1. Executive Summary

This chapter presents an overview of the proposed San Leandro General Plan Update ("proposed Plan") and Zoning Code amendments, herein together referred to as the "proposed project." This executive summary also provides a summary of the alternatives to the proposed project, identifies issues to be resolved, areas of controversy, and conclusions of the analysis contained in Chapters 4.0 through 4.14 of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR). For a complete description of the proposed project, see Chapter 3, Project Description. For a discussion of alternatives to the proposed project, see Chapter 6, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.

This Draft EIR addresses the environmental effects associated with adoption and implementation of the proposed project. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies, prior to taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An Environmental Impact Report is a public document designed to provide the public, local, and State governmental agency decision-makers with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision-making.

This Draft EIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Division 13, Section 21000, et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15000, et seq.) to determine if approval of the identified discretionary actions and related subsequent development could have a significant impact on the environment. The City of San Leandro, as the Lead Agency, has reviewed and revised as necessary all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on applicable City technical personnel and review of all technical reports. Information for this Draft EIR was obtained from on-site field observations; discussions with public service agencies; analysis of adopted plans and policies; review of available studies, reports, data, and similar literature in the public domain; and specialized environmental assessments (e.g. air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, geotechnical and transportation and traffic).

1.1 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This Draft EIR has been prepared to assess the environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed project. The six main objectives of this document as established by CEQA are:

- To disclose to decision-makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
- To identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.
- To prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.

- To disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects.
- To foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
- To enhance public participation in the planning process.

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in the CEQA statute and in the CEQA Guidelines. It provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed project, to the extent feasible. EIRs are intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a proposed project that has the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts. An EIR is also one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Prior to approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information contained in the EIR, determine whether the EIR was properly prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency, adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives, and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if the proposed project would result in significant impacts that cannot be avoided.

1.1.1 EIR ORGANIZATION

This Draft EIR is organized into the following chapters:

- Chapter 1: Executive Summary. Summarizes environmental consequences that would result from implementation of the Project, describes recommended mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of environmental impacts before and after mitigation.
- Chapter 2: Introduction. Provides an overview describing the Draft EIR document.
- Chapter 3: Project Description. Describes the proposed project in detail, including the characteristics, objectives, and the structural and technical elements of the proposed action.
- Chapter 4: Environmental Evaluation. Organized into 14 sub-chapters corresponding to the environmental resource categories identified in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, this section provides a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the proposed project as they existed at the time the Notice of Preparation was published, from both a local and regional perspective. Additionally, this chapter provides an analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, and recommended mitigation measures, if required, to reduce the impacts to less than significant where possible, and to reduce their magnitude or significance when impacts cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The environmental setting included in each sub-chapter provides baseline physical conditions, which provide a context, which the lead agency uses to determine the significance of environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. Each sub-chapter also includes a description of the thresholds used to determine if a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project; and the potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project.
- Chapter 5: Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts. Identifies impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, and therefore would remain significant and unavoidable.

- Chapter 6: Alternatives to the Proposed Project. Considers alternatives to the proposed project, including the CEQA-required "No Project" Alternative, a Reduced Floodplain Development alternative, and a Reduced Industrial Alternative.
- Chapter 7: CEQA-Mandated Sections. Discusses growth inducement, cumulative impacts, unavoidable significant effects, and significant irreversible changes as a result of the proposed project.
- Chapter 8: Organizations and Persons Consulted. Lists the people and organizations that were contacted during the preparation of this EIR for the proposed Project.
- Appendices: The appendices for this document (presented in PDF format on a CD attached to the back cover) contain the following supporting documents:
  - Appendix A: Notice of Preparation (NOP) and NOP Comment Letters
  - Appendix B: Proposed Zoning Code Amendments
  - Appendix C: Buildout Methodology
  - Appendix D: Planning Considerations for Sea Level Rise
  - Appendix E: Planning Considerations for Siting a New Receptor Proximate to Major Sources of Air Pollution
  - Appendix F: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Data
  - Appendix G: Noise Data
  - Appendix H: Transportation and Traffic Data

1.1.2 TYPE AND PURPOSE OF THIS DRAFT EIR

According to Section 15121(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of an EIR is to:

> Inform public agency decision makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.

As described in the CEQA Guidelines, different types of EIRs are used for varying situations and intended uses. Because of the long-term planning horizon of the proposed project and the permitting, planning, and development actions that are related both geographically and as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions for implementation, this Draft EIR has been prepared as a program EIR for the proposed project, pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Once a program EIR has been certified, subsequent activities within the program must be evaluated to determine whether additional CEQA review needs to be prepared. However, if the program EIR addresses the program's effects as specifically and comprehensively as possible, subsequent activities could be found to be within the program EIR scope, and additional environmental review may not be required (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c]). When a program EIR is relied on for a subsequent activity, the lead agency must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into the subsequent actions (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[c][3]). If a subsequent activity would have effects that are not within the scope of a program EIR, the lead agency must prepare a new Initial Study leading to a Negative Declaration, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an EIR. For these subsequent environmental review documents, this Program EIR will serve as the first-tier environmental analysis.

1.2 SUMMARY OF PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed General Plan Update replaces the City's existing General Plan, which was last comprehensively updated in 2002. The proposed General Plan Update is intended to guide development and conservation in the city through the 2035 buildout horizon of the General Plan. State law requires that the General Plan contain seven elements: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Open Space, Noise, Safety, and Conservation. The content of these elements is outlined in State law. The General Plan Update includes all State-required elements and some optional elements, including the following: Land Use; Transportation; Open Space, Parks, and Conservation; Environmental Hazards; Economic Development; and Historic Preservation and Community Design Elements. Key elements or components of the General Plan Update include housing, land use and circulation/transportation. The 2015-2023 Housing Element was adopted in January 2015 and certified by State Housing and Community Development in February 2015.

For most of San Leandro, including single-family residential neighborhoods and the Downtown area, the current land use designations established by the 2002 General Plan would remain unchanged. The proposed Plan removes the Office land use designation and includes the following new land use designations:

- Medium-High Density Residential
- Bay Fair Transit-Oriented Development
- Industrial Transition

The majority of proposed changes to the General Plan land use map consist of the redesignation of sites that were previously designated as Office (now an obsolete land use designation), or the application of the new land use designations to sites that were previously designated for other uses. Implementation of the proposed project is projected to result in in 5,595 new housing units, 14,790 new residents, and 12,130 new jobs in 2035.

For a detailed description of the proposed project, please see Chapter 3, Project Description, of this Draft EIR.

1.3 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

This Draft EIR analyzes alternatives to the proposed project that are designed to reduce the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project and feasibly attain most of the proposed project objectives. There is no set methodology for comparing the alternatives or determining the environmentally superior alternative under CEQA. Identification of the environmentally superior alternative involves weighing and balancing all of the environmental resource areas by the City. The following alternatives to the proposed project were considered and analyzed in detail:

- No Project Alternative
- Reduced Floodplain Development Alternative
- Reduced Industrial Alternative

Chapter 6, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, of this Draft EIR, includes a complete discussion of these alternatives and of alternatives that were rejected for various reasons.

1.3.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Consistent with Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, under the No Project Alternative, the proposed project would not be adopted or implemented, and further development in the city would continue to be subject to existing policies, regulations, development standards, and land use designations under the existing San Leandro General Plan.

1.3.2 REDUCED FLOODPLAIN DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

The Reduced Floodplain Development Alternative would include a General Plan land use map that imposes buffers to development alongside portions of San Leandro's creeks and flood control channels, in order to lower future risk associated with 100-year floodplains.

1.3.3 REDUCED INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

In the Reduced Industrial Development Alternative, some of the industrial areas on the proposed Plan land use map would be converted to residential uses. This would have the benefit of reducing industrial uses that would create new sources of Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) near new sensitive receptors.

1.4 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR identify issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With regard to the proposed project, the major issues to be resolved include decisions by the City of San Leandro, as Lead Agency, related to:

- Whether this Draft EIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the proposed project.
- Whether the benefits of the proposed project override those environmental impacts that cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance.
- Whether the proposed land use changes are compatible with the character of the existing area.
- Whether the identified goals, policies, or mitigation measures should be adopted or modified.
- Whether there are other mitigation measures that should be applied to the proposed project besides those Mitigation Measures identified in the Draft EIR.
- Whether there are any alternatives to the proposed project that would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed project and achieve most of the basic objectives.

1.5 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The City issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on November 4, 2014. The CEQA-mandated scoping period for this EIR was between November 4, 2014 and December 3, 2014, during which interested agencies and the public could submit comments about the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project.

During this time, the City received comment letters from a variety of State and local agencies, as well as several organizations.

The following is a discussion of issues that are likely to be of particular concern to agencies and interested members of the public during the environmental review process. While every concern applicable to the CEQA process is addressed in this Draft EIR, this list is not necessarily exhaustive, but rather attempts to capture those concerns that are likely to generate the greatest interest based on the input received during the scoping process.

- Water quality and supply related to wastewater treatment and recycled water.
- Protection of the shoreline related to sea level rise.
- Public access to the shoreline.
- Consistency with the Alameda County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Oakland International Airport.
- Exposure to noise from the Oakland International Airport.
- Vehicular circulation and traffic impacts.
- Cultural resources protection.
- Visual impacts of higher-density development.
- Impacts of development on public services.

1.6 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 1-1 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in this Draft EIR and presents a summary of impacts and mitigation measures identified. It is organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapters 4.1 through 4.14. The table is arranged in four columns: 1) impact; 2) significance before mitigation; 3) mitigation measures; and 4) significance after mitigation. For a complete description of potential impacts, please refer to the specific discussions in Chapters 4.1 through 4.14.

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
AESTHETICS			
AES-1: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-2: The proposed project would not substantially degrade the view from a scenic highway, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings.	No Impact	N/A	N/A
AES-3: The proposed project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-4: The proposed project would not expose people on- or off-site to substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AES-5: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to aesthetics.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AIR QUALITY			
AQ-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AQ-2A: Despite implementation of the policies in the proposed Plan, criteria air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project would cause a substantial net increase in emissions that exceeds the BAAQMD regional significance thresholds.	S	AQ-2A: Prior to issuance of construction permits, development project applicants that are subject to CEQA and exceed the screening sizes in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines shall prepare and submit to the City of San Leandro a technical assessment evaluating potential air quality impacts related to the project's operation phase. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with the BAAQMD methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operation-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance, as identified in BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines, the City of San Leandro Community Development Department shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operation activities.	SU

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
AQ-2B: Despite implementation of the proposed project policies, criteria air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project construction activities would generate a substantial net increase in emissions that exceeds the BAAQMD regional significance thresholds.	S	AQ-2B-1: As part of the City's development approval process, the City shall require applicants for future development projects to comply with the current Bay Area Air Quality Management District's basic control measures for reducing construction emissions of PM_{10} (Table 8-1, Basic Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for All Proposed Projects, of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines).	SU
		AQ-2B-2: Prior to issuance of construction permits, development project applicants that are subject to CEQA and exceed the screening sizes in the BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines shall prepare and submit to the City of San Leandro a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with the BAAQMD methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance, as identified in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, the City of San Leandro shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities to below these thresholds (Table 8-2, Additional Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for Projects with Construction Emissions Above the Threshold, of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, or applicable construction mitigation measures subsequently approved by BAAQMD). These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g. construction management plans) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City's Engineering/Transportation Department, Building and/or Planning Division, and/or Community Development Department.	
AQ-3: Warehousing operations could generate a substantial amount of diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions from off-road equipment use and truck idling. In addition, some warehousing and industrial facilities may include use of transport refrigeration units (TRUs) for cold storage that could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Mitigation is needed to ensure that new projects are evaluated in accordance with BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines, and therefore impacts	S	AQ-3: Applicants for future non-residential land uses within the city that: 1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-powered TRUs, and 2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g. residential, schools, hospitals, nursing homes), as measured from the property line of a proposed project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City of San Leandro prior to future discretionary project approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
are *significant*.		procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds 10 in one million (10E-06), $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations exceed 0.3 µg/m^3, or the appropriate non-cancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Mitigation measures may include but are not limited to: ▪ Restricting idling on-site beyond Air Toxic Control Measures idling restrictions, as feasible. ▪ Electrifying warehousing docks. ▪ Requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles. ▪ Restricting off-site truck travel through the creation of truck routes. Mitigation measures identified in the project-specific HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of a proposed project.	
AQ -4: Implementation of the proposed Plan would not create or expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors.	LTS	N/A	N/A
AQ-5: Despite implementation of the proposed Plan policies, criteria air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project would generate a substantial net increase in emissions that exceeds the BAAQMD regional significance thresholds, and impacts would be *significant*.	S	AQ-5: Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-3. There are no additional mitigation measures available to mitigate this impact.	SU
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
BIO-1: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on special-status species.	LTS	N/A	N/A
BIO-2: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive natural communities.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
BIO-3: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.	LTS	N/A	N/A
BIO-4: The proposed project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	LTS	N/A	N/A
BIO-5: The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	LTS	N/A	N/A
BIO-6: The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.	No Impact	N/A	N/A
BIO-7: The proposed project contribution to cumulative impacts on biological resources would be less than significant.	LTS	N/A	N/A
CULTURAL RESOURCES			
CULT-1: The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.	LTS	N/A	N/A
CULT-2: The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	LTS	N/A	N/A
CULT-3: The proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.	LTS	N/A	N/A
CULT-4: The proposed project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
CULT-5: The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074.	LTS	N/A	N/A
CULT-6: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to cultural resources.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY			
GEO-1: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure; including liquefaction and lateral spreading; and landslides.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-2: The proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-3: The proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to development on unstable geologic units and soils or result in on- or off-site landsliding, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-4: The proposed project would not create substantial risks to property as a result of its location on expansive soil, as defined by Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-5: The proposed project would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GEO-6: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to geology, soils, and seismicity.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
GHG-1: Implementation of the proposed Plan would directly and indirectly generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions but would not exceed identified GHG efficiency targets for 2020 or General Plan horizon year of 2035, and, therefore, would not have a significant impact on the environment.	LTS	N/A	N/A
GHG-2: While the proposed Plan supports progress toward the long term-goals identified in Executive Order B-30-15 and Executive Order S-03-05, it cannot yet be demonstrated that San Leandro will achieve GHG emissions reductions that are consistent with an 80 percent reduction below 1990 levels by the year 2050 based on existing technologies and currently adopted policies and programs.	S	GHG-2: No mitigation measures are currently available to address post-2030 GHG reductions. The proposed Plan and the Climate Action Plan (CAP) include measures to align the City with the GHG reductions of AB 32 and Executive Order B-30-15. However, additional State and federal actions are necessary to ensure that State and federally regulated sources (i.e., sources outside the City's jurisdictional control) take similar aggressive measures to ensure the deep cuts needed to achieve the 2050 target.	SU
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
HAZ-1: The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-2: The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼-mile of an existing or proposed school.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HAZ-4: The proposed project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
HAZ-5: The proposed project would not be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport it results in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.	LTS	N/A		N/A
HAZ-6: The proposed project would not be within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.	No Impact	N/A		N/A
HAZ-7: The proposed project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LTS	N/A		N/A
HAZ-8: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	LTS	N/A		N/A
HAZ-9: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.	LTS	N/A		N/A
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
HYD-1: The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements.	LTS	N/A		N/A
HYD-2: The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted).	LTS	N/A		N/A
HYD-3: The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river,	LTS	N/A		N/A

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
or substantially increase the amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.			
HYD-4: The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYD-5: The proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYD-6: The proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYD-7: The proposed project would place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.	No Impact	N/A	N/A
HYD-8: The proposed project would not result in significant impacts associated with placing within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYD-9: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a levee or dam.	No Impact	N/A	N/A
HYD-10: The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	LTS	N/A	N/A
HYD-11: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
LAND USE AND PLANNING			
LAND-1: The proposed project would not physically divide an established community.	LTS	N/A	N/A
LAND-2: The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	LTS	N/A	N/A
LAND-3: The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	No Impact	N/A	N/A
LAND-4: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonable foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to land use and planning.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOISE			
NOI-1: The proposed project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan or the Municipal Code, and/or the applicable standards of other agencies.	N/A	N/A	N/A
NOI-2: The proposed project could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOI-3: The proposed project would cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient transportation-related noise levels in the project vicinity.	S	NOI-3: Beyond the General Plan Environmental Hazards Element policies discussed above, the following mitigation measures were considered, but as described below, were found to be infeasible. <u>Technological Advances for Noise-Generating Vehicles</u> Most urban noise results from the use of roadway vehicles, including automobiles, motorcycles, and trucks. The implementation of improved technologies for the prevention or muffling of noise from these sources could theoretically prevent substantial increases to ambient noise levels; however, this approach would be infeasible as much of this implementation is beyond the jurisdiction of the City. Beyond currently-accepted State and industry standards and best	SU

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		practices, developing and/or requiring novel technological improvements for noise-generating vehicles would not be affordable, scientifically plausible, or within the City's jurisdiction. Therefore, this potential mitigation measure is regarded as infeasible. <u>Universal Use of Noise-Attenuating Features</u> The universal use of noise attenuating features such as rubberized asphalt, soundwalls, berms, and improved building sound-insulation, could prevent transmission of excessive noise to the outdoor and indoor areas of sensitive land uses and/or could prevent projected increases in ambient noise levels. However, this approach would be infeasible in several situations. Specifically, rubberized asphalt reduces tire-pavement noise and when new, achieves a reduction of approximately 4 dB when compared to normal pavement surfaces. However, the noise reduction properties degrade over time, and the noise reduction would not be sufficient to reduce noise impacts in many areas of San Leandro. In many cases, aesthetic concerns, costs, physical constraints, or other issues would prevent the universal implementation of adequate noise-attenuating features. In addition to their expense, soundwalls often block views and are regarded as unsightly. Moreover, the construction of soundwalls can result in reduced pedestrian and vehicle connectivity, which would contravene other goals of the proposed General Plan and have negative social, economic, and even environmental consequences. Although improved building construction and insulation beyond that which is required by California Title 24 and the General Plan could further reduce indoor exposure to excessive noise, substantial outdoor increases to ambient noise levels would remain. Therefore, this potential mitigation measure is regarded as infeasible.	
NOI-4: Construction activities under the proposed project may lead to substantial temporary or periodic increases to ambient noise levels. This would be a potentially significant impact.	S	NOI-4: The City of San Leandro shall adopt the following measures as Standard Conditions of Approval or Construction Development Standards for new construction in the city. The Standard Conditions of Approval/Construction Development Standards shall include an exception that states that the Engineering & Transportation Director or his/her designee may waive individual measures upon individual written request from an Applicant after City review.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation

		▪ Construction activities shall be restricted to the daytime hours of between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, or between 8:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on Sunday and Saturday.
		▪ Prior to the start of construction activities, the construction contractor shall:
		  ▪ Maintain and tune all proposed equipment in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations to minimize noise emission.
		  ▪ Inspect all proposed equipment and fit all equipment with properly operating mufflers, air intake silencers, and engine shrouds that are no less effective than as originally equipped by the manufacturer.
		  ▪ Post a sign, clearly visible at the site, with a contact name and telephone number of the City of San Leandro's authorized representative to respond in the event of a noise complaint.
		  ▪ Place stationary construction equipment and material delivery in loading and unloading areas as far as practicable from the residences.
		  ▪ Limit unnecessary engine idling to the extent feasible.
		  ▪ Use smart back-up alarms, which automatically adjust the alarm level based on the background noise level, or switch off back-up alarms and replace with human spotters.
		  ▪ Use low-noise emission equipment.
		  ▪ Limit use of public address systems.
		  ▪ Minimize grade surface irregularities on construction sites.	

NOI-5: The proposed project would not result in the exposure of people residing or working in the vicinity of the project site to excessive aircraft noise levels, for a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.	LTS	N/A	N/A
NOI-6: The proposed project would not result in the exposure of people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels, for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
NOI-7: The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable cumulatively excessive noise levels within the city.	S	NOI-7: Beyond the General Plan Environmental Hazards Element policies discussed above, the same mitigation measures were considered as were evaluated in NOI-3 and were, likewise, found to be infeasible. In summary, for cumulative noise impacts, there are no feasible mitigations for preventing substantial increases in ambient noise levels, since all conceivable mitigations would be, in some circumstances, economically impractical, scientifically unachievable, outside the City's jurisdiction, and/or inconsistent with City planning goals and objectives. Thus, cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because no feasible mitigation measures are available to mitigate noise impacts to a less than significant level, resulting in a *significant and unavoidable* impact.	SU
POPULATION AND HOUSING			
POP-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not induce substantial unexpected population growth, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).	LTS	N/A	N/A
POP-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	LTS	N/A	N/A
POP-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	LTS	N/A	N/A
POP-4: Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to population and housing.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION			
SVCS-1: The proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A	N/A
SVCS-2: The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to fire protection services.	LTS	N/A	N/A
SVCS-3: The proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A	N/A
SVCS-4: The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to police services.	LTS	N/A	N/A
SVCS-5: The proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A	N/A
SVCS-6: The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to school services.	LTS	N/A	N/A
SVCS-7: The proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered park facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A	N/A

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
SVCS-8: The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur, or be accelerated.	LTS	N/A	N/A
SVCS-9: The proposed project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	LTS	N/A	N/A
SVCS-10: The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to parks and recreation facilities.	LTS	N/A	N/A
SVCS-11: The proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered public facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives.	LTS	N/A	N/A
SVCS-12: The proposed project, in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to the construction of other public facilities.	LTS	N/A	N/A
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC			
TRAF-1: Implementation of the Proposed Plan, in combination with regional growth outside of San Leandro, would result in increased vehicle traffic, which would affect the operations of local intersections and freeway segments. ▪ As shown in Table 4.13-15, the addition of proposed Plan traffic would result in significant impacts to 15 intersections during at least one of the peak hours. ▪ As shown in Table 4.13-16 and Table 4.13-17, the addition of proposed Plan traffic would result in significant impacts to eight freeway segments during at least one of the peak hours.	S	TRAF-1A: *Intersections:* The City of San Leandro should implement the following traffic improvements and facilities to reduce impacts to standard: ▪ E. 14th Street and Davis Street (SR-112) (#3): The addition of Cumulative with proposed Plan traffic would cause the intersection level of service to degrade from LOS C to LOS F in the AM peak hour. Therefore, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact is considered to be *significant*. Implementation of the following measures would improve intersection operations during the AM peak hour to LOS D: ▪ Add an additional northbound left-turn lane on E. 14th Street. This would result in the northbound approach having two	SU

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		exclusive left-turn lanes, an exclusive through lane, and a shared through/right-turn lane. ▪ Optimize the traffic signal cycle length and splits in conjunction with adaptive traffic control technology. ▪ Because this intersection is within the East 14th Street PDA, implementation of the following measures would improve intersection operations during the AM peak hour to LOS E: ▪ Implement proposed Policy T-5.2: Evaluating Development Impacts. ▪ Optimize the traffic signal cycle length and splits in conjunction with adaptive traffic control technology. This mitigation is considered feasible if the intersection was under City control. However, this intersection is under Caltrans' jurisdiction, so the implementation and timing of the mitigation measures remain uncertain since the intersection is not under the City's control. Consequently, the Cumulative with proposed Plan impact remains *significant and unavoidable*. ▪ **E. 14th Street and San Leandro Boulevard (#4):** The addition of Cumulative with proposed Plan traffic would cause the intersection level of service to degrade from LOS C to LOS E in the AM peak hour. Therefore, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact is considered to be *significant*. Implementation of the following measure would improve intersection operations during the AM peak hour to LOS D: ▪ Optimize the traffic signal cycle length and splits in conjunction with adaptive traffic control technology. This intersection is within the Bay Fair BART Transit Village PDA and ABAG/MTC has already designated Bay Fair BART Transit Village a potential PDA. Upon adoption of the Bay Fair TOD Specific Plan, currently anticipated in 2017, Bay Fair will achieve official PDA status. Since this intersection is currently in a potential PDA area the degradation of intersection operations from LOS C to LOS E in the AM peak hour due to the addition of Cumulative with Proposed Plan traffic would not be considered a	

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		significant impact under proposed Plan Policy T-5.2: Evaluating Development Impacts. Upon implementation of this measure, intersection operations would improve to LOS D during the AM peak hour. This mitigation is considered feasible if the intersection was under City control. However, this intersection is under Caltrans' jurisdiction, so the implementation and timing of the mitigation measures remain uncertain since the intersection is under Caltrans' jurisdiction. Consequently, the Cumulative with proposed Plan impact remains *significant and unavoidable*. ▪ **E. 14th Street and Hesperian Boulevard/Bancroft Avenue (#5):** The addition of Cumulative with proposed Plan traffic would cause the intersection level of service to degrade from LOS C to LOS E in the AM peak hour. Therefore, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact is considered to be *significant*. Implementation of the following measure would improve intersection operations during the AM peak hour: ▪ Optimize the traffic signal cycle length and splits in conjunction with adaptive traffic control technology. This intersection is within the Bay Fair BART Transit Village PDA and ABAG/MTC has already designated Bay Fair BART Transit Village a potential PDA. Upon adoption of the Bay Fair TOD Specific Plan, currently anticipated in 2017, Bay Fair will achieve official PDA status. Since this intersection is currently in a potential PDA area, the degradation of intersection operations from LOS C to LOS E in the AM peak hour due to the addition of Cumulative with Proposed Plan traffic would not be considered an impact under proposed Plan Policy T-5.2: Evaluating Development Impacts. Upon implementation of this measure, intersection operations would improve to LOS D during the AM peak hour. This mitigation is considered feasible if the intersection was under City control. However, this intersection is under Caltrans' jurisdiction, so the implementation and timing of the mitigation measures remain uncertain since the intersection is under Caltrans' jurisdiction.	

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		Consequently, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact remains *significant and unavoidable*. ▪ **Hesperian Boulevard and Halcyon Drive/Fairmont Drive (#10):** The addition of Cumulative with proposed Plan traffic would cause the intersection level of service to degrade from LOS D to LOS F in the AM peak hour and LOS D to LOS E in the PM peak hour. Therefore, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact is considered to be *significant*. Implementation of the following measures would improve intersection operations during the AM and PM peak hours to LOS D: ▪ Widen the south leg of the intersection in order to add a second northbound left-turn lane. This would result in the northbound approach having two exclusive left-turn lanes, two exclusive through lanes, and an exclusive right-turn lane. ▪ Provide an overlap signal phase for the northbound right turns. ▪ Optimize the traffic signal cycle length and splits in conjunction with adaptive traffic control technology. This intersection is within the Bay Fair BART Transit Village PDA and ABAG/MTC has already designated Bay Fair BART Transit Village a potential PDA. Upon adoption of the Bay Fair TOD Specific Plan, currently anticipated in 2017, Bay Fair will achieve official PDA status. Since this intersection is currently in a potential PDA area, the degradation of intersection operations from LOS D to LOS E in the PM peak hour due to the addition of Cumulative with Proposed Plan traffic would not be considered an impact under proposed Plan Policy T-5.2: Evaluating Development Impacts. Implementation of the following measures, which do not involve evaluation or acquisition of right-of-way, would improve intersection operations during the AM peak hour to LOS E: ▪ Implement proposed Policy T-5.2: Evaluating Development Impacts. ▪ Provide an overlap signal phase for the northbound right	

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		turns. ▪ Optimize the traffic signal cycle length and splits in conjunction with adaptive traffic control technology. Upon implementation of the first three measures, intersection operations would improve to LOS D during the AM and PM peak hours. The availability of right-of-way for the required widening on the south leg of the intersection is uncertain; therefore, the measures may be infeasible. Consequently, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact remains *significant and unavoidable*. ▪ **Washington Avenue and San Leandro Boulevard (#15):** The addition of Cumulative with Proposed Plan traffic would cause the intersection level of service to degrade from LOS C to LOS F in the AM peak hour. Therefore, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact is considered to be *significant*. Implementation of the following measure would improve intersection operations during the AM peak hour to LOS D: ▪ Optimize the traffic signal cycle length and splits in conjunction with adaptive traffic control technology. Upon implementation of this measure, intersection operations would improve to LOS D during the AM peak hour and lessen the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact to *less than significant*. ▪ **San Leandro Boulevard and Marina Boulevard (#16):** The addition of Cumulative with proposed Plan traffic would cause the intersection level of service to degrade from LOS D to LOS F in the AM peak hour and LOS C to LOS F in the PM peak hour. Therefore, the Cumulative with proposed Plan impact is considered to be *significant*. Implementation of the following measures would improve intersection operations during the AM and PM peak hours: ▪ Add a northbound left-turn lane on San Leandro Boulevard to provide two exclusive left-turn lanes, one exclusive through lane and one shared through/right-turn lane. (Consistent with the findings of the San Leandro Shoreline	

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		Development Project EIR) ▪ Restripe lanes on the west leg to provide two corresponding receiving lanes. (Consistent with the findings of the San Leandro Shoreline Development Project EIR) ▪ Provide an exclusive southbound right-turn lane to feed the existing channelized right-turn lane from San Leandro Boulevard southbound to Marina Boulevard westbound so that southbound through traffic does not block access to the channelized southbound right-turn lane. ▪ Optimize the traffic signal cycle length and splits in conjunction with adaptive traffic control technology. Upon implementation of these measures, intersection operations would improve to LOS D during the AM and PM peak hours. The availability of right-of-way for the required widening on the south and north legs of the intersection is uncertain; therefore, the measure may be infeasible. Consequently, the Cumulative with proposed Plan impact remains *significant and unavoidable*. ▪ **San Leandro Boulevard and Davis Street (#17):** The addition of Cumulative with proposed Plan traffic would cause the intersection level of service to degrade from LOS C to LOS F in the AM peak hour and LOS C to LOS E in the PM peak hour. Therefore, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact is considered to be *significant*. Implementation of the following measures would improve intersection operations during the AM and PM peak hours to LOS D: ▪ Add a northbound right-turn lane on San Leandro Boulevard to provide two exclusive left-turn lanes, two exclusive through lanes and one exclusive right-turn lane. ▪ Optimize the traffic signal cycle length and splits in conjunction with adaptive traffic control technology. Because this intersection is within the Downtown Transit Oriented Development PDA, the degradation of intersection operations from LOS C to LOS E in the PM peak hour due to the	

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		addition of Cumulative with Proposed Plan traffic would not be considered an impact under Proposed Plan Policy T-5.2: Evaluating Development Impacts. Implementation of the following measures, which do not involve evaluation or acquisition of right-of-way, would improve intersection operations during the AM peak hour to LOS E: ▪ Implement proposed Policy T-5.2: Evaluating Development Impacts. ▪ Optimize the traffic signal cycle length and splits in conjunction with adaptive traffic control technology. Upon implementation of the first two measures, intersection operations would improve to LOS D during the AM and PM peak hours. The availability of right-of-way for the required widening on the south leg of the intersection is uncertain; therefore, the measure may be infeasible. This intersection is under Caltrans' jurisdiction, and the implementation and timing of the mitigation measures are not under the City's control. Consequently, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact remains *significant and unavoidable*. ▪ **Philips Lane and Davis Street (#28):** The addition of Cumulative with Proposed Plan traffic would cause the intersection level of service to degrade from LOS C to LOS F in the PM peak hour. Therefore, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact is considered to be *significant*. Implementation of the following measures would improve intersection operations during the PM peak hour: ▪ Convert the existing shared through/right-turn lane on the westbound approach to an exclusive through lane to provide an exclusive left-turn lane, two exclusive through lanes and an exclusive right-turn lane. ▪ Optimize the traffic signal cycle length and splits in conjunction with adaptive traffic control technology. Upon implementation of these measures, intersection operations would improve to LOS D during the PM peak hour. This intersection is under Caltrans' jurisdiction, and the	

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		implementation and timing of the mitigation measures are not under the City's control. Consequently, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact remains *significant and unavoidable*. ▪ **Warden Avenue/Timothy Drive and Davis Street (#29):** The addition of Cumulative with Proposed Plan traffic would cause the intersection level of service to degrade from LOS C to LOS E in the PM peak hour. Therefore, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact is considered to be *significant*. Implementation of the following measures would improve intersection operations during the PM peak hour: ▪ Restripe the three northbound lanes from Timothy Drive to provide an exclusive left-turn lane, a shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane and an exclusive right-turn lane. ▪ Optimize the traffic signal cycle length and splits in conjunction with adaptive traffic control technology. Upon implementation of these measures, intersection operations would improve to LOS D during the PM peak hour. This intersection is under Caltrans' jurisdiction, and the implementation and timing of the mitigation measures are not under the City's control. Consequently, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact remains *significant and unavoidable*. ▪ **Doolittle Drive and Davis Street (#30):** The addition of Cumulative with Proposed Plan traffic would cause the intersection level of service to degrade from LOS C to LOS F in the PM peak hour. Therefore, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact is considered to be *significant*. Implementation of the following measures would improve intersection operations during the PM peak hour: ▪ Restripe the four westbound lanes from Davis Street to provide one exclusive left-turn lane, one exclusive through lane and two exclusive right-turn lanes. ▪ Restrict westbound right turns on red to reduce conflict between right-turning vehicles in the two exclusive right-turn lanes as well as between right-turning vehicles and	

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		movements with the right-of-way. ▪ Optimize the traffic signal cycle length and splits. Upon implementation of these measures, intersection operations would improve to LOS D during the PM peak hour. Even if this intersection was under City control, the availability of right-of-way for the required widening on the east leg of the intersection is uncertain; therefore, the measure may be infeasible. This intersection is under Caltrans' jurisdiction, and the implementation and timing of the mitigation measures are not under the City's control. Consequently, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact remains *significant and unavoidable*. ▪ **Doolittle Drive and Marina Boulevard (#31):** The addition of Cumulative with Proposed Plan traffic would cause the intersection level of service to degrade from LOS C to LOS F in the AM peak hour and from LOS D to LOS E in the PM peak hour. Therefore, the Cumulative with Proposed Plan impact is considered to be *significant*. Implementation of the following measures would improve intersection operations during the AM and PM peak hours to LOS D and lessen the Cumulative with proposed Plan impact to *less than significant*: ▪ Restripe the eastbound approach on Marina Boulevard to provide an exclusive left-turn lane, an exclusive through lane and a shared through/right-turn lane. (Consistent with the findings of the San Leandro Shoreline Development Project EIR). ▪ Optimize the traffic signal cycle length and splits. (Consistent with the findings of the San Leandro Shoreline Development Project EIR). ▪ Implement a right-turn overlap signal phase for the northbound and westbound approaches. (A new mitigation not called for in the San Leandro Shoreline Development Project EIR). ▪ **Alvarado Street and Aladdin Avenue (#35):** The addition of Cumulative with Proposed Plan traffic would cause the	

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		intersection level of service to degrade from LOS D to LOS F in the AM peak hour. Therefore, the Cumulative with proposed Plan impact is considered to be *significant*. Implementation of the following measures would improve intersection operations during the AM peak hour to LOS D and lessen the Proposed Plan impact to *less than significant*: ▪ Convert the left-turn signal phasing for the eastbound and westbound approaches on Aladdin Avenue from protected left-turn signal phasing to permitted left-turn signal phasing with flashing yellow arrows. ▪ Convert the northbound left-turn signal phasing on Alvarado Avenue from protected left-turn signal phasing to protected/permitted left-turn signal phasing with flashing yellow arrows. ▪ Convert the southbound left-turn signal phasing on Alvarado Avenue from protected left-turn signal phasing to permitted left-turn signal phasing with flashing yellow arrows. ▪ Optimize the traffic signal cycle length and splits. While implementation of Mitigation Measure TRAF-1A would secure future roadway and infrastructure improvements that are necessary to mitigate impacts from future development in the city based on current standards, some impacts would remain *significant and unavoidable* because the City cannot guarantee improvements at all of the impacted intersections.	
		TRAF-1B: *Freeway Segments:* The City of San Leandro shall initiate efforts to coordinate with Caltrans and Alameda CTC to identify potential traffic improvements to reduce impacts to acceptable levels on the regional freeways. ▪ **I-880 northbound segments between Washington Avenue and 98th Avenue.** These three mainline segments experience LOS F conditions during the AM peak hour under both existing and cumulative plus Proposed Plan conditions. Implementation of the following measure would improve freeway segment operations during the AM peak hour to LOS D or better and lessen the proposed Plan impact to *less than significant*:	SU

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		▪ Add additional capacity to the freeway segment by increasing the number of travel lanes in the northbound direction. However, the implementation and timing of the Mitigation Measure is not under the City's control and widening I-880 is not considered to be feasible due to cost and freeway right-of-way constraints. . Consequently, the Cumulative plus Proposed Plan impact remains *significant and unavoidable.* ▪ **I-580 Northbound segment between 150th Avenue and Benedict Drive**, which is at LOS F during the AM peak hour under both existing and cumulative plus Proposed Plan conditions. Implementation of the following measure would improve freeway segment operations during the AM peak hour to LOS D or better and lessen the proposed Plan impact to *less than significant*: ▪ Add additional capacity to the freeway segment by increasing the number of travel lanes in the northbound direction. However, the implementation and timing of the Mitigation Measure is not under the City's control and widening I-880 is not considered to be feasible due to cost and freeway right-of-way constraints. . Consequently, the Cumulative plus Proposed Plan impact remains *significant and unavoidable.* ▪ **I-580 Northbound segment between Foothill Boulevard and 106th Avenue,** is at LOS E during the AM peak hour under existing and LOS F under cumulative plus Proposed Plan conditions. Implementation of the following measure would improve freeway segment operations during the AM peak hour to LOS D or better and lessen the proposed Plan impact to *less than significant*: ▪ Add additional capacity to the freeway segment by increasing the number of travel lanes in the northbound direction. However, the implementation and timing of the Mitigation Measure is not under the City's control and widening I-880 is not considered to be feasible due to cost and freeway right-of-way constraints. . Consequently, the Cumulative plus Proposed Plan	

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		impact remains *significant and unavoidable.* ▪ **I-880 Southbound segment between Marina Boulevard and Washington Avenue** would operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour under cumulative plus Proposed Plan condition, which is considered to be *significant*. Implementation of the following measure would improve freeway segment operations during the AM peak hour to LOS D or better and lessen the Proposed Plan impact to *less than significant*: ▪ Add additional capacity to the freeway segment by increasing the number of travel lanes in the southbound direction. However, the implementation and timing of the Mitigation Measure is not under the City's control and widening I-880 is not considered to be feasible due to cost and freeway right-of-way constraints. . Consequently, the Cumulative plus Proposed Plan impact remains *significant and unavoidable.* ▪ **I-238 Eastbound segment between Hesperian Boulevard and SR 185** would operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour under cumulative plus Proposed Plan condition, which is considered to be *significant*. Implementation of the following measure would improve freeway segment operations during the AM peak hour to LOS D or better and lessen the proposed Plan impact to *less than significant*: ▪ Add additional capacity to the freeway segment by increasing the number of travel lanes in the eastbound direction. However, the implementation and timing of the Mitigation Measure is not under the City's control and widening I-880 is not considered to be feasible due to cost and freeway right-of-way constraints. . Consequently, the Cumulative plus Proposed Plan impact remains *significant and unavoidable.* All impacted freeway sections would require additional capacity or widening to mitigate the impacts to less than significant. If the widenings are feasible, then future development implementing the Proposed Plan would contribute its fair share through development fees for street improvements. To this end, the City shall coordinate	

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		with Caltrans and the Alameda CTC to develop a co-operative agreement to fund these improvements and determine the fair share contribution. Since these mitigations are not certain, the findings remain as *significant and unavoidable*.	
TRAF-2A: The Proposed Plan would cause the volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio on the northbound segment of Doolittle Drive, which would operate at Level of Service (LOS) F, to increase by 0.04 under Year 2040 conditions in the AM peak hour. Therefore, this is considered a *significant* impact.	S	TRAF-2A: Implementation of the following improvement would reduce the impact to acceptable levels: ▪ Widen Doolittle Drive to provide an additional travel lane in the northbound direction; or ▪ Provide transit or shuttle service that operates between the Proposed Plan site and key locations such as San Leandro and Coliseum BART stations and Oakland International Airport. Widening Doolittle Drive to provide an additional travel lane in the northbound direction would improve the level of service to LOS D in Year 2040 and would mitigate the Proposed Plan impact to less than significant. However, the feasibility of this measure is uncertain due to right of way constraints along this mostly developed corridor. Alternatively, provision of a shuttle service that operates between the City site and key locations, such as San Leandro and Coliseum BART stations and Oakland International Airport, during the AM and PM peak hour would likely lessen the Proposed Plan's impact on the segment. However, the effectiveness of the shuttle service in reducing the number of Proposed Plan trips on Doolittle Drive cannot be adequately quantified. As discussed above, the ongoing I-880 Integrated Corridor Management effort led by the MTC that aims to optimize freeway, arterial signal, rail, and bus systems and incorporate Intelligent Transportation System would also help enhance efficiency on the freeway. However, for the reasons listed above this impact would remain *significant and unavoidable*.	SU
TRAF-2B: The effect of an increase of Proposed Plan vehicle traffic would cause mixed flow transit operations to be significantly impacted. Since impacts identified under TRAF-1 and their recommended mitigations are uncertain, this could impact mixed flow transit operations in San Leandro and therefore, this is considered a *significant* impact.	S	TRAF-2B: Implementation of the mitigation measures unidentified Under TRAF-1A would reduce the impact to transit operations to acceptable levels. However, for the reasons listed above this impact would remain *significant and unavoidable*.	SU

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
TRAF-3: The proposed Plan would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.	No Impact	N/A		N/A
TRAF-4: Implementation of the proposed Plan would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment).	LTS	N/A		N/A
TRAF-5: Implementation of the proposed Plan would not result in inadequate emergency access.	LTS	N/A		N/A
TRAF-6: Implementation of the proposed Plan would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	LTS	N/A		N/A
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS				
UTIL-1: The proposed project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the proposed project from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded entitlements.	LTS	N/A		N/A
UTIL-2: The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A		N/A
UTIL-3: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to water service.	LTS	N/A		N/A
UTIL-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.	LTS	N/A		N/A
UTIL-5: The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A		N/A

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
UTIL-6: The proposed project would not result in the determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the Project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.	LTS	N/A		N/A
UTIL-7: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to wastewater service.	LTS	N/A		N/A
UTIL-8: The proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs.	LTS	N/A		N/A
UTIL-9: The proposed project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	LTS	N/A		N/A
UTIL-10: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development, would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to solid waste.	LTS	N/A		N/A
UTIL-11: The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A		N/A
UTIL-12: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to stormwater infrastructure.	LTS	N/A		N/A
UTIL-13: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in natural gas and electrical service demands, and would not require new energy supply facilities and transmission infrastructure or capacity enhancing alterations to existing facilities.	LTS	N/A		N/A
UTIL-14: The proposed project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development, would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to energy conservation.	LTS	N/A		N/A

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact