, an understanding of the intensity of its actual operational use relative to total capacity of use is needed. If an assumption is made that the full capacity of the DMC facility was being used, the impacts of that use would be worst-case, but may not reflect actual usage.

As described previously, the percentage of the DMC's 189-bed capacity occupied in 2011 is used to represent the baseline operational level of the facility. In June 2011, an appraisal of the DMC property was prepared. It is available for review at the City of San Pablo Development Services Department upon request. That document noted that 45 percent, or about 85 of the 189 beds were occupied. This information is used to estimate quantifiable environmental effects of DMC operations in the baseline year for several environmental topics including transportation, air quality, greenhouse gases, water demand, wastewater generation, solid waste generation, etc. These effects are then compared to the same environmental effects of the proposed project. If the proposed project effects are within the DMC baseline "thresholds" for these effects, the proposed project would not result in related new or intensified significant impacts relative to those reported in the specific plan EIR.

*This side intentionally left blank.*

## 5.0

# PROPOSED PROJECT EFFECTS

The environmental effects of the proposed project are evaluated on a topic by topic basis below. The order of the topics is the same as presented in the specific plan EIR. Discussion of each topic is initiated with a summary of significance criteria and a summary of impacts and their significance as reported in the specific plan EIR. The impact analysis methodology is described in Section 4.4.

## 5.1 PROPOSED PROJECT EFFECTS ANALYSIS

### *Land Use*

The specific plan EIR includes the following significance criteria against which land use impacts of implementing the specific plan are evaluated: 1) physically divide a community, 2) conflict with adopted plans, 3) displace a substantial number of people or housing, or 4) permanently alter the characteristics and qualities of an existing neighborhood or community. The specific plan EIR concluded that with implementation of general plan and specific plan policies, implementation of the specific plan would have less-than-significant land use impacts.

The proposed project would replace an existing developed urban use and does not represent a new land use type that would divide an existing community. The proposed project would not conflict with adopted plans – it represents an urban use that is consistent with surrounding land uses and consistent with the specific plan vision for the San Pablo Avenue corridor, which in turn is consistent with the general plan. The proposed project must be developed consistent with general plan and specific plan policies and with applicable, uniformly applied standards and regulations. There is no housing or resident population on the site that would be displaced by reuse of the site with CMU uses. The proposed project would replace the baseline DMC urban use with an urban use that would not substantially change the quality of the San Pablo Avenue corridor or surrounding uses.

The baseline DMC use and the proposed project are representative of typical forms of urban development. The proposed project's related effect would be no greater than for the baseline DMC use.

### **Land Use Impacts Conclusion**

The proposed project would not result in new significant land use impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant land use effects relative to those evaluated in the specific plan EIR. Further, no changes in land use related circumstances have occurred and no new information has been identified that indicate the proposed project will have new or more significant land use impacts than were identified in the specific plan EIR.

### **Transportation**

The specific plan EIR includes the following significance criteria against which transportation impacts of implementing the specific plan are evaluated: 1) conflict with the applicable Congestion Management Plan or adopted Routes of Regional Significance Action Plan, and 2) conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bikeways, or pedestrian facilities. Three specific Congestion Management Plan significance criteria are identified, two of which are particularly relevant to the proposed project: 1) cause a signalized intersection along San Pablo Avenue or San Pablo Dam Road to operate below LOS E, and 2) cause a signalized intersection along 23rd Street or El Portal Drive to operate below LOS D. The specific plan EIR concluded that with implementation of general plan and specific plan policies, implementation of the specific plan would have no impact or less-than-significant project and cumulative transport impacts.

As described in Section 2.0, the development capacity for the proposed project was established based on an analysis of its peak hour and daily traffic generation characteristics. The analysis, entitled *Trip Generation Assessment for the Doctors Medical Center* (Fehr and Peers 2015)(hereinafter "trip generation memo") is included as Appendix B. A development capacity scenario for the proposed project was selected that ensured its traffic generation volumes would be equal to or less than those of the baseline DMC use. Hence, the proposed project is designed to have no greater impact on LOS conditions than did the baseline DMC use.

The proposed project would have no influence on the City's ability to implement transit, bikeways, or pedestrian facility programs or policies.

Potential short-term traffic impacts from demolition and construction activities would be similar to those assumed for construction/redevelopment of other sites within the specific plan boundary as discussed and evaluated in the specific plan EIR. General plan and specific plan

policies that reduce related impacts to less than significant would also apply to demolition and construction activities for the proposed project such that these effects would also be less than significant.

### **Transportation Impacts Conclusion**

The proposed project would not result in new significant transportation impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant transportation effects relative to those evaluated in the specific plan EIR. Further, no changes in land use related circumstances have occurred and no new information has been identified that indicate the proposed project will have new or more significant transportation impacts than were identified in the specific plan EIR.

### ***Air Quality***

The specific plan EIR includes three significance criteria against which air quality impacts of implementing the specific plan are evaluated: 1) cause the rate of increase in vehicle miles travelled (VMT) or vehicle trips to exceed the rate of increase in population with implementation of the specific plan, 2) be inconsistent with or fail to implement the Air Quality Plan Transportation Control Measures, and 3) fail to identify or establish goals, policies, objectives, and/or overlay or buffer zones for existing and proposed land uses that would emit odors or toxic air contaminants. The specific plan EIR concluded that impacts related to the first criterion are significant and unavoidable and that impacts related to the second two are less than significant.

The trip generation memo in Appendix B includes information on VMT changes that would occur with the proposed project relative to the baseline DMC use. The analysis concludes that VMT from the proposed use would not exceed that of the baseline DMC use. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase the severity of the noted significant and unavoidable impact.

The proposed project must be consistent with general plan and specific plan policies that ensure implementation of the specific plan does not conflict with Air Quality Transportation Control Measures. The baseline DMC operations included a boiler which is identified as a concentrated toxic air contaminant source in the specific plan EIR. The proposed project may have a beneficial effect as end uses that may occupy the site are not anticipated to require a boiler that would be classified as a toxic air contaminant source.

Potential short-term air quality impacts from demolition and construction activities at the site would be similar to those assumed for construction/redevelopment of other sites within the specific plan boundary as discussed and evaluated in the specific plan EIR. General plan and

specific plan policies that reduce related impacts to less than significant would also apply to demolition and construction activities at the site such that these effects would also be less than significant.

### **Air Quality Impacts Conclusion**

The proposed project would not result in new significant air quality impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously identified air quality impacts relative to those evaluated in the specific plan EIR. Further, no changes in land use related circumstances have occurred and no new information has been identified that indicate the proposed project will have new or more significant air quality impacts than were identified in the specific plan EIR.

### **Energy and Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

The specific plan EIR includes the following significance criteria against which energy and greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts of implementing the specific plan are evaluated: 1) cause a substantial increase in per capita or per service population energy consumption, 2) require a substantial increase in energy supply capacity or infrastructure the construction of which could cause adverse environmental effects, 3) conflict with any existing local, regional, State, or federal standards for energy production or efficiency, 4) exceed the per service population (residents + jobs) threshold of 6.6 MT CO<sub>2e</sub>/year, and 5) Conflict with existing local, regional, or State efforts to implement AB 32 or SB 375. The specific plan EIR concluded that with implementation of specific plan policies and regional and state regulations related to building energy efficiency and mobile source GHG emissions reductions, energy and GHG impacts would be less than significant.

### **Energy**

Regarding non-transportation energy use, the proposed project would likely result in reduced operational energy consumption relative to the baseline DMC use for a number of reasons. The proposed project includes 175,000 square feet of building compared to approximately 303,000 square feet of building for the baseline DMC use. This reduced scale of development would likely result in a reduction in energy demand. The baseline DMC use required a significant, continuous, 24-hour demand for energy given its function; energy demand from the proposed project would decline substantially during non-operating hours. Further, the proposed project would be constructed consistent with current state regulations for energy efficiency (e.g. CalGreen and Title 24) that did not exist when the DMC was constructed. The proposed project must also be consistent with specific plan policies designed to reduce energy consumption. For these reasons, the proposed project is not expected to increase non-transportation source energy demand relative to that assumed in the specific plan EIR and may have a beneficial effect relative to the baseline DMC use.

Regarding transportation energy use, as discussed in the Transportation section above, the proposed project would not result in a net increase in VMT relative to the baseline DMC use. Transportation sources of energy use would also be subject to state and federal regulations designed to improve fuel efficiency, and must be consistent with specific plan policies designed to reduce VMT and mobile source energy use. For these reasons, the proposed project is not anticipated to increase transportation source energy demand relative to the baseline DMC use.

## **Greenhouse Gases**

The two primary sources of GHG emissions for land use projects are on-site energy demand (GHGs generated indirectly through combustion of fossil fuels at off-site power generation facilities) and mobile sources (combustion of fossil fuels in vehicles). As discussed above for energy, the proposed project is likely to result in no greater and possibly less overall energy demand than the baseline DMC use. Hence, it would not generate a greater volume of GHG emissions than assumed for existing conditions in the specific plan EIR. Further, the proposed project must comply with specific plan policies and with state regulations for non-transportation and transportation energy demand reduction. Such compliance is the basis for the specific plan EIR determination that energy impacts of implementing the specific plan are less than significant.

The City adopted the *City of San Pablo Climate Action Plan (CAP)* in 2012. The CAP was prepared as a tool to implement GHG policies in the general plan and by extension, the specific plan. The CAP defines GHG emissions reductions objectives and strategies for reducing community wide and municipal operations GHG emissions to 15 percent below 2005 levels by 2020. Community wide emissions reduction strategies address transportation, energy, solid waste, and water supply/wastewater sources of GHG emissions. The proposed project would be conditioned to comply with the reduction measures applicable to it, thereby ensuring consistency with general plan and specific plan policies.

New state GHG emissions reduction regulations (e.g. Renewable Portfolio Standard requiring 50 percent of utility-provided electricity to be generated by renewable sources by 2030) have been adopted since the baseline year of 2011 and since the 2012 CAP was adopted. Required implementation of these regulations would further reduce the GHG emissions profile of the proposed project.

## **Energy and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impacts Conclusion**

The proposed project would not result in new significant energy or GHG emissions impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously identified energy or GHG emissions impacts relative to the baseline DMC use and relative to effects identified in the specific plan EIR.

Further, no changes in energy or GHG related circumstances have occurred and no new information has been identified that indicate the proposed project will have new or more significant air quality impacts than were identified in the specific plan EIR.

### ***Hydrology, Flooding, and Water Quality***

The specific plan EIR includes significance criteria against which hydrology, flooding, and water quality impacts of implementing the specific plan are evaluated. The significance criteria generally address: 1) violation of water quality standards, 2) depletion of groundwater supply, 3) alteration of drainage patterns that cause erosion or off-site siltation, or that change surface runoff conditions resulting in on- or off-site flooding, 4) generation of stormwater that exceeds the capacity of stormwater drainage systems, and 5) flood hazard risks for housing, other structures, and people. The specific plan EIR concludes that with the implementation of general plan and specific plan policies and with required conformance of new development/redevelopment with state and regional water quality regulations, implementation of the specific plan would have less-than-significant impacts.

General plan and specific plan policies, as well as numerous regulations such as those promulgated through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (flooding) and the State Water Resources Control Board (water quality), identify development standards with which new development/redevelopment within the specific plan boundary must comply to reduce or avoid significant hydrology, flooding, and water quality impacts. The baseline DMC use was developed prior to the adoption of many of the current stormwater management, flood hazard protection, and water quality policies, regulations, and standards now in effect for new development. The proposed project must comply with these policies and regulations. As a result, the proposed project is likely to have reduced hydrology, flooding, and water quality impacts relative to the baseline DMC use, and its related impacts would be no more significant than assumed for existing conditions as identified in the specific plan EIR.

The general plan EIR and specific plan EIR evaluate impacts of new development on water supply based on the proportionate share of water demand generated by build out of the City and of the specific plan area, respectively. Changes in water demand are based on population growth as summarized in Table 3.8-5 of the general plan EIR and Table 3.8-11 in the specific plan EIR. Water demand factors for individual land use types were not available from the East Bay Municipal Utilities District to conduct a more site specific evaluation of changes in water demand that would be created by the proposed project.

Water use data for the baseline DMC use in 2011 was not available. Therefore, water demand factors from other sources were utilized to compare DMC baseline to proposed project water demand. Water demand from the baseline DMC use is estimated using water consumption data from the Energy Information Administration's 2007 Commercial Buildings Energy

Consumption Survey: Consumption and Expenditures Tables, Table H8 – Water Consumption Information for Large Hospitals (Energy Information Administration 2012). Water consumption for hospitals ranging in size from 200,000 to 500,000 square feet is estimated at 118,500 gallons per year per bed. At a capacity of 189 beds of which 45 percent were assumed occupied in the 2011 baseline year, the DMC use consumed approximately 10,078,425 gallons, or 31 acre-feet of water. Non-residential water use factors from the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District were used to estimate proposed project demand (<http://www.mpwmd.dst.ca.us/wdd/Forms/NonResidential%20Factor%20List%20Revised%2020150701.pdf>). Using a water demand factor of .00007 acre-feet per square foot of retail and office uses, at 100,000 combined square feet, these uses would demand about seven acre-feet per year of water. Using a demand factor of 0.100 per room for hotel uses, at 100 rooms, this component would demand about 10 acre-feet per year. Total annual proposed project demand would be approximately 17 acre-feet per year. The proposed project would be conditioned to implement numerous water conservation measures that were not in effect at the time the DMC facility was most recently renovated (1999-2001). Given these factors, the proposed project water demand would be substantially lower than for the baseline DMC use.

### **Hydrology, Flooding, and Water Quality Impacts Conclusion**

The proposed project would not result in new significant hydrology, flooding, or water quality impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously identified hydrology, flooding, or water quality impacts relative to those evaluated in the specific plan EIR. Further, no changes in hydrology, flooding, or water quality related circumstances have occurred and no new information has been identified that indicate the proposed project will have new or more significant hydrology, flooding and water quality impacts than were identified in the specific plan EIR.

### **Biological Resources**

The specific plan EIR includes significance criteria against which biological resources impacts of implementing the specific plan are evaluated. The significance criteria generally address: 1) direct and indirect impacts on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, 2) substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat, federally protected wetlands or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations, 3) interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or 4) conflict with the provisions of adopted local conservation policies, resource protection and conservation plans. The specific plan EIR concludes that with the implementation of general plan and specific plan policies and with required conformance of new development/redevelopment with state and regional biological resources related regulations, implementation of the specific plan would have less-than-significant impacts.

The developed portions of the project site have low potential to contain biological resources. However, the project site includes a portion of the Wildcat Creek corridor, which may provide habitat for both special-status species, including nesting birds, California red-legged frog (*Rana draytonii*), and protected bat species. Riparian habitat and water quality within the creek must be protected during construction and operations to avoid impacts on its biological resources values. The general plan and specific plan include a range of biological resources policies, including policies to protect sensitive and special-status species, riparian habitat, and wetlands during construction and operation of land development projects. Many of these policies are based on the mandate for new development to comply with state and or federal regulations for biological resources protection. With implementation of policies in the respective documents, both the general plan EIR and specific plan EIR conclude that impacts on biological resources, including from new development within the specific plan boundary, would be less than significant.

The proposed project would be required to comply with general plan and specific plan policies designed to protect Wildcat Creek and special-status species that may use it as habitat and to comply with the requirement for preconstruction surveys for protected bird and bat species. Adherence to these policies would ensure that potential impacts of the proposed project during construction and operation would be less than significant.

### **Biological Resources Impacts Conclusion**

The proposed project would not result in new significant biological resources impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously identified biological resources impacts relative to those evaluated in the general plan EIR and specific plan EIR. Further, no changes in biological resources related circumstances have occurred and no new information has been identified that indicate the proposed project will have new or more significant biological resources impacts than were identified in the specific plan EIR.

### **Geology and Seismicity**

The specific plan EIR includes significance criteria against which geology and seismicity impacts of implementing the specific plan are evaluated. The significance criteria generally address: 1) risks involving rupture of known earthquake faults, 2) potential for substantial soil erosion or topsoil loss, 3) risks from development on unstable geologic units or soils, and 4) loss of availability of designated mineral resources. The specific plan EIR concludes that with the implementation of general plan and specific plan policies and with required conformance of new development/redevelopment with applicable state and federal regulations, geologic hazard impacts for new development/redevelopment within the specific plan boundary would be less than significant.

The project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone; the proposed project would not be at risk from location within a fault rupture hazard zone. The project site, like all areas in the City, may be subject to strong seismic shaking. A portion of the site is mapped in specific plan EIR Figure 3.7-2 as having high potential for liquefaction hazard due to saturated soils associated with Wildcat Creek and mapped as containing soils with high expansiveness characteristics.

Like all new development within the specific plan boundary, the proposed project would be subject to building standards contained in the California Building Code designed to reduce vulnerability to seismic events. As identified in the specific plan EIR, mandatory compliance with the building codes and construction standards, the requirements of the municipal code, and policies contained in the general plan would reduce the vulnerability of new development/redevelopment within the specific plan to seismic related ground shaking to less than significant.

Construction of the proposed project would result in disturbance of more than one acre of the site. Such projects are required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit, which must include a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan contains erosion control measures that effectively reduce the potential for erosion and loss of topsoil. Municipal code chapter 8.40.090 (best management practices and standards) requires the use of best management practices during construction and compliance with NPDES requirements.

There are no designated mineral resources within the city limits.

### **Geology and Seismicity Impacts Conclusion**

The proposed project would not result in new significant risks to improvements or public safety or increase the severity of previously identified geologic and seismic hazards impacts relative to those evaluated in the general plan EIR and specific plan EIR. Further, no changes in geologic and seismic hazards related circumstances have occurred and no new information has been identified that indicate the proposed project will have new or more significant geologic and seismic hazards impacts than were identified in the specific plan EIR.

### **Public Services, Facilities, and Utilities**

The specific plan EIR includes significance criteria against which public services, facilities, and utilities impacts of implementing the specific plan are evaluated. The significance criteria generally address the potential for environmental impacts resulting from: 1) need for new or expanded fire/police protection facilities, new school facilities or staffing increases for these services, 2) need to expand or construct new water, storm drainage, and/or solid waste facilities,

3) exceeding waste water treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and 4) conflict with existing City standards for parks provision. The specific plan EIR concludes that with the implementation of general plan and specific plan policies and with required conformance of new development/redevelopment with applicable state and federal regulations, public services, facilities, and utilities impacts of new development/redevelopment within the specific plan boundary would be less than significant.

The specific plan EIR evaluates impacts on police services, fire services, and schools based on population growth. The baseline DMC use did not generate population growth, nor would the proposed use. Consequently, the proposed use would have no greater impact on demand for such services than the baseline DMC use. New development must comply with fire and building codes designed to minimize fire hazards to reduce demand for related services.

The baseline DMC use is already served by water supply and storm drainage infrastructure, and with solid waste disposal services. Redevelopment of the site with the proposed uses is not expected to result in a need to construct significant new infrastructure systems or waste disposal capacity. Impacts from construction of new or modified water and storm drainage infrastructure would be less than significant with implementation of general plan and specific plan policies and applicable construction related standards such as erosion control best management practices.

Hospitals are assumed to generate about 33 pounds of solid waste per day per bed/patient (<https://practicegreenhealth.org/topics/waste>). At the baseline utilization of 45 percent of its total 189 bed capacity, the baseline DMC use would generate about 2,807 pounds of solid waste per day or about 512 tons per year. Details about waste characterization are not known, but it is assumed that a portion of this waste would be characterized as hazardous and/or biomedical waste that requires special handling/processing and disposal.

Solid waste generation from the proposed project is equivalent to the product of the estimated number of employees and waste disposal rates per employee per use type. As described in Section 2.0, Project Description, the retail and office components of the project would generate about 183 jobs, while the hotel component would generation about 38 jobs. Representative annual disposal rates for these use types as referenced on page 399 of *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures* (California Association of Air Pollution Control Officers 2010), which include 0.9 tons per year per retail and office employee, and 2.0 tons/per year per hotel employee. The proposed project would generate about 241 tons per year of solid waste.

The proposed project would have a beneficial impact on solid waste disposal capacity as it would generate substantially less solid waste per year and would not require special handling and disposal of hazardous and biomedical waste. The proposed project would be required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, including those related to waste reduction and waste diversion.

Regarding wastewater treatment requirements, as described in the Hydrology, Flooding, and Water Quality section above, the proposed project would result in a substantial reduction in water demand relative to the baseline DMC use. Wastewater flows generally represent approximately 90 percent of the total water demand of a development project, with the balance of water use typically accounted for by landscape irrigation and minor additional sources of demand. As such, the proposed project would result in reduced wastewater generation relative to the baseline DMC use and, and its related impacts will be no more significant than assumed for existing conditions as identified in the specific plan EIR.

The City estimates demand for park land based on population. Neither the baseline DMC use, nor the proposed project includes residential uses that result in direct demand for park land and park usage. With a reduction in employment relative to the baseline use, the proposed project would likely generate reduced indirect daytime demand for park resources in the project area should if in fact employees utilize such facilities. The proposed project effects on park land would be no more significant than assumed for existing conditions as identified in the specific plan EIR.

### **Public Services, Facilities, and Utilities Impacts Conclusion**

The proposed project would not result in new significant public services, facilities or utilities impacts or increase the severity of public services, facilities or utilities impacts evaluated in the general plan EIR and specific plan EIR. Further, no changes in public services, facilities or utilities related circumstances have occurred and no new information has been identified that indicate the proposed project will have new or more significant geologic and seismic hazards impacts than were identified in the specific plan EIR.

### **Noise**

The specific plan EIR includes significance criteria against which noise impacts of implementing the specific plan are evaluated. The significance criteria generally address the potential for environmental impacts resulting from: 1) exposure of persons to or generation of substantial temporary construction noise levels and groundborne vibration in excess of standards above existing levels without the project, and 2) exposure of people to or generation of outdoor noise levels in excess of standards found in the general plan noise element. The specific plan EIR concludes that with the implementation of general plan and specific plan policies and with required conformance of new development/redevelopment with applicable state and federal regulations, noise impacts from new development/redevelopment within the specific plan boundary would be less than significant.

Baseline DMC noise generating activities are related primarily to transportation noise created by vehicle trips to and from the site, emergency vehicle sirens, building equipment such as roof-top mounted ventilation equipment, and other specialized medical facility equipment. It is assumed that periodic emergency helicopter flights into the site also generated noise that contributed to the overall DMC noise generation profile. Vehicles are the greatest noise source in the City. Consequently, changes in vehicle trip number and location have the most influential effect on noise conditions in the City and on noise sensitive uses located along transportation routes to and from the project site. As described in the Transportation section above, the proposed project would not generate a greater volume of traffic than the baseline DMC use either in the peak traffic hours or on a daily basis. Therefore, its transportation related noise impacts will be no more significant than assumed for existing conditions as identified in the specific plan EIR.

The mechanical equipment that would be installed by new development is likely to produce lower noise intensities than older equipment used by the DMC; noise effects from such equipment could be reduced with the proposed project. The proposed project would not generate noise from periodic aircraft flights or emergency vehicle sirens associated with the baseline DMC use. Commercial mixed use development is generally not a source of operations related groundborne vibration. Given these factors, the proposed project would have no greater related noise generation effects than assumed for existing conditions as identified in the specific plan EIR.

Noise volumes under existing and general plan buildout conditions at the site are shown in general plan Figure 3.9-3, Future Noise Exposure. The proposed project would not be exposed to noise volumes that exceed noise compatibility standards described in the general plan noise element.

Potential short-term noise impacts from demolition and construction activities at the site would be similar to those assumed for other construction and demolition activities that would occur within the specific plan boundary as discussed and evaluated in the specific plan EIR. General plan and specific plan policies that reduce related impacts to less than significant would also apply to demolition and construction activities at the project site such that these effects would also be less than significant.

### **Noise Impacts Conclusion**

The proposed project would not result in new significant noise impacts or increase the severity of impacts evaluated in the general plan EIR and specific plan EIR. Further, no changes in noise related circumstances have occurred and no new information has been identified that indicate the proposed project will have new or more significant noise impacts than were identified in the specific plan EIR.

## ***Hazardous Materials and Wildfire Hazards***

The specific plan EIR includes significance criteria against which hazardous materials impacts of implementing the specific plan are evaluated. The significance criteria generally address the potential for development to: 1) create hazards through the routine transport, use, disposal, or emission of hazardous materials, or accidents related to, 2) be exposed to hazardous materials due to location on a known hazardous materials site, 3) impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and 4) risks from wildland fires. The specific plan EIR concludes that with the implementation of general plan and specific plan policies and with required conformance of new development/redevelopment with applicable state and federal regulations, hazardous materials and wildland fire impacts from new development/redevelopment within the specific plan boundary would be less than significant.

CMU uses that would be enabled by the proposed project may involve the use, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials such as paints, solvents, cleaning agents, and other chemicals. Unusual types or volumes of these materials would not be expected. Nor would these uses involve activities that have an elevated risk of accidents involving hazardous materials. The DMC baseline use involves the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials, likely including hazardous radioactive medical wastes and biomedical wastes. Its use and disposal of such materials is subject to the same regulatory and policy requirements as would the proposed project. Mandatory compliance with regulations and policies would ensure that impacts of the proposed project are no greater than for the baseline DMC use.

As described in the specific plan EIR, implementation of the specific plan could result in the disturbance of structures containing hazardous building materials, such as lead-based paint, asbestos, and PCBs which could expose and adversely affect workers, the public, or the environment if not handled appropriately. Such risks could also result from demolition of some or all of the existing DMC structures if they were found to contain such materials. The level of potential impact is dependent upon the age, construction, and building materials in each building and the protocols employed for demolition. Handling and management of hazardous building materials including asbestos and lead-based paint is regulated through existing state and federal regulations, and mandatory compliance with regulations and policies would ensure that hazards associated with building demolition would be less than significant.

General plan Figure 3.10-1, Hazardous Material & Wildfire Hazards, shows that there are no known Department of Toxic Substances Control cleanup sites, leaking underground storage tanks, or other cleanup sites located within the project site. As the figure also shows, the site is not within a high wildland fire hazard area.

## **Hazardous Materials and Wildfire Hazards Impacts Conclusion**

The proposed project would not result in new significant hazardous materials or wildland fire hazard risk impacts or increase the severity of impacts evaluated in the general plan EIR and specific plan EIR. Further, no changes in hazardous materials or wildland fire risk impact circumstances have occurred and no new information has been identified that indicate the proposed project will have new or more significant noise impacts than were identified in the specific plan EIR.

## **Cultural Resources**

The specific plan EIR includes significance criteria against which cultural resources impacts of implementing the specific plan are evaluated. The significance criteria generally address the potential for environmental impacts from: 1) substantial adverse changes in the significance of a historic resource, 2) substantial adverse changes in the significance of a unique archaeological resource, 3) disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, and 4) destruction, directly or indirectly, of a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. The specific plan EIR concludes that with the implementation of general plan and specific plan policies and with required conformance of new development/redevelopment with applicable state and federal regulations, cultural resources impacts from new development/redevelopment within the specific plan boundary would be less than significant.

Seven Native American archaeological sites are known to be located within the City. Native American cultural resources in the region have typically been found near sources of water; there is a high likelihood that further unrecorded Native American cultural sites exist in the City. The project site does not contain recorded historic buildings. No known significant paleontological resources exist within the specific plan boundary. Construction activities associated with new development/redevelopment within the specific plan boundary could result in the disturbance of cultural resources. State regulations provide guidance on the steps that must be taken if significant archaeological resources are uncovered during construction activities. These regulations are embodied in general plan and specific plan policies designed to protect cultural resources and human remains with which new development at the project site must be consistent.

The City conducted and completed a Native American Tribal consultation process to solicit comments regarding the proposed project. The City received no responses as to its consultation request.

## **Cultural Resources Impacts Conclusion**

The proposed project would not result in new significant cultural resources impacts or increase the severity of impacts evaluated in the general plan EIR and specific plan EIR. Further, no changes in cultural resources related circumstances have occurred and no new information has been identified that indicate the proposed project will have new or more significant cultural resources impacts than were identified in the specific plan EIR.

## **Visual Resources**

The specific plan EIR concludes that through required consistency with policies contained in the specific plan and with the City's design guidelines, new development within the specific plan boundary would have less-than-significant aesthetics impacts.

There are no regional scenic features in San Pablo and from most low-lying portions of the City, views in general are quite limited (general plan EIR, page 3.12-1). The proposed project would have no impact on a scenic vista and no adverse effect relative to the baseline DMC use. The proposed project would not block a panoramic view and may be considered to have a positive effect as its maximum building height of 40 feet as permitted with the CMU land use designation is much lower than the eight-story DMC hospital building.

As described on page 3.12-4 of the specific plan EIR, there are no State- or County-designated or eligible scenic highways in the City. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on such scenic resources as evaluated in the specific plan EIR and no effect relative to the baseline DMC use.

As identified on page 2-12 of the specific plan under the discussion of the CMU land use designation, basic development standards for CMU include building heights of two to three stories, a maximum allowable height of 40 feet, a maximum FAR of 1.5 and a maximum residential density of 50 units per gross acre. The proposed project consists of 175,000 square feet of buildings with associated parking; and landscaping and a FAR of 0.40. The proposed project would have a physical footprint that is below the minimum required in the absence of the proposed general plan amendments. The proposed project would result in development of a height, scale, and form that is more visually compatible with the scale of existing surrounding than the baseline DMC use. Future development would be required to conform to the City's development standards through the design review process (as required by general plan policy LU-I-7).

As identified in the specific plan EIR, visual effects from construction activities are short-term and confined to specific locations and; therefore, are considered to have less-than-significant visual impacts. The temporary visual impacts associated with future site construction would be less than significant.

The project site is developed with an urban use. Consequently, the proposed project would have no impact from adding an urban visual element to an open space.

Redevelopment of the site with CMU uses would result in the need for building, parking lot, and other types of lighting. These lighting sources are similar to those for the baseline DMC use and consistent with existing uses adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to create a substantial new source of light or glare relative to the baseline DMC use. Lighting design must conform to the general plan and specific plan policies, as well as with municipal code design guidelines, which identify lighting standards to reduce glare and sky glow. Appendix B, Commercial Design Guidelines, contained in the municipal code, includes guidelines for lighting design for commercial projects. The guidelines include a requirement to shield lighting to avoid its splay onto off-site properties.

### **Visual Resources Impacts Conclusion**

The proposed project would not result in new significant aesthetics or substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects relative to those evaluated in the specific plan EIR, no changes in aesthetics related circumstances have occurred and no new information has been identified that indicate the proposed project will have new or more significant impacts on aesthetics than the existing baseline DMC use.

## **5.2 CONCLUSION – EIR ADDENDUM AS APPROPRIATE CEQA DOCUMENTATION**

The environmental effects of the proposed project have been evaluated to determine whether any of the conditions identified in CEQA Guidelines sections 15162 and 15163 under which a subsequent EIR or negative declaration would be required are met. For environmental topics for which baseline DMC and proposed project effects can be compared quantitatively, proposed project effects would be no greater than the baseline DMC effects as assumed in the environmental setting in the specific plan EIR. For the balance of the proposed project's environmental effects, all would be less than significant or would be reduced to less than significant with required conformance to general plan and/or specific plan policies, and conformance with local, state, and federal regulations described in the specific plan EIR.

Substantial changes have not occurred with respect to the environmental and regulatory conditions assumed in the specific plan EIR that could result in the proposed project having new or more intense impacts than identified in that EIR. Conditions within the City and the specific plan boundary are largely similar to those assumed in the general plan and specific plan EIRs. Further, no new information relevant to the CEQA environmental review process has become available since the specific plan EIR was certified that suggests the proposed project would have new significant impacts or more severe impacts than identified in the specific plan EIR for implementation of the specific plan as a whole.

Given the above conclusions, none of the conditions identified in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163 would be triggered such that preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration is necessary.

The City should consider this EIR addendum along with the general plan EIR and specific plan EIR as the CEQA documentation for consideration prior to taking discretionary action on the proposed project.

*This side intentionally left blank.*

## 6.0

# REFERENCES

## 6.1 DOCUMENTS CITED

California Association of Air Pollution Control Officers. *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures*. 2010. <http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pdf>.

CalRecycle website. [www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Directory/07-AA-0032/Detail](http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Directory/07-AA-0032/Detail).

City of San Pablo. *City of San Pablo Climate Action Plan*. 2012.  
<http://sanpabloca.gov/index.aspx?NID=1121>

City of San Pablo. *Municipal Code*. May 5, 2014. <http://www.codepublishing.com/ca/sanpablo>.

Contra Costa Health Services website. <http://cchealth.org/eh/medical-waste/faq.php>.

Dyett & Bhatia. *San Pablo General Plan 2030*. April 2011. <http://www.ci.san-pablo.ca.us/index.aspx?NID=867>.

Dyett & Bhatia. *San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan*. 2011. <http://www.ci.san-pablo.ca.us/index.aspx?NID=1203>.

Dyett & Bhatia. *San Pablo General Plan 2030 Final Environmental Impact Report*. February 2011.  
<http://www.ci.san-pablo.ca.us/index.aspx?NID=867>.

Dyett & Bhatia. *San Pablo Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*. June 2011.  
<http://www.ci.san-pablo.ca.us/index.aspx?NID=1203>.

East Bay Municipal Utility District. *2005 Urban Water Management Plan*. November 2005.  
<http://www.ebmud.com/sites/default/files/pdfs>.

Fehr and Peers. *Trip Generation Assessment for Doctors Medical Center, San Pablo*. 2015.

Practice Green Health website. August 2014. (<https://practicegreenhealth.org/topics/waste>).

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District. Water Demand Factors.

[http://www.mpwmd.dst.ca.us/wdd/Forms/Non-Residential%20Factor %20List%20Revised%2020150701.pdf](http://www.mpwmd.dst.ca.us/wdd/Forms/Non-Residential%20Factor%20List%20Revised%2020150701.pdf).

Southern California Association of Governments. *Employment Density Study Summary Report*. 2001.

<http://www.mwcog.org/uploads/committee-documents/b15aX1pa20091008155406.pdf>.

U.S. Energy Information Administration. *2007 Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey: Consumption and Expenditures Tables, Table H8 – Water Consumption Information for Large Hospitals*. 2012.

## **6.2 EIR ADDENDUM PREPARERS**

**Michael Groves, AICP, Senior Principal**

Principal-in-Charge

**Ron Sissem, Principal Planner**

Project Manager and Report Preparation

**Janine Bird, Assistant Planner**

Graphics

**Vickie Bermea, Administrative Assistant**

Report Production

---

# **APPENDIX A**

PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN/SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS

---



# PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN AND SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS

## GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS

### General Plan Page 2-12 (Economic Development Element)

#### Hotels and Gaming

...The City could build on the casino's presence by considering future uses complementary to or supportive of the existing Class II gaming operations, and by adding more family-friendly uses, which would draw in a greater variety of visitors and augment the City's image as an entertainment destination.

### General Plan Page 3-10 (Land Use & Physical Design Element)

*Commercial Mixed Use.* This is a mixed-use designation that includes office, retail, commercial and public uses. Typical height is expected to be two to three stories. The maximum permitted FAR is 1.5. The residential buildout is assumed at 20 units per gross acre and the non-residential buildout is assumed at a FAR of 0.50, except for 2000 Vale Road (APN 417-190-019, the Doctors Medical Center site, where a FAR of less than 0.50 is permitted. Residential uses are allowed only when the commercial FAR is 0.50 or greater. No on-site parking to support any future off-site Class III Indian gaming is allowed in absence of amendment to City-Tribe Municipal Services Agreement.

### General Plan Page 3-1 (Land Use & Physical Design Element)

Modify Land Use Diagram to change site to Commercial Mixed Use. Add asterisk within boundary of the site.

Add footnote to Land Use Diagram which reads:

\*Development capacity for the Doctors Medical Center site is limited to a maximum capacity such as the equivalent of: a 100-room hotel with restaurant, 50,000 square feet of retail, and 50,000 square feet of office uses per the City's approval of General Plan Amendment # Plan 1502-0007 for this site. Other uses of equal or lesser development capacities may be allowed as set forth for the Commercial Mixed Use designation. Increased development capacity is possible with further evaluation and CEQA review.

### **General Plan Page 3-16 (Land Use & Physical Design Element)**

Modify table 3.2-2 to add 12.5 acres of Commercial Mixed Use and remove 12.5 acres of Public Institutional acreage. Modify land use designation percentages accordingly.

### **General Plan Page 3-22 (Land Use & Physical Design Element)**

In the general plan, mixed uses are planned along San Pablo Avenue and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street to capitalize on accessibility to public transportation. A Commercial Mixed Use area is also designated at the Doctors Medical Center site. The allowable use and typical density depend on the type of mixed uses and may vary greatly depending on location and the characteristics of the area. General Plan goals for mixed use areas support complementary uses, mitigate potential conflict, and promote pedestrian-oriented amenities.

### **General Plan Page 3-23 (Land Use & Physical Design Element)**

LU-I-23 Require that a minimum of non-residential uses be developed in conjunction with any proposed residential development on Commercial Mixed Use site.

*The minimum FAR for non-residential development needed on these sites is 0.5. The exception is the Doctors Medical Center site where a minimum FAR of less than 0.5 is permitted.*

### **General Plan Page 3-27 (Land Use & Physical Design Element)**

LU-I-37 Allow commercial or employment generating uses to replace medical offices on sites previously zoned public/institutional, opposite including the Doctors Medical Center on Vale Road and medical offices opposite the Doctors Medical Center on Vale Road, if existing medical offices relocate in the future. With regard to the nearby San Pablo Lytton Casino, use of the Doctors Medical Center site shall be limited to uses complementary to, or supportive of, Class I and/or Class II gaming only. Uses complementing or supporting any future off-site Class III gaming are not allowed in absence of an amendment to City-Tribe Municipal Services Agreement.

## **SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS**

### **Specific Plan Page 2-7 (Land Use)**

Modify Table 2-1 to remove 12.5 ac from Public Institutional and add to Commercial Mixed Use (Other sites) and modify land use designation percentages.

### **Specific Plan Page 2-8 (Land Use)**

Modify Figure 2-4 to change Doctors Medical Center site land use to Commercial Mixed Use. Add asterisk (\*) within boundary of the site.

Add footnote to the Land Use Diagram which reads:

\*Development capacity for the Doctors Medical Center site is limited to a maximum capacity such as the equivalent of: a 100-room hotel with restaurant, 50,000 square feet of retail, and 50,000 square feet of office uses per the City's approval of General Plan Amendment # Plan 1502-0007 for this site. Other uses of equal or lesser development capacities may be allowed as set forth for the Commercial Mixed Use designation. Increased development capacity is possible with further evaluation and CEQA review.

### **Specific Plan Page 2-9 (Land Use)**

Modify pie chart to reflect Table 2-1 changes.

### **Specific Plan Page 2-12 (Land Use)**

*Commercial Mixed Use.* This is a mixed-use designation that includes office, retail, commercial, residential, and public uses. Active uses are required for frontage along San Pablo Avenue, and residential uses are allowed only when the commercial FAR is 0.5 or greater. This designation applies primarily to the gateway area at the southern end of the corridor, the Doctors Medical Center site, and near the intersection with Church Lane in the central portion of the corridor. With regard to the nearby existing San Pablo Lytton Casino, use of the Doctors Medical Center site shall be limited to uses complementary to, or supportive of, Class I and/or Class II gaming only, and/or ancillary uses that support these classes of gaming, including uses designated as Recreation-Amusement and/or ancillary uses that support these gaming classes. Uses complementing or supporting any future off-site Class III gaming are not allowed in absence of amendment to City-Tribe Municipal Services Agreement to protect the City's interests. Typical height is expected to be two to three stories, with a maximum allowable height of 40 feet. The maximum FAR is 1.5 and the maximum density is 50 units per gross acre.

**Specific Plan Page 2-16 (Land Use)**

Permitted Uses	Residential (Medium/High)	Residential Mixed Use	Mixed Use Center	Commercial Mixed Use	Commercial (Neigh/Region)
Recreation	<i>See Sub-classifications below</i>				
<i>Amusements</i>	--	--	--	<u>U(8)</u>	<u>U(8)</u>

8. ~~Permitted by right in the Entertainment Overlay District. All other areas require a use permit.~~ Use Permit required, including for on-site parking to support off-site Class I and/or Class II Indian gaming. No on-site parking to support off-site Class III Indian gaming is allowed in absence of an amendment to the City-Tribe Municipal Services Agreement.

**Specific Plan Page 2-20 (Land Use)**

Modify Table 2-5 to add footnote (\*) to the Commercial Mixed Use designation:

\*No residential development capacity is assumed for the Doctors Medical Center site per General Plan Amendment # Plan 1502-0007.

**Specific Plan Page 2-21 (Land Use)**

Modify Table 2-7 to add footnote (\*) to Other Areas column heading:

\*Buildout summary data is modified by General Plan Amendment # Plan 1502-0007 for the Doctors Medical Center site.

**Specific Plan Page 2-23 (Land Use)**

2-I-12 Allow commercial uses to occupy the Public/Institutional area on the north side of Vale Road if medical office facilities vacate and to occupy the Public Institutional area on the south side of Vale Road if the Doctors Medical Center vacates.

---

## **APPENDIX B**

### TRIP GENERATION ASSESSMENT MEMORANDUM

---





## DRAFT MEMORANDUM

Date: November 18, 2015  
To: Ron Sisseem, EMC Planning Group  
From: Kathrin Tellez, Fehr & Peers  
**Subject: Trip Generation and Vehicle Miles of Travel Assessment for Doctors Medical Center, San Pablo**

WC14-3141

This memorandum presents the results of a trip generation and vehicle miles of travel (VMT) assessment for the Doctors Medical Center (DMC) in San Pablo, California, which ceased operations in April 2015. The DMC site is located at 2000 Vale Road, west of San Pablo Avenue. Land uses in the vicinity of the campus include single and multi-family residential, office, retail, educational and casino development. The DMC parcel is designated for public/institutional land uses in the City's *General Plan 2030* and the City's *San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan*, both of which were adopted in 2011 with accompanying Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs). The City of San Pablo proposes to change the land use designation for the site to commercial mixed-use and to rezone the site to commercial to implement that land use designation. The purpose of this assessment is to document the trip generation of the baseline DMC site use as a basis to identify a commercial mixed-use project for the site under the changed designation. The DMC site is within the specific plan boundary. The baseline operations of the DMC facility are assumed to be in the year 2011 when the specific plan EIR was certified.

The following present the Project Description, Trip Generation Analysis, VMT Analysis, and Conclusions.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The DMC site is designated for public/institutional uses in the *San Pablo General Plan 2030* and the *San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan*. The DMC site is on an approximately 10.8 acre parcel, with approximately 303,320 square feet of hospital and supporting uses. Surface parking and a helipad are also on the site. Under the proposed commercial mixed-use designation, a redevelopment project at the site could include a variety of uses.

For this assessment, Fehr & Peers worked with City Staff and the project team to calculate vehicle trip generation for a variety of possible commercial mixed-use development scenarios and compared those estimates to the vehicle trip generating potential of the baseline DMC use, considering its intensity of use in 2011. Based on information provided by the City, the DMC facility was operating at 45 percent of its 189-bed capacity in 2011. An estimate of the vehicle miles of travel generated by the site under baseline DMC use and a potential development scenario was also conducted.

### **TRIP GENERATION ANALYSIS**

Trip generation refers to the process of estimating the amount of vehicular traffic a project might add to the local roadway network. In addition to estimates of daily traffic, estimates are also created for the peak one-hour periods during the morning (AM) and evening (PM) commute hours, when traffic volumes on adjacent streets are typically at their highest.

The vehicle trip generation for the baseline DMC use and for the various uses that could be allowed if the land use designation was changed were estimated based on trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual* (9th Edition) and trip generation studies presented in the ITE Journal. Vehicle trip generation for the baseline DMC use is shown in **Table 1**; considering that the hospital was operating at approximately 45 percent of capacity in 2011, the hospital generated approximately 3,870 daily vehicle trips, including approximately 210 vehicle trips in both the morning and evening peak hours.

With changes to the land use designation, it is anticipated that a variety of uses, including but not limited to lodging, retail, office, and/or medical office uses could be developed on the site. Based on the minimum allowed non-residential floor-area-ratio of 0.5 for site under the commercial mixed-use land use designation, approximately 322,000 square feet of development could occur. However, this level of development is expected to generate vehicle trips on a daily and peak hour basis at a level higher than the baseline DMC use. A representative commercial mixed-use development scenario that would generate traffic at a similar level as the baseline DMC use was developed. This scenario includes the following uses:

- 100-room hotel with supporting restaurant
- 50,000 square feet of retail
- 50,000 square feet of general office

Results of the trip generation analysis are shown in **Table 1**, which indicates that the above commercial mixed-use scenario would generate less traffic on a daily and morning peak hour basis than the baseline DMC use, and a similar level of traffic during the evening peak hour.

<b>TABLE 1 TRIP GENERATION COMPARISON</b>								
Use	Size	Daily	Morning			Evening		
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
<b>Baseline Use</b>								
Hospital <sup>1</sup>	136,490 square feet	3,870	140	72	212	90	124	214
<b>Rezoning Scenario</b>								
Hotel <sup>2</sup>	100 Rooms	890	39	28	67	35	35	70
Shopping Center <sup>3</sup>	50,000 square feet	2,150	31	19	50	90	97	187
Pass-by Reduction	50 Percent	(1,080)	(16)	(10)	(26)	(45)	(49)	(94)
	Net-new retail trips	1,070	15	9	24	45	48	93
Office <sup>4</sup>	50,000 square feet	550	70	8	78	13	62	75
Internalization (10%) <sup>5</sup>		(250)	(12)	(5)	(17)	(9)	(15)	(24)
Subtotal		2,260	112	40	152	84	130	214
<b>Net Change in Vehicle Trip Generation from Existing Use</b>		<b>(1,610)</b>	<b>(28)</b>	<b>(32)</b>	<b>(60)</b>	<b>(6)</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>
Notes:								
1. The 303,320 square foot hospital was operating at approximately 45 percent capacity at the time of the closure; therefore, trip generation based on <i>Trip Generation Manual</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Edition) trip generation equations for land use 610, Hospital assuming 136,490 square feet.								
2. Based on <i>Trip Generation Manual</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Edition) trip generation rates for land use 310, Hotel. Includes a restaurant.								
3. Based on <i>Trip Generation Manual</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Edition) average trip generation rates for land use 820, Shopping Center; A 50 percent pass-by trip reduction was applied to account for vehicle trips already on the roadway system that stop at the site while on an already planned trip.								
4. Based on <i>Trip Generation Manual</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Edition) trip generation rates for land use 710, Office.								
5. Based on guidance contained in the <i>Trip Generation Manual</i> , a 10 percent internalization factor was used to account for patrons of one use also patronizing another use on the site, such as a hotel guest visiting the retail or office use.								
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015.								

**VMT ANALYSIS**

Fehr & Peers estimated the vehicle miles of travel generated by the baseline DMC use and the mixed-use development scenario presented in Table 1. Several sources of data were used, including the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) regional travel demand model and published data, including the National Household Travel Survey, the California Household Travel Survey and the Bay Area Travel Survey. This data was used in combination with the vehicle trip generation estimates from Table 1 to estimate the net change in vehicle miles of travel that could result from redevelopment of the site, as presented in **Table 2**.

<b>TABLE 2 VEHICLE MILES OF TRAVEL</b>			
<b>Use</b>	<b>Daily Trip Generation (From Table 1)</b>	<b>Average Trip Length</b>	<b>Daily VMT</b>
<b>Baseline Use</b>			
Hospital <sup>1</sup>	3,870	10.82	41,870
<b>Rezoning Scenario</b>			
Hotel <sup>2</sup>	800	17.99	14,390
Shopping Center <sup>3</sup>	960	7.64	7,330
Office <sup>4</sup>	500	12.46	6,230
<i>Total VMT</i>			<i>27,950</i>
<b>Net Change in VMT from Existing Use</b>			<b>(13,920)</b>
Notes:			
1. Of the total daily trips, 40 percent are generated by employees at an average trip length of 12.2 miles and 60 percent are generated by patients/visitors with an average trip length of 9.9 miles.			
2. Of the total daily trips, 20 percent are generated by employees at an average trip length of 12.2 miles and 80 percent are generated by guests with an average trip length of 19.4 miles.			
3. Of the total daily trips, 20 percent are generated by employees at an average trip length of 12.2 miles and 80 percent are generated by customers with an average trip length of 6.5 miles.			
4. Of the total daily trips, 95 percent are generated by employees at an average trip length of 12.2 miles and 5 percent are generated by visitors with an average trip length of 17.2 miles.			
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015.			

Under the baseline conditions, site uses generated approximately 41,870 vehicle miles of travel. The rezoning scenario would generate approximately 27,950 vehicle miles of travel on a daily basis, approximately 14,000 fewer miles of vehicle travel.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Results of the trip generation assessment for potential land use designation changes to the DMC site in San Pablo indicate that there are a variety of possible mixed-use development scenarios that could be contemplated for the site that would generate vehicle traffic at a similar or lower level as the baseline DMC use, thus not changing the transportation analysis conclusions presented in either the City's *General Plan 2030* and the City's *San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan* EIRs. The scenario presented in Table 1 is one representative scenario. This representative scenario would also reduce vehicle miles of travel as compared to the baseline DMC use.

Redevelopment of the site at intensities within the floor-area-ratio range for the commercial mixed-use land use designation would likely exceed the level of vehicle trip generation as compared to the baseline DMC use, potentially triggering the need for analysis of off-site impacts to the local and regional transportation system.

This completes our trip generation assessment for the San Pablo Doctors Medical Center. Please call Kathrin if you have questions.



# Media Advisory

## *Information on Health Care Resources for West Contra Costa County Residents*

Monday, April 20, 2015

### **WHAT**

Contra Costa Health Services (CCHS) and its partners have developed a resource list to provide the community information on health care resources in West Contra Costa after Doctors Medical Center San Pablo closes on April 21. The resource list provides information about urgent care centers, including new services starting today at Lifelong Medical Care in San Pablo, as well as other health centers, clinics and a free advice nurse line.

CCHS is urging anyone without health insurance to call the county's free Advice Nurse Line (1-877-661-6230, option 1) for nonlife-threatening conditions. The line is available to anyone 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The advice nurses can help people decide whether they need to seek emergency, urgent or next-day care, and where to get care. Anyone experiencing a life-threatening medical or psychiatric emergency should call 9-1-1 immediately.

### **WHY:**

This resource list will help people find urgent care and other types of health services in West Contra Costa or free medical advice by phone to help them decide what kind of care they need.

### **WHERE:**

The resource list is being distributed throughout the community. A more comprehensive, 2-page version and a 1-page version of the resource list are available in English and Spanish (other languages will be added soon) on Contra Costa Health Services' website. For more information, visit [www.cchealth.org](http://www.cchealth.org). For formation on the new Lifelong Urgent Care Center, visit [www.lifelongmedical.org](http://www.lifelongmedical.org) or call 510-231-9800.



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Edmund G. Brown, Jr., Governor

**NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION**

1550 Harbor Blvd, Suite 100  
West Sacramento, CA 95691  
(916) 373-3710  
(916) 373-5471-FAX



July 23, 2014

Michele Rodriguez  
City of San Pablo  
13831 San Pablo Ave, Bldg 3  
San Pablo, CA 94806

VIA FAX: 510-215-3014  
Number of Pages: 2

RE: Tribal Consultation: 2000 Vale Road GP and Specific Plan Amend, Contra Costa County

Dear Ms. Rodriguez:


Government Code §65352.3 requires local governments to consult with California Native American tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the purpose of protecting, and/or mitigating impacts to cultural places. Attached is a consultation list of tribes with traditional lands or cultural places located within the requested General Plan boundaries.

As a part of consultation, the NAHC recommends that local governments conduct record searches through the NAHC and California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) to determine if any cultural places are located within the area(s) affected by the proposed action. NAHC Sacred Lands File requests must be made in writing. All requests must include: county, USGS quad map name, township, range and section. Local governments should be aware, however, that records maintained by the NAHC and CHRIS are not exhaustive, and a negative response to these searches does not preclude the existence of a cultural place. A tribe may be the only source of information regarding the existence of a cultural place.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from Tribes, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our consultation list contains current information.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (916) 373-3713.

Sincerely,

  
Debbie Pilas-Treadway  
Environmental Specialist III

**Native American Tribal Consultation List  
City of San Pablo  
July 23, 2014**

Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista  
Irene Zwierlein, Chairperson  
789 Canada Road Ohlone/Costanoan  
Woodside, CA 94062  
amahmutsuntribal@gmail.com  
(650) 400-4806 Cell  
(650) 332-1526 Fax

Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan  
Ann Marie Sayers, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 28 Ohlone/Costanoan  
Hollister, CA 95024  
ams@indiancanyon.org  
(831) 637-4238

Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area  
Rosemary Cambra, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 360791 Ohlone / Costanoan  
Milpitas, CA 95036  
muwekma@muwekma.org  
(408) 205-9714  
(510) 581-5194

The Ohlone Indian Tribe  
Andrew Galvan  
P.O. Box 3152 Ohlone/Costanoan  
Fremont, CA 94539 Bay Miwok  
chochenyo@AOL.com Plains Miwok  
(510) 882-0527 Cell Patwin  
(510) 687-9393 Fax

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.



August 18, 2015

Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan  
P.O. Box 28  
Hollister, CA 95024

**RE: Native American Consultation (SB 18 Consultation) for the 2000 Vale Road General Plan and Specific Plan Amendment and Rezone**

The City of San Pablo is considering re-designating property located at 2000 Vale Road near San Pablo Avenue (formerly Doctors Medical Center) to a full range of commercial and office uses. The City is requesting your input of the proposed project to determine if formal consultation is appropriate pursuant to Government Code Section 65352.3 (SB 18). The project involves the following:

- General Plan Amendment – An amendment to the City of San Pablo General Plan 2030 to re-designate the property from Public Institutional to Commercial.
- Specific Plan Amendment – An amendment to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan to re-designate the property from Public Institutional to Mixed Use Commercial.
- Rezone – A rezoning of the property from institutional to Commercial.
- Environmental Review – This project is subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines.

Please refer to the enclosed location map.

The Tribe's input is important to the City's planning process. We are requesting that you advise us at the earliest possible time of your interest in consulting on the project. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65352.3(a)(2), a Tribe has 90 days to respond and request consultation. The Government Code Section also states that Tribes can agree to a shorter timeframe. Due to the potential economic impacts of the DMC closure, the City is requesting a 20 day timeframe for the response and request consultation. As part of the formal action on the project, you will also have an opportunity for review and comment.

If you have any questions, or would like to schedule a consult, please feel free to contact me at 510.215.3031 or via email at [MicheleR@sanpabloca.gov](mailto:MicheleR@sanpabloca.gov).


Sincerely,



Michele Rodriguez

Development Department Director





# Doctors Medical Center

(FORMERLY)

## San Pablo

San Pablo  
Lyonn Calif

Contra Costa  
College

Richmond

Fosse the Riverer WWI  
Home National  
Historical Park

Richmond  
Inner Harbor

Mira Vista Golf  
& Country Club

Wildcat Canyon  
Regional Park

San Pablo Dam Rd

So  
Regi

Pino

Valley Rd

Hilltop Mall

Grant Rd

Richmond Park

San Pablo Ave

Marshall Blvd

30th Ave

Johnston-Knox Fwy

380

580

580

Magwood

10

580

10

580


Talbot Bridge (Toll road)

Richmond

10


10

580



# San Pablo Avenue

## *Specific Plan*



**Adopted**  
SEPTEMBER 2011

PREPARED BY  
**DYETT & BHATIA**  
Urban and Regional Planners



*Commercial Mixed Use.* This is a mixed-use designation that includes office, retail, commercial, residential, and public uses. Active uses are required for frontage along San Pablo Avenue, and residential uses are allowed only when the commercial FAR is 0.5 or greater. This designation applies primarily to the gateway area at the southern end of the corridor, and near the intersection with Church Lane in the central portion of the corridor. Typical height is expected to be two to three stories, with a maximum allowable height of 40 feet. The maximum FAR is 1.5 and the maximum density is 50 units per gross acre.

**Commercial Mixed Use**

Mix of uses with a focus on commercial. Uses include retail, office, institutional, and hotel. Residential uses are not permitted.



Portland, OR  
0.4 FAR



Bay Meadows, San Mateo  
0.95 FAR




Burlingame  
1.1 FAR

**FLOOR AREA RATIO**

FAR expresses the ratio of building square footage to land square footage. For example, a FAR of 2.0 means that for every square foot of land, a developer may build two square feet of building. However, this example does not necessitate a two-story building that covers the entire lot. This FAR illustration describes different ways that a building can be constructed while meeting the FAR requirement. Within each set of examples, the building square footages and FAR values are equal, but the building footprints and heights change. (Note that this illustration does not account for additional setback and lot coverage requirements, described in the Zoning Ordinance.)

**EXAMPLES OF FLOOR AREA RATIOS**





## RESOLUTION 16-01

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN PABLO RECOMMENDING ADOPTION OF AN ADDENDUM TO THE SAN PABLO SPECIFIC PLAN EIR AND APPROVAL OF GENERAL PLAN AND SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS INCLUDING REDESIGNATION TO COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE FOR AN EXISTING 12.5 ACRE PARCEL LOCATED AT 2000 VALE ROAD (FORMER DOCTORS MEDICAL CENTER) (ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER 417-190-019-6).

**WHEREAS**, in 2014, staff received a Kennedy Wilson Brokerage Group flyer “Hospital for SALE \$30,000,000” regarding the Doctors Medical Center located at 2000 Vale Road, San Pablo, California; and,

**WHEREAS**, on April 21, 2015, the West Contra Costa Health Care District (“District”) ceased operations of the Doctors Medical Center despite the City’s efforts to assist the District with its financial challenges including purchasing District property adjoining the DMC site that allows the continuation of urgent health care services to the San Pablo community; and

**WHEREAS**, with the closure of DMC, it is appropriate for the City to consider what the best uses are for the site, particularly given the commercial development surrounding it and the City’s long-standing efforts to plan for the San Pablo Avenue Corridor which is the key gateway into the City including the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan adopted in 2011 (“Specific Plan”), pursuant to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR (“Specific Plan EIR”); and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council adopted Resolution 2015-185 appropriating General Fund Designated Reserves / Economic Development to fund land use and legal consulting agreements to complete the CEQA review for any proposed land use policy changes, PLAN1512-0007, on November 2, 2015; and,

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to Government Code 65352.3 the City of San Pablo requested to consult with California Native American tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission and the City received no requests for consultation; and,

**WHEREAS**, staff proposes that the General Plan and Specific Plan be amended including redesignating the former DMC property as Commercial Mixed-use; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Guidelines section 15164, the effects of the proposed General Plan and Specific Plan amendments would be no greater than the baseline DMC effects as assumed in the environmental setting for the 2011 Specific Plan EIR; substantial changes have not occurred to the environmental and regulatory conditions assumed; no new significant impacts or more several impacts than identified in the Specific Plan EIR were identified. Therefore it was determined that preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration is not necessary; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission has reviewed the EIR Addendum, and intends to take action on the project in compliance with CEQA and state and local guidelines implementing CEQA (attached as Exhibit B of the accompanying Planning Commission Staff Report); and,

**WHEREAS**, the project will result in land use consistency between the General Plan and the San Pablo Specific Plan; and,

**WHEREAS**, the San Pablo Specific Plan Guiding Principles include Walkability and High-Intensity Mix of Uses, where vertical mixes of uses is encouraged or required in an effort to create self-supporting districts. The vision of San Pablo Avenue is a regional thoroughfare to become a vibrant, accessible, and sustainable mixed-use corridor

**WHEREAS**, this action is consistent with General Plan Policy ED-I-26: Undertake strategic initiatives to attract new retail and commercial development; and,

**WHEREAS**, this action is consistent with General Plan land use framework intended for high density mixed use development allowing office, retail, commercial, and residential uses.

**WHEREAS**, requiring consistency with the adjoining casino class I and II use is necessary to ensure compatibility between said uses; and

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing notice has been posted at City Hall has been given by mail to the applicant, local affected agencies and to all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property, the California Native American Tribes on December 21, 2015; and was published in the West County Times on December 26, 2015, in accordance with the requirements of Government Code Section 65091;

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Planning Commission of the City of San Pablo recommends adoption of the Addendum to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR and makes the following findings:

1. The Planning Commission has considered the EIR Addendum together with the Specific Plan EIR. The EIR Addendum reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Commission and the City, as lead agency for the project, has been completed in compliance with CEQA and state and local guidelines implementing CEQA, and is adequate for this proposal.
2. On the basis of the whole record, including the EIR Addendum, the Planning Commission finds on the basis of the whole record, there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment greater than the baseline DMC effects as assumed in the environmental setting for the 2011 Specific Plan EIR; substantial changes have not occurred to the environmental and regulatory conditions assumed; no new significant impacts or more several impacts than identified in the Specific Plan EIR were identified; and therefore preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration is not necessary; and,
3. The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based are in the custody of the Development Services Manager of the City of San Pablo, located at 13831 San Pablo Avenue, San Pablo, CA, 94806;

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Planning Commission of the City of San Pablo finds that the amendments to the General Plan, and Specific Plan are appropriate and desirable to further the public welfare because the The West Contra Costa County Healthcare District has ceased hospital operations and placed the property up for sale, and if sold, the land use designations will provide better guidance to future property owners as to the types of commercial development the City believes would best implement the City's goals and policies for the area as set forth in the General Plan and San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Planning Commission of the City of San Pablo hereby recommends adoption of the Addendum to the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan EIR and approval the General Plan and Specific Plan Amendments regarding the 12.5-acre parcel at 2000 Vale Road formerly known as the Doctors Medical Center, attached hereto as Exhibit 1, including the redesignation of the property to Commercial Mixed-use for PLAN1512-0007, based upon the accompanying Staff Report and its exhibits, which are hereby incorporated by reference.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the foregoing recitations are true and correct, and are included herein by reference.

\*\*\*\*\*

Adopted this 5<sup>th</sup> day of January 2016, by the following vote to wit:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: Sutton, Xavier, Shi, Trujillo  
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: Alvarado  
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS:  
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS:

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michele Rodriguez  
Secretary

APPROVED:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Rita Xavier  
Chairperson