LSA

CARLSBAD
FRESNO
IRVINE
LOS ANGELES
PALM SPRINGS
POINT RICHMOND
RIVERSIDE
ROSEVILLE
SAN LUIS OBISPO

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 15, 2021

TO: Leigha Schmidt, City of Hayward

FROM: Shanna Guiler, AICP, Associate/Environmental Planner
Theresa Wallace, AICP, Principal

SUBJECT: Environmental Review of Modifications to the Hayward Route 238 Properties Project – Parcel Group 5, City of Hayward, California

This memorandum, prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), describes the proposed modifications to the Hayward Route 238 Properties Project – Bunker Hill (Parcel Group 5) Project (modified project) and confirms through supplemental analysis that the potential environmental effects of the modified project are within the scope of the Addendum for the Route 238 Development Project - Bunker Hill (Parcel Group 5).[1]

INTRODUCTION

In June 2019, LSA prepared an Addendum to the City of Hayward 2040 General Plan Environmental Impact Report[2] (GP EIR), to evaluate the environmental impacts associated with development of the Parcel Group 5 Project (PG 5 Project). The PG 5 project, evaluated in the Addendum, included a Master Plan detailing the construction of up to 74 single-family residential units plus 8 accessory dwelling units (ADUs), approximately 10.5 acres of open space, a new segment of the Hayward Foothill Trail, and associated roadway and infrastructure improvements on the project site. The project site encompasses 37 acres over several parcels, which were obtained by the City from Caltrans. The Final Addendum was considered by the City of Hayward Planning Commission and City Council as part of the PG 5 Project approvals, including the Master Plan. On July 9, 2019, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 19-162 adopting and certifying the Addendum.

PROPOSED PROJECT

On August 6, 2020, Trumak Homes submitted Zone Change, Tentative Map, and Site Plan Review Application No. 202003054 to develop the site in accordance with the adopted Master Plan. The City proposes to expand the Zone Change entitlement to incorporate four privately-owned parcels that are located within the PG 5 Project area. Under this proposal, the four privately owned parcels would be

1 LSA. 2019. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Addendum for the Route 238 Development Project - Bunker Hill (Parcel Group 5). June.

2 Hayward, City of. 2014. *Final Environmental Impact Report City of Hayward General Plan*. May.

incorporated into the proposed PD (Planned Development) District rather than creating isolated lots within the PG 5 Project area with differentiated and more stringent zoning requirements.

These four privately owned properties are currently developed with single-family residential homes and are shown in the attached Figure 1. The subject properties are zoned RNP (Residential Natural Preserve) District, which requires a minimum 20,000-square foot lot and are designated Suburban Residential in the City's General Plan, which allows development of up to four units per acre.

The proposed Zone Change would permit each of these four parcels to be subdivided and subject to the same development standards as the other properties within the PG 5 Project area, potentially resulting in an additional four units in the project area. The proposed PD District would remain consistent with the applicable Suburban Residential General Plan designation in that the average lot size across the entire PD District would be 10,000 square feet.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The following includes an evaluation of the potential environmental effects of incorporating the four additional parcels into the PD District, compared to the impacts associated with implementation of the PG 5 Project as identified in the Environmental Checklist included in the Addendum.

Aesthetics

Section 1 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed the visual conditions of the project area. Similar to the PG 5 Project, the modified project would not substantially impact a scenic vista nor would it substantially damage scenic resources within a State scenic highway. Similar to other development proposed with the City and within the City's hillside areas, any development proposed on the four additional parcels would be required to comply with General Plan policies related to scenic vistas, the City's Design Guidelines, and the City's Hillside Design and Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines. In addition, proposed development would be required to comply with General Plan Policies LU-7.2, LU-7.3, LU-7.4, LU-7.5, NR-8.1 and NR-8.2, which require hillside developments to adhere to design guidelines that respect natural topography, minimize site grading, preserve scenic resources, and mitigate visual impacts. Design Review of any proposed development would ensure that any lighting proposed within the project site is sufficient to protect public safety but does not excessively illuminate the surrounding area. ***No new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur.***

Agricultural Resources

Section 2 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed impacts to agricultural resources. No impacts to agricultural resources were identified. Similar to the PG 5 Project, the modified project would not result in the conversion of agricultural land nor would it conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract. ***No new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur.***

Air Quality

Section 3 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed impacts to air quality. The Addendum identified temporary short-term, construction-related impacts to air quality. No long-term operational impacts were identified. Similar to the PG 5 Project, the rezoning and potential subdivision of the four additional parcels would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, violate air

quality standards, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant. Construction of any potential structures would utilize similar construction techniques as identified in the Environmental Checklist. All development projects would be required to implement the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Basic Construction Mitigation Measures to minimize construction fugitive dust impacts. ***No new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur.***

Biological Resources

Section 4 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed impacts to biological resources associated with implementation of the PG 5 Project. The Addendum identified areas of potential impact, including adverse effects on nesting birds and roosting bats, indirect effects to wetlands/riparian areas, and tree removal. The additional four parcels are located within the same area as the PG 5 Project and would be subject to the same biological conditions. Therefore, impacts to biological resources would be similar to those analyzed for the PG 5 Project in the Environmental Checklist. Implementation of Standard Conditions of Approval and Best Management Practices (BMPs) in compliance with regulatory requirements, including the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the California Fish and Game Code, Regional Water Quality Control Board guidelines, City of Hayward General Plan policies, and the City of Hayward Municipal Code, would ensure that impacts of the proposed project as a whole would be reduced to less than significant levels. ***No new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur.***

Cultural Resources

As described in Section 5 of the Environmental Checklist, the Addendum identified potential impacts to previously unidentified archaeological deposits as a result of ground disturbing activities. No known or previously identified cultural resources were identified in the project area. Similar to the PG 5 Project, potential development resulting from the rezoning and subdivision of the four additional parcels has the potential to encounter unidentified cultural deposits during construction activities. In the unlikely event that historic or archaeological resources are discovered during excavation, Standard Conditions of Approval for all development projects require the contractor to stop all work adjacent to the find and contact the City of Hayward Development Services Department to preserve and record the uncovered materials so it can be safely removed. Therefore, the proposed project would not lead to new or more severe impacts to archaeological resources beyond those identified in the GP EIR. ***No new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur.***

Energy

Section 6 of the Environmental Checklist evaluated potential project impacts related to energy. Like the PG 5 project, construction of any future development resulting from the rezoning and subdivision of the additional four parcels would require the use of energy to fuel grading vehicles, trucks, and other construction vehicles. All or most of this energy would be derived from non-renewable resources. However, implementation of BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, as required for all development projects, would improve energy efficiency by reducing idling times for vehicle equipment. In addition, construction activities are not anticipated to result in an inefficient use of energy as gasoline and diesel fuel would be supplied by construction contractors who would conserve the use of their supplies to minimize project costs. Energy usage on the project site during construction would be temporary in nature and would be relatively small in comparison to the State's available energy sources.

Energy use consumed by the PG 5 Project would be associated with electricity consumption and fuel used for vehicle trips associated with the project. The Addendum determined that potential operational energy use associated with the PG 5 Project would be less than significant. Like the PG 5 Project, any proposed development on the four additional parcels would be required to implement the latest CALGreen standard building measures and Title 24 standards, which would help to reduce energy and natural gas consumption. Therefore, the modified project would not use non-renewable resources in a wasteful or inefficient manner. ***No new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur.***

Geology and Soils

Section 7 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed the geological, seismic, and soil conditions within the project area. The Addendum identified areas of potential impact, including damage due to seismic ground shaking, seismic-related liquefaction, soil erosion, and expansive soils. The four additional parcels are located within the PG 5 Project area and would be subject to similar geological and soil conditions. Like the PG 5 Project, any potential development on the four additional parcels would be required to comply with the current California Building Code ([CBC] Title 24, California Code of Regulations). In addition, a site-specific geotechnical investigation would be performed as required by State regulations, and the City of Hayward General Plan policies in the event of future subdivision and development of any new structures on the subject properties. Completion of a site-specific geotechnical investigation, and compliance with geotechnical recommendations and the CBC during design and construction would ensure that the potential impacts related to geology and soils would be reduced to less than significant levels. ***No new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur.***

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Section 8 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed impacts associated with global climate change and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions resulting from the implementation of the PG 5 Project. No potentially significant GHG impacts were identified. Similar to the PG 5 Project, future development on the four additional parcels could generate greenhouse gas emissions during construction, as well as, long-term GHG emissions associated with project-generated vehicle trips to and from the project site, as well as landscaping and maintenance on the project site. Incorporation of the four additional parcels into the Planned Development District would result in limited additional development beyond what was evaluated for the PG 5 Project. Therefore, like the PG 5 Project, the modified project is not anticipated to generate significant GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. ***No new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur.***

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Section 9 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials that would be associated with implementation of the PG 5 Project. The Addendum identified potential impacts related to transport, handling, and disposal of potentially contaminated soil and/or groundwater during excavation and grading activities at the PG 5 Project site, as well as potential risks related to wildfire. Any potential development on the four additional parcels would use similar construction techniques identified for the PG 5 Project and would be subject to the same conditions with respect to hazards. Like the PG 5 Project, development of the four additional parcels would be required to comply with all applicable local, State, and federal regulations and standards pertaining to

the release of hazardous materials, including the City of Hayward General Plan, which requires that site-specific environmental investigations be prepared before discretionary project approvals are issued by the City. Like the PG 5 Project, the additional four parcels would be located within the wildland urban interface as identified by the Hayward Fire Department. Any development on these parcels would be required to comply with the Hillside Design and Wildland/Urban Interface Guidelines to address potential fire hazards for developments in the hills. Compliance with these regulatory requirements would ensure that impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant. ***No new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur.***

Hydrology and Water Quality

Section 10 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed impacts to hydrology and water quality associated with implementation of the PG 5 Project. The Addendum determined that the PG 5 Project would have a less than significant effect on water quality standards and waste discharge requirements, groundwater recharge, and alteration of drainage patterns. Like the PG 5 Project, construction activities associated with potential development on the additional four parcels could disturb site soils and could introduce pollutants into the stormwater. Implementation of construction BMPs would be required to comply with the Statewide Phase II Permit (Water Quality Order No. 2013-0001-DWQ, NPDES General Permit No. CAS000004), and the City's General Plan. In addition, like the PG 5 Project, the modified project would be required to comply with Provision C.3 requirements of the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Regional Stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit, which requires implementation of low impact development (LID) source control, site design, and stormwater treatment for regulated projects. Adherence to regulatory requirements would ensure that potential impacts of the modified project are less than significant with respect to water quality. ***No new impacts or increase in severity of impacts would occur.***

Land Use

Section 11 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed impacts to land use and planning associated with implementation of the PG 5 Project. The four additional parcels are located within the boundaries of the PG 5 Project area and would be subject to the same land use plans discussed in the Addendum, including the City of Hayward General Plan. Incorporation of these four additional parcels into the Planned Development District would bring these properties into conformity with the surrounding parcels, which are part of the PG 5 Project. The proposed Planned Development District zoning is consistent with the site's existing General Plan land use designation, which is Suburban Density Residential. Similar to the PG 5 Project, the modified project would not physically divide an established community or conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. ***No new impacts or increase in severity of impacts would occur.***

Mineral Resources

No impacts to mineral resources were identified in the Addendum. Similar to the PG 5 Project, the modified project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. ***No new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur.***

Noise

Section 13 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed noise impacts associated with implementation of the PG 5 Project. The Addendum identified potential temporary, short-term, construction-related noise and vibration impacts. Operational noise impacts were determined to be less than significant. Construction period noise would be short-term and intermittent and subject to measures that restrict the hours of construction and impose maintenance and operation restrictions on construction equipment, consistent with Mitigation 15-1 and Mitigation 15-2 identified in the GP EIR as well as policies in the City's General Plan. In addition, like the PG 5 Project, any proposed development on the four additional parcels would be required to implement best management practices to ensure potential construction-period noise impacts would be less than significant. ***No new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur.***

Population and Housing

Section 14 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed impacts to population and housing associated with implementation of the PG 5 Project. No impacts to population and housing were identified in the Addendum. Similar to the PG 5 Project, incorporation of the four additional parcels into the Planned Development District could result in the development of four additional residential units within the PG 5 Project area; however, as described in the Environmental Checklist, this growth would fall within the increase identified in the City's General Plan, including the Housing Element. Therefore, the modified project would not induce substantial growth, displace any existing housing units or people, and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. ***No new impact or increase in the severity of impacts would occur.***

Public Services

Section 15 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed impacts to public services associated with implementation of the PG 5 Project. No significant impacts were identified. Similar to the PG 5 Project, incorporation of the four additional parcels into the Planned Development District could result in the development of limited (four) additional residential units within the PG 5 Project area, which would result in a proportionate increase in demand for police, fire and school services. However, General Plan policies ensure that the City reviews Hayward Police Department and Hayward Fire Department staffing levels to ensure the availability of adequate police and fire manpower and service facilities. Consistent with the City of Hayward General Plan policies, any new development would be required to pay development fees to ensure adequate provision of fire and police services, schools, and other public facilities (e.g., libraries). Implementation of these policies would ensure the planning of new school facilities to accommodate projected increases in student enrollment. Public services impacts would be less than significant. ***No new impacts or increase in severity of impacts would occur.***

Recreation

Section 16 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed impacts to recreation associated with implementation of the PG 5 Project. No significant impacts were identified. Limited new development would result from incorporation of the four additional parcels into the Planned Development District; therefore, the modified project is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in use of recreation facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be facilitated. Further, any new development would be subject to Park Impact Fees intended to mitigate any potential impacts

from new development. Therefore, impacts associated with existing parks and other recreational facilities would be less than significant. ***No new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur.***

Transportation

Section 17 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed impacts to transportation/traffic associated with implementation of the PG 5 Project. The Addendum identified significant level of service (LOS) impacts at four intersections under the Cumulative 2035 Plus Project condition. The Addendum concluded that these impacts fell under the significant cumulative transportation impacts identified in the GP EIR as Impact 18-1, Project Intersection Impacts, and Impact 18-2, Cumulative Intersection Impacts. Mitigation Measure 18-2, as identified in the GP EIR, was modified to incorporate mitigation for these impacts.

As described in the attached memorandum, the previous traffic analysis conservatively analyzed the 74 single-family units and eight ADUs as 82 single-family units; however, ADUs are exempt from CEQA analysis. Therefore, with the four additional parcels, the total number of single-family units associated with the modified project would be 78. As a result, the modified project is expected to generate fewer vehicle trips than was disclosed in the previous Addendum. Specifically, it is expected to generate 39 fewer daily vehicle trips, three fewer AM peak hour vehicle trips, and four fewer PM peak hour vehicle trips compared to what was analyzed in the previous traffic analysis. Therefore, the incorporation of the four additional parcels into the Planned Development District is not expected to generate any new LOS impacts or worsen impacts at the study intersections. In addition, no additional traffic calming, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements would be required beyond what was recommended in the previous traffic analysis. Supporting data and documentation is included as an attachment to this memorandum. ***No new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur.***

Tribal Cultural Resources

Section 18 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed impacts to tribal cultural resources associated with the PG 5 Project. No significant impacts to tribal resources were identified. As stated in the Addendum, impacts of the PG 5 Project on potential archaeological and human remains, which are considered both tribal and cultural resources, were evaluated and were identified as less than significant with implementation of General Plan policies. Similar to the PG 5 Project, the modified project would not result in any new or more significant impacts related to tribal cultural resources. ***No new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur.***

Utilities and Service Systems

Section 19 of the Environmental Checklist analyzed impacts to utilities and service systems associated with the PG 5 Project. No potentially significant impacts were identified in the Addendum. Limited new development could result from incorporation of the four additional parcels into the Planned Development District; therefore, the modified project is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in the demand for utilities and service systems that would exceed wastewater treatment requirements, require the construction of new/expansion of existing water or wastewater treatment facilities, result in the construction or expansion of storm water drainage facilities, or generate substantial amounts of solid waste that would exceed landfill capacity. ***No new impacts or increase in severity of impacts would occur.***

Wildfire

Risks associated with wildfire were evaluated in Section 20 of the Environmental Checklist. The four additional parcels are located within the PG 5 Project area. As described in Section 20 of the Environmental Checklist, the PG 5 Project would be located within the wildland urban interface as identified by the Hayward Fire Department. Like the PG 5 Project, any development proposed on the four additional parcels would be required to comply with the Hillside Design and Wildland/Urban Interface Guidelines, which include standards for streets and sidewalks that allow for fire truck access, cluster home development to make efficient use of hillside space, and architectural and site design that allow for fire setbacks and environmental disaster mitigation. Compliance with the City's Hillside Design and Wildland/Urban Interface Guidelines would ensure potential impacts related to wildland fires would be less than significant. ***No new impacts or increase in severity of impacts would occur.***

CONCLUSION

Although not specifically identified as part of the PG 5 Project, the incorporation of the four additional parcels into the Planned Development District is within the scope of the PG 5 Project as evaluated in the Addendum. On the basis of the evaluation presented above, the incorporation of the four additional parcels into the Planned Development District, if implemented, would not trigger any of the conditions listed under CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, requiring preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR. Thus, this memorandum satisfies the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and 15164. Incorporation of the four additional parcels into the Planned Development District would not introduce new significant environmental effects, substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant environmental effects, or demonstrate that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible. The proposed changes that would be implemented as part of the modified project would not alter the findings in the Addendum. In addition, no change has occurred with respect to the circumstances surrounding the project that would cause new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects than identified in the Addendum, and no new information has become available that shows that the project would cause significant environmental effects not already analyzed in the Addendum. Therefore, no further environmental review is required.

Attachments: Figure 1 - Parcels to be Incorporated into the Planned Development District

Traffic Memorandum prepared by Kittelson & Associates, dated December 15, 2020

LSA

LEGEND

- Parcel Group
- Proposed Parcels to be Incorporated
- Parcel

N

0 200 400
FEET

SOURCE: Microsoft Bing Basemap.

FIGURE 1

Route 238 Property Development Project –
Bunker Hill (Parcel Group 5)
Hayward, California
Parcels to be Incorporated into the Planned Development District

I:\HAY2002\GIS\Maps\CEQA - Parcel Group 5\Figure 2_Parcel Group 5 - Bunker Hill Aerial.mxd (12/15/2020)

KITTELSON & ASSOCIATES
155 GRAND AVENUE, SUITE 505
OAKLAND, CA 94612
P 510.839.1742 F 510.839.0871

MEMORANDUM

Date:	December 15, 2020	Project #25690
To:	Theresa Wallace and Shanna Guiler – LSA City of Hayward	
From:	Michael Sahimi and Damian Stefanakis – Kittelson & Associates, Inc.	
Project:	Hayward Parcel Group 5 Master Plan Amendment	
Subject:	Updated PG 5 Project Description and Traffic Impacts	

In June 2019, Kittelson & Associates (Kittelson) prepared the Route 238 Property Development Project (Parcel Group 5 and Parcel Group 6) Transportation Impact Analysis Report. The report assessed potential near-term transportation impacts resulting from the proposed Parcel Group 5 (PG 5) development, as well as long-term cumulative transportation impacts resulting from the combined development of PG 5 and Parcel Group 6 (PG 6). Since the preparation of the report, the City of Hayward has requested a traffic memo for PG 5 to document changes in the transportation findings resulting from the addition of four parcels as single-family units to the project. Prior to this, Kittelson had analyzed PG 5 assuming 82 single-family dwelling units. This memorandum documents the effects of the four additional parcels on the previous Parcel 5 Addendum analysis and is organized into the following sections:

- Original and Updated Project Description
- June 2019 Traffic Study Findings
- Effects on Traffic Study Findings
- Summary and Conclusion

ORIGINAL AND UPDATED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PG 5 is located on the site known as Bunker Hill, which is situated northwest of Harder Road, approximately 1,000 feet east of Mission Boulevard and adjacent to and southwest of California State University, East Bay (CSU East Bay). As of June 2019, the project would consist of up to 74 single-family residential units and eight accessory dwelling units (ADUs), or 82 total units; note, Kittelson conservatively analyzed PG 5 as consisting of 82 single-family residential units in the June 2019 traffic study. Additional project elements include approximately 10.50 acres of open space to preserve riparian areas, a new cul-de-sac road extending from Maitland Drive, a new roadway connection from Bunker Hill Road to Carlos Bee Boulevard, a new segment of the Hayward Foothill Trail, and additional street improvements such as curbs, gutters, sidewalks, on-street parking bulb-outs, utilities, and lighting.

Since the preparation of the June 2019 report, the project boundary has been updated to include an additional four parcels which would allow for the development of four additional single-family units. The final project would thus consist of 78 single-family residential units and eight accessory dwelling units, or 86 total units.

Note, legislation categorically exempts ADUs from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis; therefore, this memo analyzes 78 units as the revised project.

JUNE 2019 TRAFFIC STUDY FINDINGS

The PG 5 trip generation estimate used for the June 2019 transportation analysis is shown in Table 1 below; note, Kittelson conservatively analyzed the entirety of the project (including the ADUs) as 82 single-family residential units in the June 2019 traffic study. As shown in the table, PG 5 was estimated to generate 866 daily vehicle trips, 63 AM peak hour vehicle trips and 84 PM peak hour vehicle trips.

Table 1: Parcel Group 5 Trip Generation (June 2019 Traffic Study)

Trip Generation Rates								
Land Use	***Rate***	***Daily***	***AM Peak Hour***			***PM Peak Hour***		
			In	***Out***	***Total***	***In***	***Out***	***Total***
Single-Family Detached Housing (ITE Code 210)	per du	Ln(T)=0.92* Ln(X)+2.71	25%	75%	T=0.71(X)+4.80	63%	37%	Ln(T)=0.96*Ln(X) +0.20
Trip Generation Estimates								
Land Use	***Size***	***Daily***	***AM Peak Hour***			***PM Peak Hour***		
			In	***Out***	***Total***	***In***	***Out***	***Total***
Single-Family Detached Housing (ITE Code 210)	82 DU	866	16	47	63	53	31	84

Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers
Notes:
DU = dwelling units
Kittelson and Associates, Inc., 2019

No Existing Plus Project level of service (LOS) impacts were found at any of the 12 study intersections in the project vicinity. For the Cumulative 2035 Plus Project LOS analysis, PG 5 was analyzed together with PG 6 as a single project. Significant LOS impacts were found at four study intersections, which are listed with their mitigation measures below. The June 2019 traffic study recommended folding these mitigation measures into the 2014 Hayward General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPU EIR) mitigation program.

- **Mission Boulevard & Fletcher Lane** (AM peak hour): Install an eastbound left turn pocket and restripe the current eastbound shared left/through lane to a dedicated through lane.
- **Mission Boulevard & Palisade Street** (AM and PM peak hours): Signalization of the intersection. The northbound and westbound directions should be signalized. The southbound direction should remain uncontrolled with the Mission Blvd. median retained.
- **Mission Boulevard & Carlos Bee Boulevard/Orchard Avenue** (PM peak hour): Restripe the outer westbound through lane as a shared through/right turn lane.

- **Mission Boulevard & Harder Road** (PM peak hour): Re-optimization of signal timing splits to provide additional green time for eastbound left turn and westbound left turn movements.

The 2019 traffic study also included the following non-CEQA recommendations:

- Coordinate with the City of Hayward to install driveway conflict paint along bikeways at the impacted intersections along Carlos Bee Blvd. and Harder Rd.
- Coordinate with the City of Hayward to install signage (such as bikeway signage and caution signage) at and approaching the project access points.
- Work with the City of Hayward to explore options for implementing traffic calming techniques (such as narrowing lanes or roadways, installing lateral shifts, or installing speed bumps) on local roads that provide access to the project as part of design review and conditions of approval.

EFFECTS ON TRAFFIC STUDY FINDINGS

Since the preparation of the June 2019 traffic study, the project description has been updated and project boundaries expanded to consist of 78 single-family residential units (an increase of four) and eight ADUs (no increase). This section examines the implications of the updated project description in terms of additional or worsened transportation impacts compared to the 2019 traffic study.

The trip generation estimates for the updated project are shown in Table 2 below. Given that ADUs are exempt from CEQA environmental analysis, trip generation has only been estimated for the 78 single-family units. As shown in the table, the project is expected to generate 827 daily vehicle trips, 60 AM peak hour vehicle trips, and 80 PM peak hour trips.

Table 2: Parcel Group 5 Trip Generation (Updated Project Description)

Trip Generation Rates								
Land Use	***Rate***	***Daily***	***AM Peak Hour***			***PM Peak Hour***		
			In	***Out***	***Total***	***In***	***Out***	***Total***
Single-Family Detached Housing (ITE Code 210)	per du	Ln(T)=0.92* Ln(X)+2.71	25%	75%	T=0.71(X)+4.80	63%	37%	Ln(T)=0.96*Ln(X) +0.20
Trip Generation Estimates								
Land Use	***Size***	***Daily***	***AM Peak Hour***			***PM Peak Hour***		
			In	***Out***	***Total***	***In***	***Out***	***Total***
Single-Family Detached Housing (ITE Code 210)	78 DU	827	15	45	60	50	30	80

Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers
Notes:
DU = dwelling units
Kittelson and Associates, Inc., 2020

As shown in the table, the updated project is expected to generate fewer vehicle trips for environmental impact analysis purposes. Specifically, it is expected to generate 39 fewer daily vehicle trips, three fewer AM peak hour vehicle trips, and four fewer PM peak hour vehicle trips compared to

what was analyzed in the June 2019 traffic study. As noted earlier in this memo, the June 2019 traffic study conservatively analyzed all 74 single-family units and eight ADUs as 82 single-family units; however, ADUs are exempt from CEQA analysis.

Given that the updated project is expected to generate fewer vehicle trips compared to what was analyzed for the June 2019 traffic study, this change is not expected to generate any new LOS impacts or worsen impacts at the study intersections. In addition, additional traffic calming, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements would not be required beyond what was recommended in the June 2019 study.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The findings detailed in this memorandum are summarized below:

- Per City request, this memorandum analyzed the transportation impact implications of adding four single-family units to the project. Prior to this, Kittelson had analyzed PG 5 assuming 82 single-family dwelling units (including the eight ADUs).
- Previously, the 2019 traffic study found cumulative LOS impacts and provided mitigation measures at four study intersections. The study also recommended traffic calming, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements.
- With the change in the number of units, the updated project is expected to generate 39 fewer daily vehicle trips, three fewer AM peak hour vehicle trips, and four fewer PM peak hour vehicle trips compared to what was analyzed in the June 2019 traffic study.
- Since ADUs are categorically exempt from CEQA analysis, this memo analyzed 78 units as the revised project.
- Due the lower expected vehicle trips, the updated project is not expected to generate any new LOS impacts or worsen impacts at the study intersections, nor require any additional traffic calming, bicycle, or pedestrian improvements.