EXHIBIT A

Date: June 7, 2004
To: City File 99-EIA-9
From: Planning and Community Environment Department
Subject: Minor Modifications, Revisions and Corrections to the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Hyatt Rickey’s Hotel and Residential Project, 4219 El Camino Real, Palo Alto

Background

In February 2003, the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) prepared for the Hyatt Rickey’s Hotel and Residential Project was completed and published. The FEIR is comprised of the following documents:

Volume 1 – Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), March 2002
Volume 2 – Responses to Comments on the DEIR and associated revisions to the DEIR, February 2003
Volume 3 – Verbatim written comments and public hearing minutes, coded to correspond to the summary comments and related responses in Volume 2, February 2003

Subsequent to the publication of this FEIR, on April 14, 2003, the City Council directed staff to prepare a plan for transportation, urban design and landscape improvements for the Charleston/Arastradero Road Corridor. This plan was initiated as a follow-up to the Charleston Road Corridor Traffic Management and Safety Study, which was reviewed and accepted by the City Council in December 2000. The purpose of the improvement plan is to address school commute and other travel safety concerns for pedestrians, bicyclist and drivers, as well as to incorporate residential amenities along the corridor without inducing traffic onto nearby residential streets. The City Council imposed an interim moratorium on the processing of planning applications and permits for projects along the Charleston Road/Arastradero corridor while this plan was being prepared. Consequently, the processing of the Hyatt Rickey’s project and certification of the project FEIR was tolled. The interim moratorium was lifted in Spring 2004.

Since the February 2003 publication of the FEIR, there have been some changes in the status of information provided in this document. In order to certify the FEIR as complete, accurate and
current, the changes in information need to be identified and incorporated into the document. The purpose of this memorandum is to identify these changes and incorporate the appropriate revisions and modifications into the FEIR to ensure that the document is current. It should be noted that the information that is being revised in the FEIR would: a) essentially update, clarify and amplify information that is already provided in the FEIR; b) not result in any new significant impacts that had not been previously identified; and c) not result in the need for new mitigation measures that had not been previously recommended. Therefore, per CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, a re-circulation of the document is not required.

**Updated Information**

The FEIR currently includes extensive discussion of and reference to several City studies and projects that were underway when the FEIR was published (February 2003). Since the FEIR publication, the following action has been taken on City-sponsored studies/projects that are pertinent to the Hyatt Rickey’s project site:

1. The Charleston/Arastradero Corridor Improvement Plan was completed and adopted by the City Council in January 2004. This plan proposes improvements along Charleston Road, which should be acknowledged in the FEIR.
2. As follow-up to the City Council action to impose Citywide Development Impact Fees (March 25, 2002), fee amounts were established/set for the Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) and a Community Facilities Impact Fee (October 7, 2002). However, a Public Safety Impact, which had been recommended in the initial City Manager’s Report on impact fees, has not been adopted. Lastly, the Housing Impact Fee was updated.
3. The Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan Housing Element Update was adopted by the City Council on December 2, 2003 (Resolution No. 8232). This update includes changes in the City’s below market rate (BMR) housing requirements for new development. For development of sites that are larger than five acres in size, the BMR component requirement was increased from 15% to 20%.
4. The South El Camino Real Design Guidelines (2002) were endorsed by the City Architectural Review Board on June 6, 2002. However, these guidelines are not referenced in the FEIR. As the City is currently using these guidelines in the assessing new development projects in the South El Camino Real area, reference to these guidelines in this FEIR is appropriate.

Secondly, in May 2004, the project sponsor filed revisions to the initial hotel and residential project. The revised project presents a significantly smaller development of the site with 185 residential units. This revised project does not include a hotel land use component. It has been determined that this FEIR adequately addresses and covers all of the potential environmental effects of and the mitigation measures that would be required for this revised project for the following reasons:

1. The revised project would retain some of the basic concepts and description of the initial project and the project alternatives studied in the FEIR, except at a significantly smaller
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scale and size. This revised project is essentially a smaller-scale hybrid of the initial hotel/residential project and several of the FEIR project alternatives. Specifically, the revised project presents the same land use concepts presented in FEIR Alternative 18.8 (an all residential development containing up to 475 residential units), and proposes similar site planning concepts as the initial project and FEIR Alternatives 18.2, 18.3 and 18.4 (mixed hotel and residential developments with a lower residential density along the Charleston Road and Wilkie Way border of the site). Since the FEIR Alternatives analysis presented in Section 18 provides a detailed and quantitative review of impacts at a greater degree not typical of a Project EIR, the City can rely on this environmental document to consider approval of or action on any of the FEIR alternatives or a revised project that is similar to the project or these alternatives.

2. The revised project has been designed to respond to community concerns and implement a number of the mitigation measures recommended in the FEIR. While this revised project would result in an all-residential development of the site instead of the initially proposed mixed hotel and residential development, this revised project would not result in any new significant environmental impacts that had not been previously identified and analyzed. Actually, the revised project responds to and implements a number of the FEIR recommended mitigation measures, which would result in the elimination or reduction of certain significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. Other significant impacts would be mitigated by application of the mitigation measures identified in the EIR.

Lastly, it has been discovered that that there are several documents referenced in the FEIR, which had not been included in the published document. Furthermore, several errors were found, which require correction. These include the following:

1. A September 9, 2002 memorandum from Dave Dockter, Planning Division Managing Arborist is referenced in the FEIR (FEIR Appendix C) but is not included as an appendix. This memorandum identifies tree resources on the project site that are regulated by the City and recommendations for tree preservation.
2. DEIR comment letter number 71 (letter from Henry Lum, April 22, 2002) was not included in FEIR Volume 3.

Modifications, Revisions and Corrections to FEIR

The following minor modifications, revisions and corrections are incorporated into the FEIR (underline/strikeout format):

1. The following new sub-section (Section 3.8) is added to Volume 1 (DEIR), Section 3 (Project Description), page 3-50 to address and incorporate the project revisions filed by the project sponsor in May 2004:
3.8 REVISED PROJECT – MAY 2004

In May 2004, the project sponsor filed revisions to the project described in this section and assessed in this environmental document. The revised project proposes an all-residential development of the 15.84-acre site, with no hotel land use component. The revised project presents a similar land use concept as FEIR Alternative 18.8, described and analyzed in Section 18 of this document. Furthermore, the revised project presents site-planning features that are similar to the initially proposed project and FEIR Alternatives 18.2, 18.3 and 18.4. However, the revised project proposes a development that is substantially lower in scale, size and density than the initial project and these alternatives. In part, the project revisions were filed to address and mitigate the environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures summarized in this environmental document.

The revised project proposes a redevelopment of the 15.84-acre site with 185 for-sale residential units:

- Some of the residential units are designed to front and orient toward El Camino Real, Charleston Road and Wilkie Way. These units would be sited to meet setback requirements and would respect the existing landscape buffer (L Combining District) along the Charleston Road and Wilkie Way frontages. The majority of the residential units are oriented inward to the project site and are sited around clusters and courts. Building to site area coverage is estimated at 26%.

- The project site would be accessed from El Camino Real (one main driveway) and Wilkie Way (existing driveway). The El Camino Real driveway would serve as the main, primary access to the development. No physical changes to the existing Wilkie Way driveway are proposed. Unlike the initial project, no access to the project site is proposed from Charleston Road. Internal site circulation is essentially provided by a private loop road, which would provide direct access to units or access to private auto courts or driveways. Uncovered guest parking is proposed throughout the project site to meet minimum off-street parking requirements.

- The revised site plan is designed to include large expanses of common open space and landscaped grounds (32% of the site coverage). This common open space has been arranged to preserve many but not all of the “regulated trees” (which include protected trees) that are found on the site. These trees are referenced in Section 15 (Biological Resources) of this document.

- As this revised project proposes an all-residential development within the CS (Service Commercial) District, it is required to comply with the standards of the RM-30 (Multiple-Family Residential) District and the City’s Multiple-Family Residence District Guidelines (PAMC Chapter 18.28). The revised project is designed to comply with the spatial standards of the RM-30 District, including daylight plane and
special setback requirements. However, the revised project includes detached, single-family homes, which would not comply with the R-1 District site development regulations.

The proposed residential unit types include:

- **Fifteen (15) two-story, detached single-family homes sited along the Wilkie Way frontage.** Exclusive of the land area within the L Combining District, this band of homes would result in a lower density.

- **Ninety-five 95 attached row homes and 75 attached townhomes.** The row homes are designed to be 2100 square feet in size, while the attached townhomes would be 1700 square feet. These units would range in height from two- to three-stories, with no structure exceeding 35 feet. The two-story structures are sited along the project edges fronting Charleston Road and El Camino Real. The taller, three-story buildings are sited within the project site, where they are less visible from off-site.

- **Each residential unit is designed to include an attached two-car garage.** Unlike the initial project, no sub-surface parking garages are proposed.

- **Each residential unit is designed to include a fenced, private yard/patio area.**

The revised project proposes that 20% of the units (37 townhomes) be reserved for sale as below-market-rate (BMR) units. This proposal is intended to comply with the City’s recently adopted Housing Element policy, which requires a 20% BMR housing component for development projects on sites of five acres or more.

As this revised project is essentially a smaller hybrid of the project and four FEIR alternatives described and assessed in this environmental document, it would not result in any new significant environmental effects that have not been previously analyzed, nor would it result in any new mitigation measures that have not been included and recommended in this document. The impacts and mitigation measures presented in this document represent a worst-case assessment, and the project revisions would either mitigate the identified impacts to a less-than-significant level or result in lower impacts than those presented in this document. Nonetheless, prior to approval of planning applications for this revised project, it will need to be demonstrated how this environmental document adequately assesses the impacts of this revised project in order to determine whether it should be supplemented.”

2. The following changes address and incorporate the background and recommendations of the Charleston/Arastradero Corridor Improvement Plan (January 2004):
New text is added to Volume 1 (DEIR), Section 8 (Transportation and Traffic), page 8-4, under the discussion of Charleston Road, add new fourth and fifth paragraphs to read:

“As follow-up to and implementation of the Charleston Road Corridor Traffic Management and Safety Study, on April 14, 2003, the City Council directed staff to prepare a plan addressing transportation and urban design improvements along the Charleston/Arastradero corridor. Simultaneously, the City Council imposed an interim moratorium on the processing of planning applications and permits for projects along the Charleston Road/Arastradero corridor while this plan was being prepared. The Charleston/Arastradero Corridor Improvement Plan was completed and adopted by the City Council in January 2004. The purpose of the improvement plan is to: a) address school commute and other travel safety concerns for pedestrians, bicyclist and drivers; and b) incorporate residential amenities along the corridor without inducing traffic to shift onto nearby residential streets, while maintaining capacity for existing and projected traffic. Improvements recommended in the plan include visual frontage improvements (lighting, signage, speed advisory signs), infrastructure improvements (traffic adaptive signal technology, medians, lane reductions, lighted crosswalks, vegetation islands, continuous bike lanes, colored asphalt bike lanes, pedestrian bulbouts) and City transit service improvements to address school commute and other travel safety concerns for all travel modes. All improvements would be contained within the existing public right-of-way width along Charleston Road and Arastradero Road. With regard to the portion of the corridor that is immediately adjacent to the Hyatt Rickey’s project site (that portion along Charleston Road between El Camino Real and Wilkie Way) the plan recommends improvements, which include the following, among others:

1. Removal of the two free right-turn (“porkchop”) islands to improve bicycle and pedestrian safety on the southern leg of the El Camino Real and Charleston/Arastradero Road intersection.
2. Provision for continuous bicycle lanes to enhance cycling safety. Tinting or painting these bicycle lanes for higher visibility to both motorists and cyclists and the corridor.
3. Retaining the four lane travel lanes (two in each direction) on Charleston Road from El Camino Real to Alma with intermittent “tree islands” (small medians).
4. Installation of frontage improvements, including street trees and new street lighting along the corridor.

The plan recommends a first phase demonstration program, which would be implemented to test temporary improvements during a trial period. The finding sources and options that have been identified in the plan include federal, state and regional grants, as well as traffic impact fees.
It should be noted that preparation of the improvement plan included a modeling of existing and future traffic conditions along the corridor by TJKM Transportation Consultants. One analysis of the modeling assessed land use growth based on the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan (2015 build-out), which assumed that the Hyatt Rickey’s site would be redeveloped with 150 residential units and 100 residential hotel suites. TJKM also assessed a 2015 scenario incorporating “known proposed projects,” which included the Hyatt Rickey’s development as proposed and describe in this FEIR. The purpose of the traffic analysis was to demonstrate how the corridor intersections would function and operate during AM and PM peak hour conditions with implementation of the plan measures. With the improvements that are proposed, TJKM concluded that two of the intersections along the corridor would operate at improved level of service conditions.

b. New text added to Volume 1 (DEIR), Table 2.1 and Section 8 (Transportation and Traffic, page 8-51, Mitigation 8-1 (required right turn lane on eastbound Charleston Road to southbound Alma Street), add new last paragraph to read:

“The installation of a right-turn lane at the Charleston Road/Alma Street intersection, as recommended by this mitigation measure, would not be consistent with the improvements recommended in the Charleston/Arastradero Corridor Improvement Plan (2004). This improvement plan does not recommend a right-turn at this intersection. Furthermore, this plan recommends that all improvements are to be contained within the existing, public right-of-way width along Charleston Road. As noted above, additional public right-of-way would need to be purchased to accommodate the right-turn lane and retain the existing bicycle lanes.”

c. New text added to Volume 1 (DEIR), Table 2.1 and Section 8 (Transportation and Traffic, page 8-59, Mitigation 8-3 (provide a left-turn deceleration lane at the Charleston Road main driveway entrance), add new last paragraph to read:

“The installation of a left-turn lane deceleration lane at this Charleston Road location, as recommended by this mitigation measure, would not be consistent with the improvements recommended in the Charleston/Arastradero Corridor Improvement Plan (2004). This improvement plan recommends the installation of a center, tree planting median at this location, which would prohibit a vehicle crossing.”

d. New text added to Volume 1 (DEIR), Table 2.1 and Section 8 (Transportation and Traffic, page 8-60, Mitigation 8-4 (prohibit outbound left-turns at the Charleston Road main driveway entrance) and page 8-65, Mitigation 8-5 (prohibit left-turns at Charleston Road westerly driveway entrance), add new last paragraph to read:
“This mitigation measure would be consistent with the improvements recommended in the Charleston/Arastradero Corridor Improvement Plan (2004). This improvement plan recommends the installation of a center, tree planting median at this location, which would prohibit a vehicle crossing.”

e. New text added to Volume 1 (DEIR), Table 2.1 and Section 8 (Transportation and Traffic, page 8-85, Mitigation 8-8 (bicycle lane/intersection improvements), add new last paragraph to read:

“This mitigation measure would be consistent with the improvements recommended in the Charleston/Arastradero Corridor Improvement Plan (2004). This improvement plan recommends the removal of the right-turn “porkchop” island.”

3. The following changes address and incorporate the current status of the Citywide Development Impact Fees:

a. Volume 1 (DEIR), Section 8 (Transportation and Parking), sub-section 8.1.7 (Planned Local Circulation Improvements or Changes), page 8-28 is revised to add new sub-section 8.1.7c) to read:

“(c) Traffic Impact Fees (TIF). On October 7, 2002, the City Council adopted Ordinance 4763, which amended Traffic Impact Fees (TIF) required for new development. A new TIF was adopted for new development projects in the Stanford Research Park/El Camino Real CS Zoning District. Per this ordinance, the nonresidential development portion of the Hyatt Rickey’s Hotel and Residential project would be subject to these fees, but the fee would apply only to new building square footage. The residential development portion of the project would be exempt from the TIF. As this fee is adopted and required as a standard condition of project approval, no separate or additional mitigation is required to impose this fee on the proposed project.”

b. Volume 1 (DEIR), Mitigation 9-4 (Table 2.1 and Section 9, Public Services and Utilities) addresses a Public Safety Impact Fee for police service impacts, which has not been adopted by the City Council. Therefore, the first portion of this mitigation measure is revised to read:

“Mitigation 9-4. In the event the City adopts a Public Safety Impact Fee prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the proposed project, the project shall be subject to this fee to mitigate police service impacts. If the new Public Safety Impact Fee currently being considered by the City is adopted prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the proposed project, the fee shall apply to the project as a condition of Site and Design Review approval.
Otherwise, the PAPD shall continue to monitor the rate of additional police calls per year associated with the project area. . . .”

c. Volume 1 (DEIR), Mitigation 9-8 (Table 2.1 and Section 9, Public Services and Utilities) addresses a Public Safety Impact Fee for fire protection/emergency medical service impacts, which has not been adopted by the City Council. Therefore, Mitigation 9-8 (1) is revised to read:

“Mitigation 9-8. Implement any one of the following alternative mitigations in order to reduce identified cumulative impacts on fire and EMS services to less-than-significant levels:

(1) In the event the City adopts a Public Safety Impact Fee prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the proposed project, the project shall be subject to this fee. If the new Public Safety Impact Fee currently being considered by the City is adopted prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the proposed project, the fee shall apply to the project as a condition of Site and Design Review approval; or . . .”
[(2) and (3) remain unchanged]

d. Volume 1 (DEIR), Mitigation 9-10 (Table 2.1 and Section 9, Public Services and Utilities) addresses a Parks and Community Facilities Impact Fee for park and recreation impacts, which has been adopted and set since the publication of the DEIR (March 2002). Therefore, this mitigation measure is replaced in its entirety to read:

“Mitigation 9-10. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the proposed project, the project sponsor shall pay the City-adopted Parks and Community Facilities Impact Fee. The fee shall be imposed as a condition of project approval. Should the project site plan be revised to incorporate an on-site mini-park sufficient to serve the project residents and satisfy the City’s neighborhood park requirement, a credit to this impact fee may be considered and approved by the City. Implementation of this measure would reduce project impacts on neighborhood and district park facilities, recreational programs, and libraries to a less-than-significant level.”

4. The following changes address and incorporate the Housing Element Update, adopted by the City in 2003:

a. Volume 1 (DEIR), Section 6 (Population, Housing and Employment), page 6-13 (Compliance with City Affordable Housing Goals), the second and third paragraphs are replaced in their entirety to read:
“The Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan Housing Element Update (1999-2006) was adopted in December 2003. As a result, the BMR requirement for this project has been increased to 20% (or 60 units based on the proposed residential unit count of 302). For mixed residential/commercial projects on sites of five acres or greater, the provision requires that a 20% BMR component be applied for the housing component, or that a payment of a BMR fee be applied for the commercial component, whichever yields the most BMR units.”

Other text references to the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan Housing Element Update (1999-2006) as being “pending” in Volumes 1 and 2 are hereby amended to reflect the City’s adoption of this document in December 2003.

b. Volume 1 (DEIR), Mitigation 6-1 (in Table 2.1 and in Section 6, Population Housing and Employment) is revised to read:

“Mitigation 6-1. The applicant shall enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City that shall provide for the following items or equivalent provisions acceptable to the City and Palo Alto Housing Corporation (PAHC): (1) 20 percent of the total project unit count shall be reserved as BMR units, consistent with the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan Housing Element Update (1999-2006), adopted in December 2003, which with the proposed 302 residential unit total would yield 45 BMR units; (2) provisions for PAHC (or other City entity) administration of the BMR units; and (3) provisions for the units to be rented to eligible households at BMR levels. In case the project ultimately results in the sale of the residential units as condominiums, the third provision shall also include details for the sale and administration of these BMR units. This measure would reduce this potential impact to less-than-significant levels.

The second paragraph of this mitigation measure is hereby deleted.

5. The following changes address and incorporate reference to the South El Camino Real Design Guidelines (2002):

a. Volume 1 (DEIR), Mitigation 7-2 (in Table 2.1 and in Section 7, Land Use), this measure is revised to read:

“Mitigation 7-2. In conducting Site and Design Review, the City shall give special attention to the adequacy of proposed parking area visual screening along the project’s El Camino Real frontage. Although the El Camino Real Design Guidelines are advisory only and are not adopted by City policy, The project site plan should be revised to place most or all of the project parking behind the project buildings, or where this is not feasible, the City shall require that the project final landscape design to include additional substantial vegetation screening between any retained surface parking (e.g., one tree every 25 feet and/or
dual tree rows), a landscape berm treatment along El Camino Real, and possibly, and additional setback as necessary to accommodate the berm location between the street and parking area. Discretionary determination by the City that the project final design is consistent with El Camino Real Design Guidelines, the South El Camino Real Design Guidelines, endorsed by the City Architectural Review Board (June 6, 2002) and the land use and design standards set forth in PAMC Sections 16.48 and 18.28, will establish that the visual impacts of the project from El Camino Real have been reduced to an acceptable less-than-significant level.”

6. The following changes address and incorporate the September 9, 2002 memorandum from Dave Dockter, Planning Division Managing Arborist regarding tree resources and tree protection:

a. Volume 1 (DEIR), Section 15 (Biological Resources), page 15-3 (b) summarizing protected trees, is expanded to include the following text:

“The City of Palo Alto Planning Division Managing Arborist (Dave Dockter) completed a review of all tree surveys prepared for environmental review. In addition, an independent survey of the site was conducted by the Managing Arborist in summer 2002. The findings of this additional survey and a summary of City “regulated trees” is provided in a memorandum from Dave Dockter, dated September 9, 2002 (found in FEIR Appendix F). This memorandum contains a list of the regulated trees and tree groves that are recommended for preservation and protection, consistent with the City of Palo Alto Technical Tree Manual, in order to reduce impacts to tree resources to less-than-significant levels.”

b. Volume 1 (DEIR), Mitigation 15-2 (in Table 2.1 and Section 15, Biological Resources), the first portion of this measure is revised to read:

“Mitigation 15-2. The project site plan shall be revised to preserve the “protected trees” on the site, as identified and inventoried by the Planning Division Managing Arborist (September 9, 2002 memorandum, FEIR Appendix F). Prior to any grading and/or demolition activities --, e.g., as a condition of project grading permit and tree removal permit approval, . . .”

All references to “Final EIR Appendix B” noted in Mitigation 15-1 is hereby replaced with reference to FEIR Appendix F.

c. Volume 1 (DEIR), Mitigation 15-2 (in Table 2.1 and Section 15, Biological Resources), the first portion of this measure is revised to read:

“Mitigation 15-2. The project site plan shall be revised to preserve the “protected trees” on the site, as identified and inventoried by the Planning Division
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Managing Arborist (September 9, 2002 memorandum, FEIR Appendix F). Prior
to the preparation of the tree removal and replacement plan, . . .”

d. Volume 2 (Responses to Comments on DEIR), Contents table, page ii, number 4
entitled, FINAL EIR APPENDICES (see VOLUME 3 OF THE FINAL EIR) is
replaced with the following to address the correct
number, reference and order of
appendices presented in FEIR Volume 3:

“4. FINAL EIR APPENDICES (See VOLUME 3 of the Final EIR)

FEIR Appendix A: . . . (no change).

FEIR Appendix B: September 9, 2002 Memorandum from Dave Dockter, City-
Managing Arborist

FEIR Appendix B: Minutes of April 18, 2002 meeting of the City of Palo Alto
Architectural Review Board

FEIR Appendix C: Minutes of April 24, April 30, 2002 meetings of the City of
Palo Alto Planning and Transportation Commission

FEIR Appendix C D: Letter and attachments from Lane Liroff re: Declaration
Documenting Recent Overflow Parking Problems Associated with Hyatt
Operation

FEIR Appendix D E: Additional EIR Appendices

- Additional Letters Received During Public Scoping Process
- Photographs by Local Residents of Hotel Related Off-site Parking Activity
- Note Regarding Removal of Tables TA-12 and TA-20 from DEIR

FEIR Appendix F: September 9, 2002 Memorandum from Dave Dockter,
Planning Division Managing Arborist”

All references to Final EIR Appendix B” noted in Volume 2 is hereby replaced
with reference to FEIR Appendix F.

e. Volume 3 (Verbatim comments Memorandum from Dave Dockter, Planning
Division Managing Arborist, dated September 9, 2002 is hereby added as FEIR
Appendix F.

7. DEIR comment letter from Henry Lum, dated April 22, 2002 (attached) is hereby
incorporated into FEIR Volume 3 (verbatim written comments), comment letter number
71.
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Attachments:
Memorandum from Dave Dockter, Planning Division Managing Arborist; September 9, 2002
Letter from Henry Lum; April 22, 2002