2. SUMMARY

This EIR chapter provides a summary description of the City of Hayward 2040 General Plan, a list of associated environmental issues to be resolved, a summary identification of significant impacts and mitigation measures associated with the 2040 General Plan, and a summary identification of possible alternatives to the 2040 General Plan (pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123, Summary).

This summary should not be relied upon for a thorough understanding of the details of the project, its individual impacts, and related mitigation needs. Please refer to Chapter 3 for a complete description of the project, Chapters 5 through 19 for a complete description of environmental impacts and associated mitigation measures, Chapter 20 for a description and evaluation of alternatives to the project, and Chapter 21 for CEQA-mandated sections.

2.1 PROPOSED 2040 GENERAL PLAN

The City of Hayward is proposing to adopt the 2040 General Plan. The 2040 General Plan represents the community's view of its future and expresses the community's conservation and development goals for the next 26 years (2014-2040). The purpose of 2040 General Plan is to: (1) identify land use, transportation, environmental, economic, and social goals and policies as they relate to land use and development; (2) provide a basis for a community's decision-making regarding land use; (3) provide citizens an opportunity to participate in the planning and decision-making process; and (4) inform citizens, developers, decision-makers, and others of the ground rules that guide development in the community.

The project objectives of the 2040 General Plan are:

#1: Hayward should value, challenge, and support youth by providing excellent public schools and youth enrichment activities and programs.

#2: Hayward should have safe and clean neighborhoods with an expanded network of parks and thriving commercial centers that incorporate attractive design, provide easy access to jobs, support a diverse population, encourage long-term residency, and inspire all residents to live active, healthy, and green lifestyles.

#3: Hayward should develop and enhance its utility, communications, and technology infrastructure; and provide exceptional police, fire, and emergency services.

#4: Hayward should be a business-friendly community that has a robust and diversified economy based in innovation, creativity, and local entrepreneurship.

#5: Hayward should have a safe, walkable, vibrant, and prosperous Downtown that serves as an attractive area for businesses and a destination for shopping and dining, arts and entertainment, and college-town culture.

#6: Hayward should have a reputation as a great college town and a community that offers a range of opportunities for life-long learning.

#7: Hayward residents, workers, and students should have access to an interconnected network of safe, affordable, dependable, and convenient transportation options.

#8: Hayward should preserve, enhance, increase, and connect its baylands, hillsides, greenway trails, and regional parks to protect environmental resources, mitigate the impacts of rising sea levels, and provide opportunities to live an active outdoor lifestyle.

The 2040 General Plan would allow up to approximately 7,472 additional single family dwelling units, 7,399 additional multi-family dwelling units, and 25,787 additional jobs over current (2010) conditions in the Planning Area. The jobs are generally categorized as follows: retail, service, manufacturing, wholesale, agricultural, and other. Approximately 79 percent of the 2010-2040 housing growth in the Planning Area is expected to occur in five Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in the City. As a largely built-out community, future development opportunities are limited to relatively small infill sites and the redevelopment of underutilized parcels. The development capacity assumptions are derived from already adopted plans and initiatives as well as on housing, population, and employment projections issued by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG).

The adopted 2002 General Plan can already accommodate ABAG-projected 2040 housing, population, and employment growth in the Planning Area. Therefore, the 2040 General Plan focuses primarily on new and revised goals, policies, and implementation programs to reflect the City's recent accomplishments, adopted plans and initiatives, and new priorities. The 2040 General Plan does not significantly alter existing or create any new land use designations, or result in significant redesignation of land, in the Planning Area.

Implementation of the Hayward 2040 General Plan would require the following City actions:

(1) Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the proposed General Plan;

(2) Adoption of the 2040 General Plan itself; and

(3) Approval of any associated zoning amendments and any associated amendments to other City regulations to reflect and implement the land uses, goals, policies, and implementation programs specified by the 2040 General Plan.

2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

As required by the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR addresses the following areas of potential environmental impact or controversy known to the Lead Agency (the City), including those issues and concerns identified by the City in its Notice of Preparation (NOP) of this EIR (dated August 2, 2013) and by other agencies, organizations, and individuals in response to the NOP. These environmental concerns relate to the following topics (listed in the order that they are addressed in this EIR):

- Aesthetics and Visual Resources,

- Agricultural and Forestry Resources,
- Air Quality,
- Biological Resources,
- Geology, Soils, and Minerals,
- Global Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions,
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials,
- Historic and Cultural Resources,
- Hydrology and Water Quality,
- Land Use and Planning,
- Noise,
- Population and Housing,
- Public Services,
- Transportation and Circulation, and
- Utilities and Service Systems.

2.3 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

For each of the 15 environmental topics listed above, any ***"significant"*** project or cumulative impact and associated mitigation measure or measures identified in this EIR are summarized in Table 2.1, the SUMMARY OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES, which follows. The summary chart has been organized to correspond with the more detailed impact and mitigation discussions in chapters 5 through 19 of this EIR. The chart is arranged in five columns: (1) identified impacts, (2) significance without mitigation, (3) recommended mitigation measures, (4) the entity responsible for implementing each mitigation measure, and (5) the level of impact significance after implementation of the mitigation measure(s).

Table 2.1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
AIR QUALITY				
Impact 7-1: Conflict With or Obstruct Implementation of Applicable Air Quality Plans. The proposed General Plan would be substantially consistent with all applicable control measures in the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan. However, the proposed General Plan would still have significant and unavoidable impacts associated with short-term construction and long-term operational emissions, as well as health risk exposure associated with toxic air contaminants and $PM_{2.5}$, as noted under Impacts 7-2, 7-3, and 7-4. Because the proposed General Plan exceeds the District's air quality thresholds of significance, the proposed General Plan would not be considered to be fully consistent with the Clean Air Plan goals. This would be a ***significant impact***.	S	**Mitigation 7-1.** There are no additional measures that would reduce this impact. As discussed under Impacts 7-2, 7-3 and 7-4, the identified impacts from short-term construction emissions, long-term operational emissions, and health risk exposure to TAC and $PM_{2.5}$ impacts would remain significant and unavoidable after application of all feasible mitigation. Therefore, in accordance with guidance from BAAQMD, the proposed General Plan would not be fully consistent with the primary goals of the Bay Area Clean Air Plan. This impact would be ***significant and unavoidable***.	City	SU
Impact 7-2: Short-Term Construction Emissions of ROG, NO_X, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Implementation of the proposed General Plan would involve construction of development projects that would result in the temporary generation of ROG and NO_X (ozone precursors), and PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ (criteria pollutant) emissions from site preparation (e.g.,	S	**Mitigation 7-2.** There are no additional measures available that would reduce impacts from short-term construction emissions. All feasible construction emission reduction measures have been incorporated into the proposed General Plan. Therefore, this impact would remain ***significant and unavoidable.***	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
excavation, grading, and clearing), off-road equipment, material import/export, worker commute exhaust emissions, paving, and other miscellaneous activities. Emissions from individual construction projects could exceed BAAQMD's project-level significance thresholds. This would be a ***significant impact***.				
Impact 7-3: Long-Term Operational Emissions of ROG, NO_X, CO, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Project-related operational emissions of the ozone precursors ROG and NO_X would be reduced on an annual basis over the General Plan implementation period, as compared with existing conditions. However, operational PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would increase compared to baseline conditions. While the proposed General Plan would be consistent with all applicable control measures in the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan, the rate of increase in VMT and vehicle trips under the proposed General Plan would be higher than the rate of population increase by 2035. Therefore, impacts associated with long-term operational emissions under the proposed General Plan would be a ***significant impact***.	S	**Mitigation 7-3.** There are no additional measures that would substantially reduce impacts from long-term operational emissions. All feasible long-term operational emission reduction measures have been incorporated into the goals, policies and programs in the proposed General Plan. This impact would therefore be ***significant and unavoidable.***	City	SU
Impact 7-4: Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) and Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$). Implementation of development projects consistent with the	S	**Mitigation 7-4.** Incorporation of specific source-reduction and receptor-oriented risk reduction measures and best management (BMPs) into the proposed General Plan (see Tables 7.9 and	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
proposed General Plan could involve siting of sensitive receptors near major roadways or near major stationary sources of TAC and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions, as well as the siting of potential new sources of these emissions. Such actions could increase community health risk exposure associated with these emissions. While the proposed General Plan contains a Community Risk Reduction Strategy consisting of goals, policies, implementation programs, and specific BMPs to reduce these risks, the effectiveness of the Strategy in reducing health risk exposure cannot be quantified at this time. Therefore, impacts associated with health risk exposure to TACs and $PM_{2.5}$ would be a ***significant impact***.		7.10 above), would further reduce impacts associated with health risk exposure to TACs and $PM_{2.5}$, as part of the Community Risk Reduction Strategy. While the above-referenced source-reduction and receptor-oriented measures and BMPs would reduce health risk exposure, the overall effectiveness of these measures and BMPs in reducing communitywide health risk exposure cannot be quantified at this time, due to lack of quantification methodology and/or limited research on their effectiveness. There are no additional mitigation measures that would substantially reduce community health risk exposure to TACs and $PM_{2.5}$. All feasible risk reduction measures and BMPs have been incorporated into the Community Risk Reduction Strategy contained within the proposed General Plan. Therefore, this impact would remain ***significant and unavoidable***.		
NOISE				
Impact 15-1: Short-Term Construction Noise Levels. Implementation of projects under the proposed General Plan would involve construction that would result in temporary noise generation primarily from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment. Based on modeling for typical construction activities, short-term construction-generated noise could exceed applicable standards. This would represent a ***significant impact***.	S	**Mitigation 15-1.** The proposed General Plan Goal HAZ-8 and Policies HAZ-8.17, HAZ-8.20, and HAZ-8.21 establish the overall goal and intentions of the City with regards to construction-related noise. Policy HAZ-8.17 refers to a community noise control ordinance for the purposes of regulating community noise levels. The City has adopted Section 4-1.03.4 of the Municipal Code (Construction and Alteration of Structures; Landscaping Activities), which	City	LS

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		states that individual devices/pieces of construction equipment are not to exceed 83 dB at a distance of 25 feet from the source and 86 dB at any point of the property plane Monday through Saturday from 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM and Sundays from 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM, "unless otherwise provided pursuant to a duly-issued permit or a condition of approval." Thus, while the code establishes specific standards to reduce construction noise from typical construction activities, it may not apply to all development projects requiring discretionary approval. Policy HAZ-8.20 establishes that a site-specific noise study may be required by the City for discretionary projects requiring land use entitlements. In addition, Policy HAZ-8.21 establishes limits on construction noise-generating activities to the less sensitive times of the day, when people are less likely to be disturbed. While adoption of these proposed General Plan policies could reduce potential impacts, these policies would not fully prevent exposure of sensitive receptors located near construction activities to excessive noise levels. Some construction projects could still be approved that would not be subject to specific noise studies or be required to reduce construction noise levels.		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		Therefore, this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable.**		
Impact 15-2: Long-Term Traffic Noise Levels. Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase noise levels along transportation routes with nearby sensitive receptors. Proposed policies would establish noise standards for new development and require that site-specific noise studies be conducted to reduce noise exposure. However, in some instances, traffic-related noise increases could be more than 3 dB, the level typically audible to the human ear and; therefore, considered a substantial increase in noise. This would represent a ***significant impact***.	S	**Mitigation 15-2.** The implementation of the proposed policies and standards included in Tables 15.5 and 15.6 above would require all new development to comply with the City's noise standards, noise mitigation procedures, and sensitive land use siting policies. The proposed policies would require new projects to evaluate noise exposure and provide mitigation measures, if applicable, to reduce noise exposure at sensitive land uses and meet noise standards for the specific project type. Therefore, conducting project-level noise studies to comply with adopted noise standards would ensure that individuals are not exposed to excessive noise levels. Although adoption of the proposed policies would ensure that new development would comply with adopted noise standards and, therefore, would not expose new receptors to excessive noise levels, the proposed General Plan would still result in increases in traffic-related noise (i.e., increases of 3 or more dB and up to 15 dB in some areas of the City). As a result, project-generated increases in noise would result in a substantial permanent increase in community noise levels that could adversely affect existing receptors.	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		Much of the City is already built out, and anticipated growth under the proposed General Plan is expected to occur as infill, primarily in PDAs located near transit stations, in the City's downtown, and along major corridors. The ability of the City to reduce adverse effects of increased traffic noise on existing receptors by either constructing sound barriers or walls, or requiring new development to construct these sound walls, is constrained by a number of factors. First, many existing homes and other sensitive uses front on major traffic corridors from which the increased traffic noise is generated, and construction of new sound walls would be infeasible or incompatible with these developed uses. Second, the proposed General Plan contains Policy LU-4.10 (New Sound Walls and Fences), which discourages the construction of new sound walls and fences along corridors, and encourages new developments to front corridors whenever feasible. There are no additional, feasible measures or policies that would reduce this impact. Therefore, this impact would remain ***significant and unavoidable.***		
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION				
Impact 18-1: Project Intersection Impacts. Under the 2035 Project condition, implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in traffic volumes that exceed the City standard for intersection performance.	S	**Mitigation 18-1.** Make the following intersection improvements:		
		(a) Intersection 13: NB I-880 Ramps / Whipple Road-Industrial Parkway SW. Widen	City	LS

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
According to City guidelines, this change due to the proposed General Plan would potentially constitute a ***'considerable' project contribution to the significant cumulative impact.***		to convert northbound shared through-right lane to separate northbound right turn lane and a northbound through lane. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 64.5 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a ***less-than-significant level*** with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. **(b) Intersection 18: Industrial Boulevard / WB SR 92 ramps – Cryer St.** (1) Widen to add second northbound left turn lane (which could be done with striping if 10 foot lanes allowed); (2) Add second receiving lane on on-ramp (ramp would need reconfiguring). Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 57.2 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. These improvements to the on-ramp would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward; therefore, the mitigation is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		(c) Intersection 21: Hesperian Boulevard / Industrial Parkway. (1) Widen to convert the northbound through-right lane to a third northbound through (NBT) lane and one northbound right (NBR) lane; (2) Widen to convert eastbound through-right lane (EBTR) to second eastbound thru (EBT) lane and one eastbound right (EBR) lane; (3) Widen to convert southbound through-right (SBTR) to one southbound through (SBT) lane and one southbound right (SBR) lane; (4) Add overlap phasing at NBR, EBR, SBR, and WBR movements. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 75.7 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a ***less-than-significant level*** with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.	City	LS
		(d) Intersection 22: Santa Clara Street / Jackson Street. There is no feasible mitigation for this impact. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions or return the operations to the No Project condition. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. As a result this impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.		
		(e) Intersection 23: Santa Clara Street / Winton Avenue. (1) Widen to reconfigure northbound approach to 2 northbound left (NBL), 1 northbound through (NBT),and 1 northbound shared through-right (NBTR); (2) Widen to reconfigure southbound approach to 1 southbound left (SBL), 2 southbound through (SBT), and 1 southbound right (SBR); (3) Widen to reconfigure westbound approach to 1 westbound left (WBL), 2 westbound through (WBT), 1 westbound shared through-right (WBTR); (4) Add overlap on all signal phases except for the northbound-right (NBR) phase. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 75.2 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to ***less-than-significant*** with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.	City	LS
		(f) Intersection 25: Santa Clara St / West A St. (1) Widen to add exclusive northbound right (NBR) at least as far back as Amador Way	City	LS

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		and widen to have dual left, convert northbound shared through-right (NBTR) to northbound through (NBT) resulting in 2 northbound left (NBL) lanes, 2 northbound through (NBT) lanes, and one northbound right (NBR); (2) Add second eastbound left (EBL) lane; (3) Add another southbound through (SBT) lane; (4) Add overlap for right turns on all signal phases). Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS D with 50.4 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a ***less-than-significant level*** with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.		
		(g) Intersection 31: Foothill Blvd / Mattox Rd. (1) Reconfigure the southbound (SB) off-ramp lanes to 2 southbound left (SBL) lanes, 3 southbound through (SBT) lanes, and 1 southbound right (SBR); (2) Add overlaps for SBR and northbound right (NBR). Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS F with 90.7 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour and to LOS E with 76.9 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, which returns the operations to better than the	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		No Project condition. However, additional improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. These improvements to the intersection would be subject to coordination with and approval of Alameda County, and this intersection is not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward; therefore, the mitigation is considered to be infeasible, and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.		
Impact 18-2: Cumulative Intersection Impacts. Future growth in Hayward and the region would result in substandard intersection LOS under 2035 conditions with or without the project. According to the significance thresholds, these changes constitute a ***significant cumulative impact.***	S	**Mitigation 18-2.** Make the following intersection improvements: **(a) Intersection 2: Mission Boulevard / A Street**. There is no feasible mitigation for this impact. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. As a result this impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		(b) Intersection 6: SB I-880 Ramps / A Street. Reconfigure eastbound approach to 1 eastbound through (EBT) lane, 1 eastbound through-right (EBTR) lane and 1 right (EBR) lane and optimize signal timings. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 79.7 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour and LOS E with 77.8 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. These improvements to A Street would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward; therefore, the mitigation is considered to be infeasible, and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.	City	SU
		(c) Intersection 8: Mission Boulevard / Carlos Bee Boulevard. Optimize signal cycle length to 115 seconds. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 73.8 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a ***less-than-significant level*** with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.	City	LS
		(d) Intersection 11: Mission Boulevard / Industrial Parkway. There is no feasible mitigation for this impact. The signal cycle length could be optimized to 115 seconds; this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		74.8 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, but the AM peak hour would remain at LOS F with 128.1 seconds of delay. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions during the AM peak hour. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. As a result this impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*.**		
		(e) Intersection 12: Industrial Parkway SW / Industrial Parkway. There is no feasible mitigation for this impact. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. As a result this impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*.**	City	SU
		(f) Intersection 14: SB I-880 / Industrial Parkway. There is no feasible mitigation for this impact. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. As a result this impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*.**		
		(g) Intersection 15: Hesperian Boulevard / EB SR 92 Ramps. There is no feasible mitigation for this impact. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. As a result this impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*.**	City	SU
		(h) Intersection 16: Hesperian Boulevard / WB SR 92 Ramps. There is no feasible mitigation for this impact. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		modes. As a result this impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*.**		
		(i) Intersection 17: Industrial Parkway / EB SR 92 Ramps & Sleepy Hollow Avenue. There is no feasible mitigation for this impact. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. As a result this impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*.**	City	SU
		(j) Intersection 24: Hesperian Boulevard / West Winton Avenue. There is no feasible mitigation for this impact. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. As a result this impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*.**	City	SU
		(k) Intersection 26: Mission Boulevard / Sunset Boulevard. There is no feasible	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		mitigation for this impact. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. As a result this impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*.**		
		(l) Intersection 29: Mission Boulevard / D Street. There is no feasible mitigation for this impact. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. As a result this impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.	City	SU
		(m) Intersection 40: Hesperian Boulevard / Tennyson Road. Widen to reconfigure to 1 northbound left (NBL) lane, 3 northbound through (NBT) lanes, and 1 northbound right (NBR) lane. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 78.0 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour. However, this mitigation is considered to be	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		infeasible because widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. As a result this impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

2.4 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

To provide a basis for further understanding of the environmental effects of a proposed project and possible approaches to reducing its identified significant impacts, the CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to also "…describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives."

2.4.1 Identified Alternatives

Pursuant to these CEQA sections, Chapter 20 identifies and evaluates the following three alternatives to the project:

- **Alternative 1: No Project--Existing 2002 General Plan.** Alternative 1 consists of buildout of the Planning Area in accordance with the existing Hayward 2002 General Plan. Alternative 1 would result in the same number of single family residences, approximately 659 fewer multi-family dwelling units, a reduction in employment potential of 1,734 jobs, and a more auto-oriented development character in the Planning Area. The Planning Area population would be approximately 204,600 under the existing General Plan and 206,580 under the 2040 General Plan, a difference of less than 2,000.

- **Alternative 2: Overall Lower Development Density and Intensity.** Alternative 2 assumes adoption of a similar 2040 General Plan, but with an overall lower density and intensity of development in the Planning Area--for example, less new (net) residential development in the Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and less new (net) potential employment in the Planning Area. For the sake of comparison, new potential multi-family residential units and new potential employment would each be reduced by 20 percent compared to the proposed General Plan. Therefore, this alternative would result in 5,920 new multi-family units and 20,620 new jobs, compared to 7,399 new dwelling units and 25,787 new jobs under the 2040 General Plan, a reduction of 1,479 dwelling units and 5,167 jobs. ABAG projects that Hayward will grow to a total of 60,584 dwelling units by 2040; this alternative would result in about 57,308 units. The Planning Area household population would be approximately 202,000 under the alternative and 206,580 under the 2040 General Plan, a difference of 4,580.

- **Alternative 3: Less Employment in the Industrial Technology and Innovation Corridor.** Alternative 3 assumes adoption of a similar 2040 General Plan, but with less employment in the Industrial Technology and Innovation Corridor--for example, a combination of less new (net) development and less employee-intensive uses (e.g., manufacturing and warehousing at 1 employee per 750 square feet vs. research & development at 1 employee per 450 square feet). For the sake of comparison, this alternative assumes that the net change in employment across the Planning Area (including secondary employment not in the Industrial Corridor) would be reduced by 15 percent compared to the proposed General Plan. Therefore, this alternative would result in approximately 21,920 new jobs, compared to 25,787 new jobs under the 2040 General Plan, a reduction of 3,867 jobs. Further details of this alternative would be based on the fiscal analysis prepared for the 2040 General Plan.

- **Alternative 4: Alternative Plan Location.** Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states, "An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project[.]" Further, section 15126.6(c) explains, "Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental effects."

  Because an alternative project location would be infeasible, would not achieve the project objectives, and would not necessarily avoid or lessen the significant impacts of the project and might result in new significant impacts, an alternative that would involve a different project location was eliminated from further detailed consideration. No further evaluation of alternative project locations is required under CEQA.

2.4.2 Environmentally Superior Alternative

The CEQA Guidelines (section 15126[e][2]) stipulate, "If the environmentally superior alternative is the 'no project' alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives." Other than Alternative 1 (No Project--Existing 2002 General Plan), Alternative 2: Overall Lower Development Density and Intensity would result in the least adverse environmental impacts, and would therefore be the "environmentally superior alternative." This conclusion is based on the avoidance of significant unavoidable traffic intersection impacts of the project and the reduction of other significant unavoidable and less-than-significant impacts (see EIR Table 20.1).

3. DRAFT EIR REVISIONS

The following section includes all revisions to the Draft EIR made in response to comments received during the Draft EIR comment period. All text revisions are indicated by strike-through and underlining plus a bracket in the left margin next to the revised line(s). All of the revised pages supersede the corresponding pages in the February 2014 Draft EIR. None of the criteria listed in CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5 (Recirculation of an EIR Prior to Certification) indicating the need for recirculation of the February 2014 Draft EIR has been met as a result of the revisions. In particular:

- no new significant environmental impact due to the project or due to a new mitigation measure has been identified;
- no substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact has been identified; and
- no additional feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others analyzed in the Draft EIR has been identified that would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project.

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
proposed General Plan could involve siting of sensitive receptors near major roadways or near major stationary sources of TAC and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions, as well as the siting of potential new sources of these emissions. Such actions could increase community health risk exposure associated with these emissions. While the proposed General Plan contains a Community Risk Reduction Strategy consisting of goals, policies, implementation programs, and specific BMPs to reduce these risks, the effectiveness of the Strategy in reducing health risk exposure cannot be quantified at this time. Therefore, impacts associated with health risk exposure to TACs and $PM_{2.5}$ would be a ***significant impact***.		7.10 above), would further reduce impacts associated with health risk exposure to TACs and $PM_{2.5}$, as part of the Community Risk Reduction Strategy. While the above-referenced source-reduction and receptor-oriented measures and BMPs would reduce health risk exposure, the overall effectiveness of these measures and BMPs in reducing communitywide health risk exposure cannot be quantified at this time, due to lack of quantification methodology and/or limited research on their effectiveness. There are no additional mitigation measures that would substantially reduce community health risk exposure to TACs and $PM_{2.5}$. All feasible risk reduction measures and BMPs have been incorporated into the Community Risk Reduction Strategy contained within the proposed General Plan. Therefore, this impact would remain ***significant and unavoidable***.		
NOISE				
Impact 15-1: Short-Term Construction Noise Levels. Implementation of projects under the proposed General Plan would involve construction that would result in temporary noise generation primarily from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment. Based on modeling for typical construction activities, short-term construction-generated noise could exceed applicable standards. This would represent a ***significant impact***.	S	**Mitigation 15-1.** The proposed General Plan includes Goal HAZ-8; ~~and~~ Policies HAZ-8.17, HAZ-8.20, ~~and~~ HAZ-8.21, and HAZ-8.24; and Implementation Program HAZ 7, which establish the overall goal and intentions of the City with regards to construction-related noise. Policy HAZ-8.17 refers to a community noise control ordinance for the purposes of regulating community noise levels. The City has adopted Section 4-1.03.4 of the Municipal Code	City	LS

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		(Construction and Alteration of Structures; Landscaping Activities), which		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		states that individual devices/pieces of construction equipment are not to exceed 83 dB at a distance of 25 feet from the source and 86 dB at any point of the property plane Monday through Saturday from 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM and Sundays from 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM, "unless otherwise provided pursuant to a duly-issued permit or a condition of approval." Thus, while the code establishes specific standards to reduce construction noise from typical construction activities, it may not apply to all development projects requiring discretionary approval. However, Policy HAZ-8.24 establishes the City's intent to develop specific construction noise standards, and Implementation Program HAZ-7 would result in the preparation and adoption of a Construction Noise Control Ordinance that would apply to all construction projects, including discretionary projects. Policy HAZ-8.20 establishes that a site-specific noise study may be required by the City for discretionary projects requiring land use entitlements. In addition, Policy HAZ-8.21 establishes limits on construction noise-generating activities to the less sensitive times of the day, when people are less likely to be disturbed.		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		~~While a~~Adoption of these proposed General Plan policies and implementation program ~~could reduce potential impacts, these policies~~ would ~~not fully prevent~~ ensure that exposure of sensitive receptors located near construction activities to excessive noise levels would be avoided or reduced to~~. Some construction projects could still be approved that would not be subject to specific noise studies or be required to reduce construction noise levels.~~		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		~~Therefore, this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable.**~~ a ***less-than-significant level.***		
Impact 15-2: Long-Term Traffic Noise Levels. Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase noise levels along transportation routes with nearby sensitive receptors. Proposed policies would establish noise standards for new development and require that site-specific noise studies be conducted to reduce noise exposure. However, in some instances, traffic-related noise increases could be more than 3 dB, the level typically audible to the human ear and~~:~~, therefore, considered a substantial increase in noise. This would represent a ***significant impact***.	S	**Mitigation 15-2.** The implementation of the proposed policies and standards included in Tables 15.5 and 15.6 above would require all new development to comply with the City's noise standards, noise mitigation procedures, and sensitive land use siting policies. The proposed policies would require new projects to evaluate noise exposure and provide mitigation measures, if applicable, to reduce noise exposure at sensitive land uses and meet noise standards for the specific project type. Therefore, conducting project-level noise studies to comply with adopted noise standards would ensure that individuals are not exposed to excessive noise levels. Although adoption of the proposed policies would ensure that new development would comply with adopted noise standards and, therefore, would not expose new receptors to excessive noise levels, the proposed General Plan would still result in increases in traffic-related noise (i.e., increases of 3 or more dB and up to 15 dB in some areas of the City). As a result, project-generated increases in noise would result in a substantial permanent increase in community noise levels that could adversely affect existing receptors.	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		Much of the City is already built out, and anticipated growth under the proposed General Plan is expected to occur as infill, primarily in PDAs located near transit stations, in the City's downtown, and along major corridors. The ability of the City to reduce adverse effects of increased traffic noise on existing receptors by either constructing sound barriers or walls, or requiring new development to construct these sound walls, is constrained by a number of factors. First, many existing homes and other sensitive uses front on major traffic corridors from which the increased traffic noise is generated, and construction of new sound walls would be infeasible or incompatible with these developed uses. Second, the proposed General Plan contains Policy LU-4.10 (New Sound Walls and Fences), which discourages the construction of new sound walls and fences along corridors, and encourages new developments to front corridors whenever feasible. There are no additional, feasible measures or policies that would reduce this impact. Therefore, this impact would remain ***significant and unavoidable.***		
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION				
Impact 18-1: Project Intersection Impacts. Under the 2035 Project condition, implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in traffic volumes that exceed the City standard for intersection performance.	S	**Mitigation 18-1.** Make the following intersection improvements:		
		(a) Intersection 13: NB I-880 Ramps / Whipple Road-Industrial Parkway SW. Widen	City	LS

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
According to City guidelines, this change due to the proposed General Plan would potentially constitute a ***'considerable' project contribution to the significant cumulative impact.***		to convert northbound shared through-right lane to separate northbound right turn lane and a northbound through lane. This may require additional right of way of approximately 12 feet. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 64.5 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. These improvements to the ramp intersection would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward; therefore, the mitigation would require coordination with these jurisdictions for implementation. The buildout of the General Plan would take place over many years; the City will monitor conditions as individual projects are implemented to determine when these		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		mitigations need to be implemented. The proposed mitigations are considered to be feasible after a determination is made for fair share contribution and coordination with Caltrans and other jurisdictions as applicable. The impact is considered to be ***less-than-significant.***		
		(b) Intersection 18: Industrial Boulevard / WB SR 92 ramps – Cryer St. (1) Widen to add second northbound left turn lane (which could be done with striping if 10 foot lanes allowed); (2) Add second receiving lane on on-ramp (ramp would need reconfiguring). Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 57.2 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection, and mitigation would require coordination with AC Transit to	City	~~SU~~LS

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		ensure there are no impacts to bus stop locations and bus service. These improvements to the ~~on~~ ramp intersection, would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward; therefore, the mitigation would require coordination with other jurisdictions. The buildout of the General Plan would take place over many years; the City will monitor conditions as individual projects are implemented to determine when these mitigations need to be implemented. The proposed mitigations are considered to be feasible after a determination is made for fair share contribution and coordination with Caltrans, AC Transit, and other jurisdictions as applicable. The impact is considered to be ***less-than-significant.*** ~~is considered to be infeasible, and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable.***~~		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		(c) Intersection 21: Hesperian Boulevard / Industrial Parkway. (1) Widen to convert the northbound through-right lane to a third northbound through (NBT) lane and one northbound right (NBR) lane; this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (2) Widen to convert eastbound through-right lane (EBTR) to second eastbound thru (EBT) lane and one eastbound right (EBR) lane; this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (3) Widen to convert southbound through-right (SBTR) to one southbound through (SBT) lane and one southbound right (SBR) lane; this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (4) Add overlap phasing at NBR, EBR, SBR, and WBR movements. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 75.7 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location.	City	LS

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, this intersection is located on the Alameda Countywide Bicycle network and resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan. Also, major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection. Mitigation would require coordination with Alameda County and AC Transit to ensure there are no impacts on the bicycle network, pedestrian amenities, bus stop locations, and bus service. The buildout of the General Plan would take place over many years; the City will monitor conditions as individual projects are implemented to determine when these mitigations need to be implemented. The proposed mitigations are considered to be feasible after coordination with Alameda County and AC Transit. The impact is considered to be ***less-than-significant.***		
		(d) Intersection 22: Santa Clara Street / Jackson Street. (1) Widen to add a 4th westbound through lane (WBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		(2) Widen to add a 2nd eastbound left turn lane (EBLT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (3) Widen to add a 2nd northbound through lane (NBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (4) Widen to add a 2nd southbound through lane (SBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. Implementation of these improvements would mitigate both Project level and Cumulative level impacts, and improve conditions to LOS E with 66.9 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 91.0 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour. The mitigations would reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.		
		~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions or return the operations to the No Project condition. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. These improvements to the intersection would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward. At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, and ~~As a result this~~ the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.		
		(e) Intersection 23: Santa Clara Street / Winton Avenue. (1) Widen to reconfigure northbound approach to 2 northbound left (NBL), 1 northbound through (NBT),and 1 northbound shared through-right (NBTR); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (2) Widen to reconfigure southbound approach to 1 southbound left (SBL), 2 southbound through (SBT), and 1 southbound right (SBR); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (3) Widen to reconfigure westbound approach to 1 westbound left (WBL), 2 westbound through (WBT), 1 westbound shared through-right (WBTR); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.	City	LS

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		(4) Add overlap on all signal phases except for the northbound-right (NBR) phase. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 75.2 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to *less-than-significant* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, this intersection is located on the Alameda Countywide Bicycle network and resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan. Also, major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection. Mitigation would require coordination with Alameda County and AC Transit to ensure there are no impacts on the bicycle network, pedestrian amenities, bus stop locations, and bus service.		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		The buildout of the General Plan would take place over many years; the City will monitor conditions as individual projects are implemented to determine when these mitigations need to be implemented. The proposed mitigations are considered to be feasible after coordination with Alameda County and AC Transit. The impact is considered to be ***less-than-significant.***		
		(f) Intersection 25: Santa Clara St / West A St. (1) Widen to add exclusive northbound right (NBR) at least as far back as Amador Way	City	LS

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		and widen to have dual left, convert northbound shared through-right (NBTR) to northbound through (NBT) resulting in 2 northbound left (NBL) lanes, 2 northbound through (NBT) lanes, and one northbound right (NBR); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (2) Add second eastbound left (EBL) lane; this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (3) Add another southbound through (SBT) lane; this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (4) Add overlap for right turns on all signal phases~~)~~. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS D with 50.4 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, this intersection is located on the Alameda Countywide Bicycle		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		network; mitigation would require coordination with Alameda County to ensure there are no impacts to the bicycle network. The buildout of the General Plan would take place over many years; the City will monitor conditions as individual projects are implemented to determine when these mitigations need to be implemented. The proposed mitigations are considered to be feasible after coordination with Alameda County. The impact is considered to be ***less-than-significant.***		
		(g) Intersection 31: Foothill Blvd / Mattox Rd. (1) Reconfigure the southbound (SB) off-ramp lanes to 2 southbound left (SBL) lanes, 3 southbound through (SBT) lanes, and 1 southbound right (SBR); (2) Add overlaps for SBR and northbound right (NBR). Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS F with 90.7 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour and to LOS E with 76.9 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, which returns the operations to better than the	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		No Project condition. However, ~~additional~~ significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. This intersection is under the jurisdiction of Alameda County. In addition, this intersection is located on the Alameda Countywide Bicycle network and resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan. ~~These improvements to the intersection would be subject to coordination with and approval of Alameda County, and this intersection is not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward; therefore, the mitigation is~~ At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
Impact 18-2: Cumulative Intersection Impacts. Future growth in Hayward and the region would result in substandard intersection LOS under 2035 conditions with or without the project. According to the significance thresholds, these changes constitute a ***significant cumulative impact.***	S	**Mitigation 18-2.** Make the following intersection improvements: **(a) Intersection 2: Mission Boulevard / A Street**. (1) Widen to add a 4th westbound left turn lane (WBL); (2) Widen to add a 2nd westbound through lane (WBT); (3) Widen to add 2 exclusive westbound right turn lanes (WBR) (4) Widen to add a 2nd southbound through lane (SBT) (5) Widen to add a 3rd eastbound left turn lane (EBL) (6) Optimize signal cycle length to 115 seconds. Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS E with 65.1 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 61.6 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. ~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, this intersection is located on the Alameda Countywide Bicycle network and resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan. Also, major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection. The City has implemented Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) strategies at this location, including signal coordination and adaptive traffic control systems using the Sydney Coordinated Adaptive Traffic Systems (SCATS) system. These strategies could help to improve conditions and reduce impacts. However, at this time, the additional required measures are considered to be infeasible, and the~~As a result this~~ impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		(b) Intersection 6: SB I-880 Ramps / A Street. Reconfigure eastbound approach to 1 eastbound through (EBT) lane, 1 eastbound through-right (EBTR) lane, and 1 right (EBR) lane and optimize signal timings. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 79.7 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour and LOS E with 77.8 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. These improvements to A Street would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward; therefore, until Caltrans (and other jurisdictions as applicable) approve the mitigation, the mitigation is considered to be infeasible, and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.	City	SU
		(c) Intersection 8: Mission Boulevard / Carlos Bee Boulevard. Optimize signal cycle length to 115 seconds. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 73.8 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a ***less-than-significant level*** with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.	City	LS

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		(d) Intersection 11: Mission Boulevard / Industrial Parkway. (1) Widen to add a 3th southbound through lane (SBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (2) Restripe the southbound shared through-right lane as a southbound right turn lane (SBR). (3) Optimize signal cycle length to 115 seconds. Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS E with 79.3 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 57.5 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. ~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact. The signal cycle length could be optimized to 115 seconds; this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with~~	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		~~74.8 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, but the AM peak hour would remain at LOS F with 128.1 seconds of delay.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions during the AM peak hour. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, this intersection resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan, and major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection. At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, ~~As a result this~~ and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*****.**		
		(e) Intersection 12: Industrial Parkway SW / Industrial Parkway. (1) Restripe the westbound shared through-right lane as a westbound right turn lane (WBR). (2) Widen to add 2nd and 3rd westbound through lanes (WBT); this will require approximately 24 feet of additional right of way. (3) Restripe the eastbound shared through-right lane as an eastbound right turn lane (EBR).	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		(4) Widen to add 2nd and 3rd eastbound through lanes (EBT); this will require approximately 24 feet of additional right of way. (5) Widen to add a 2nd southbound through lane (SBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (6) Restripe the southbound shared through-right lane as a southbound right turn lane (SBR). (7) Widen to add a 2nd northbound through lane (NBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (8) Optimize signal cycle length to 95 seconds. Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS D with 45.8 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 74.2 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. ~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, this intersection resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan. At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, and the~~As a result this~~ impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*****.**		
		(f) Intersection 14: SB I-880 / Industrial Parkway. (1) Provide an additional receiving lane on the west side of the intersection to allow overlap phase for southbound right turn lane; this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (2) Widen to add 3rd westbound through lane (WBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (3) Widen to add 3rd eastbound through lane (EBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS D with 54.6 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS D with 54.9 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, these improvements to the intersection would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward. At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, ~~As a result this~~ and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*.**		
		(g) Intersection 15: Hesperian Boulevard / EB SR 92 Ramps. (1) Widen to add 3rd northbound through lane (NBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (2) Widen to add 2nd eastbound left turn lane (EBL) ; this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS B with 19.0 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS D with 50.1 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, these improvements to the intersection would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward. At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, ~~As a result this~~ and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*****.**		
		(h) Intersection 16: Hesperian Boulevard / WB SR 92 Ramps. (1) Widen to add 3rd southbound through lane (SBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (2) Widen to add 2nd eastbound left turn lane (EBL); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (3) Widen to add separate eastbound right turn lane (EBR); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (4) Provide overlap phase for eastbound right turn lane.	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS E with 60.4 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS B with 13.6 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. ~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		modes. In addition, major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection. Also, these improvements to the intersection would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward. At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, ~~As a result this~~ and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*.**		
		(i) Intersection 17: Industrial Parkway / EB SR 92 Ramps & Sleepy Hollow Avenue. (1) Widen to add 2nd southbound through lane (SBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (2) Widen to add separate southbound right turn lane (SBR); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (3) Widen to add 2nd eastbound right turn lane (EBR); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS C with 24.3 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 61.0 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, these improvements to the intersection would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward. At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, ~~As a result this~~ and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*.**		
		(j) Intersection 24: Hesperian Boulevard / West Winton Avenue. (1) Widen to add 2nd westbound left turn lane (WBL); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (2) Optimize signal with a 105 second cycle length. Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS E with 63.3 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 69.6 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level*	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. ~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection. At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, ~~As a result this~~ and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*.**		
		(k) Intersection 26: Mission Boulevard / Sunset Boulevard. (1) Widen to add a separate southbound left turn lane (SBL); this may require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (2) Widen to add a separate northbound left turn lane (NBL); this may require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (3) Widen to add a separate eastbound left turn lane (EBL); this may require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		(4) Widen to add a separate westbound left turn lane (WSBL); this may require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (5) Optimize signal with a 105 second cycle length. Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS D with 35.2 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 73.7 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. ~~There is no feasible~~		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		~~mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, this intersection resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan, and major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection. At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, ~~As a result this~~ and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*****.**		
		(l) Intersection 29: Mission Boulevard / D Street. (1) Widen to add 4th southbound through lane (SBT); this may require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way. (2) Optimize signal with a 120 second cycle length. Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS E with 60.1 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 79.5 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, this intersection resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan, and major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection. The City has implemented ITS strategies at this location, including signal coordination and adaptive traffic control systems using the SCATS system. These strategies could help to improve conditions and reduce impacts. However, at this time, the additional required measures are considered to be infeasible, and the~~As a result this~~ impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.		
		(m) Intersection 40: Hesperian Boulevard / Tennyson Road. Widen to reconfigure to 1 northbound left (NBL) lane, 3 northbound through (NBT) lanes, and 1 northbound right (NBR) lane. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 78.0 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour. In addition, this intersection resides in an area of	City	SU

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan, and major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection. ~~However~~At this time, this mitigation is considered to be		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Impacts	Significance Without Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Responsibility	Significance With Mitigation
		infeasible because widening and increasing capacity could require significant right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. As a result this impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.		

S = Significant
LS = Less than significant
SU = Significant unavoidable impact
NA = Not applicable

Table 7.3 Proposed Hayward General Plan Policies to Avoid or Reduce Construction-Related Emissions		
Objective	Goal/Policy/Implementation Program	How Does It Avoid or Reduce Impact?
	sensitive land uses in proximity to TAC- and $PM_{2.5}$-emitting sources and odor sources in order to minimize health risk.	
Policy NR-2.17 Source Reduction Measures	The City shall coordinate with and support the efforts of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the California Air Resources Board, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other agencies as appropriate to implement source reduction measures and best management practices that address both existing and new sources of toxic air contaminants (TAC) and fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$), and odors.	Requires the application of project-specific BMPs that reduce construction exhaust and fugitive dust as part of the City's Community Risk Reduction Strategy (see Impact 7.4).
Policy NR-2.18 Exposure Reduction BMPs for New Receptors	The City shall require development projects to implement all applicable best management practices that will reduce exposure of new sensitive receptors (e.g., hospitals, schools, daycare facilities, elderly housing and convalescent facilities) to odors, toxic air contaminants (TAC), and fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$).	Requires the application of project-specific BMPs that reduce exposure to construction exhaust and fugitive dust as part of the City's Community Risk Reduction Strategy (see Impact 7.4).
Policy NR-2.19 Exposure Reduction Measures for both Existing and New Receptors	The City shall work with area businesses, residents and partnering organizations to provide information about best management practices that can be implemented on a voluntary basis to reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants (TAC) and fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$).	Encourages voluntary reduction of construction exhaust emissions and fugitive dust, as well as exposure to these emissions, as part of the City's Community Risk Reduction Strategy (see Impact 7.4).
Implementation Program NR 19 Dust Control Ordinance	The City shall prepare a Dust Control Ordinance to regulate wind-blown dust generated from demolition, grading, excavation, and other temporary construction and landscaping activities. The ordinance shall include a list of best management practices (BMPs) designed to reduce dust, including but not limited to watering all active construction areas, covering any inactive areas on a construction site, installing wheel washers, sweeping streets surrounding project site, and installing dust monitors.	Establishes the City's intent to adopt a Dust Control Ordinance requiring application of BMPs to reduce dust from construction and landscaping activities.

Table 15.2 Proposed Hayward General Plan Policies to Avoid or Reduce Construction Noise and Vibration		
Objective	Goal/Policy/Implementation Program	How Does It Avoid or Reduce Impact?
Hazards Element		
Goal HAZ-8	Minimize human exposure to excessive noise	States the overall goal of the City to protect the overall welfare of the residents from adverse levels of noise.
Policy HAZ-8.17 Community Noise Control Ordinance	The City shall maintain, implement, and enforce a community noise control ordinance to regulate noise levels from public and private properties, vehicles, construction sites, and landscaping activities.	Requires construction activities to comply with the adopted construction-noise standards (Municipal Code Chapter 4 Public Welfare, Morals and Conflict, SEC. 4-1.03.4), which is intended to prevent sensitive receptors from exposure to excessive noise levels from short-term construction activities within the City.
Policy Haz-8.20 Construction Noise Study	The City may require development projects subject to discretionary approval to assess potential construction noise impacts on nearby sensitive uses and to minimize impacts on those uses, to the extent feasible.	Allows the City to require construction noise studies for discretionary projects that have the potential to result in substantial noise levels from construction activities. Noise studies would evaluate construction noise against adopted noise standards and provide mitigation measures to reduce noise exposure if deemed necessary.
Policy Haz-8.21 Construction and Maintenance Noise Limits	The City shall limit the hours of construction and maintenance activities to the less sensitive hours of the day (7:00 am to 7:00 pm Monday through Saturday and 10:00 am to 6:00 pm on Sundays and holidays)	Limits construction and maintenance activities to the less sensitive times of the day when people are more likely to be away from home. As result, people would be less likely to be affected by daytime construction noise activities.
Policy Haz-8.22 Vibration Impact Assessment	The City shall require a vibration impact assessment for proposed projects in which heavy-duty construction equipment would be used (e.g., pile driving, bulldozing) within 200 feet of an existing structure or sensitive receptor. If applicable, the City shall require all feasible mitigation measures to be implemented to ensure that no damage or disturbance to structures or sensitive receptors would occur.	Requires construction activities located in close proximity to existing sensitive receptors to conduct site-specific vibration noise studies. The noise studies would determine vibration impacts and include measures to reduce impacts associated with vibration noise and vibration damage to buildings, if deemed necessary. Therefore, under the proposed GPU, construction activities would not expose existing sensitive receptors to excessive levels of ground vibration.
Policy HAZ-8.24 Construction Noise Control Ordinance	The City shall develop noise control standards to regulate noise levels generated from temporary construction and landscaping activities.	Establishes the City's intent to develop noise control standards that would reduce noise levels from construction and landscaping activities.

Table 15.2 Proposed Hayward General Plan Policies to Avoid or Reduce Construction Noise and Vibration		
Objective	Goal/Policy/Implementation Program	How Does It Avoid or Reduce Impact?
Implementation Program HAZ 7 Construction Noise Control Ordinance	The City shall prepare and adopt a Construction Noise Control Ordinance to regulate the noise levels generated from temporary construction and landscaping activities. The ordinance shall include decibel level thresholds that should not be exceeded for construction equipment as well as establish appropriate hours and reduction measures for construction and landscaping activities to minimize impacts on nearby sensitive receptors.	Establishes the City's intent to develop a new Construction Noise Control Ordinance that would establish specific standards and appropriate hours of activity to reduce noise levels from construction and landscaping activities.

Mitigation 15-1. The proposed General Plan includes Goal HAZ-8~~;~~ ~~and~~ Policies HAZ-8.17, HAZ-8.20, ~~and~~ HAZ-8.21, and HAZ-8.24; and Implementation Program HAZ 7, which establish the overall goal and intentions of the City with regards to construction-related noise. Policy HAZ-8.17 refers to a community noise control ordinance for the purposes of regulating community noise levels. The City has adopted Section 4-1.03.4 of the Municipal Code (Construction and Alteration of Structures; Landscaping Activities), which states that individual devices/pieces of construction equipment are not to exceed 83 dB at a distance of 25 feet from the source and 86 dB at any point of the property plane Monday through Saturday from 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM and Sundays from 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM, "unless otherwise provided pursuant to a duly-issued permit or a condition of approval." Thus, while the code establishes specific standards to reduce construction noise from typical construction activities, it may not apply to all development projects requiring discretionary approval. However, Policy HAZ-8.24 establishes the City's intent to develop specific construction noise standards, and Implementation Program HAZ 7 would result in the preparation and adoption of a Construction Noise Control Ordinance that would apply to all construction projects, including discretionary projects.

Policy HAZ-8.20 establishes that a site-specific noise study may be required by the City for discretionary projects requiring land use entitlements. In addition, Policy HAZ-8.21 establishes limits on construction noise-generating activities to the less sensitive times of the day, when people are less likely to be disturbed. ~~While a~~Adoption of these proposed General Plan policies and implementation program ~~could reduce potential impacts, these policies~~ would ~~not fully prevent~~ ensure that exposure of sensitive receptors located near construction activities to excessive noise levels would be avoided or reduced ~~. Some construction projects could still be approved that would not be subject to specific noise studies or be required to reduce construction noise levels. Therefore, this impact would remain **significant and unavoidable.**~~to a ***less-than-significant level*.**

Ground Vibration. Construction activities due to implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in the temporary ground vibration from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment as well as long-term exposure to ground vibration from sources such as trains, busses, and the BART. The proposed General Plan contains policies that require construction activities located in close proximity to existing sensitive land uses, as well as new development projects located in close proximity to vibration noise sources, to conduct vibration noise studies. Noise studies would determine vibration impacts, and the City would require all feasible mitigation to be implemented to ensure that no damage or disturbance to structures or sensitive receptors would occur. Therefore, new development would not be exposed to excessive levels of vibration and this impact would be ***less than significant*** (see criterion [b] in subsection 15.2.1, "Significance Criteria," above).

Ground vibration may result from short-term construction activities as well as long-term exposure from transportation noise sources (i.e., passenger trains, freight trains, buses). Short-term and long-term vibration exposure are discussed separately below.

(a) Short-Term Construction-Related Ground Vibration Exposure. Construction activities have the potential to result in varying degrees of temporary ground vibration, depending on the specific construction equipment used and activities involved. Vibration generated by construction equipment spreads through the ground and diminishes with increases in distance.

Summary

Adoption of proposed Policies HAZ-8.22 and HAZ-8.23 would require a project-level noise and vibration study to determine vibration-related impacts on structures and humans. For projects located within 200 feet of a vibration-noise source, noise levels could exceed the FTA recommended threshold of 72 VdB and result in excessive vibration-noise exposure to residents. However, project level noise studies would determine vibration levels at these projects and recommend feasible mitigation measures (e.g., insulated windows and walls, sound walls or barriers, distance setbacks, or other construction or design measures) that would reduce vibration-noise to an acceptable level. Therefore, existing sensitive receptors and new sensitive receptors would not be exposed to excessive levels of ground vibration from new construction or existing vibration sources. This would be a ***less-than-significant impact.***

Mitigation. No additional mitigation is required beyond the requirements described above.

Impact 15-2: Long-Term Traffic Noise Levels. Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase noise levels along transportation routes with nearby sensitive receptors. Proposed policies would establish noise standards for new development and require that site-specific noise studies be conducted to reduce noise exposure. However, in some instances, traffic-related noise increases could be more than 3 dB, the level typically audible to the human ear and, therefore, considered a substantial increase in noise. This would represent a ***significant impact*** (see criteria [a] and [c] in subsection 15.2.1, "Significance Criteria," above).

Future planned development with implementation of the proposed General Plan could be exposed to existing community noise as well as increases in traffic noise due to anticipated traffic increases on transportation networks within the Planning Area. In addition, existing development within the Planning Area may also be exposed to increases in traffic noise as a result of the proposed General Plan.

Single-family residential development, schools, libraries, hospitals, convalescent homes, and places of worship are considered the most noise-sensitive land uses with regards to community noise. High-density and mixed-use residential, commercial, and industrial development is less noise-sensitive because uses are primarily indoors, and typically noise exposure can be reduced through design and material choice (e.g., outdoor activity areas are located in courtyards surrounded by structures, materials with greater insulation are used).

Existing and future traffic noise levels throughout the City were modeled to determine the anticipated traffic noise levels along major roadways. For a complete list of roadway segments and the modeled distances from the roadway centerline to the 60, 65, 70, and the 75 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)/Day-night noise level (L_{dn}) contour and the noise level at 50 feet from the roadway centerline (see the EIR appendices**)**. Noise contours were developed for the proposed General Plan buildout year of 2040 based on modeling results, and are shown below in Figure 15-1. Table 15.4 shows the existing (baseline) traffic noise levels on modeled roadways and, the projected 2040 traffic noise levels, and the change in noise levels at 50 feet from the modeled roadways. Existing and future projected traffic noise levels were based on the traffic modeling and Average Daily Traffic (ADT) data

(a) Intersections. The threshold used to determine whether project-related impacts at signalized intersections would be considered significant is if the additional traffic associated with the project would:

- Degrade the AM or PM peak hour from an acceptable LOS D (average control delay of 55 seconds/vehicle) or better under the Existing or No Project condition to an unacceptable LOS E or worse under the Project condition except when LOS E is determined by the City of Hayward as acceptable due to costs of mitigation or when there would be other unacceptable impacts; or

- Degrade the AM or PM peak hour operating at LOS E or F under the Existing or No Project condition by increasing the average control delay per vehicle by five (5) seconds or more.

Since the proposed General Plan is a long range plan, the intersection impacts were determined comparing the future (2035) cumulative with project condition to the baseline (existing) condition. Then, to determine whether the proposed General Plan results in a "considerable" contribution to that future cumulative condition, the future with project condition was compared to the future no project condition.

(b) Congestion Management Program Roadways and Transit. For CEQA purposes, a roadway segment is considered to operate at an acceptable level if the segment operates at the level of service standard identified for that segment by the county congestion management agency. According to the Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) 2011 Congestion Management Program (CMP), the ACTC has not adopted any policy for determining the threshold of significance for LOS for the Land Use Analysis Program of the CMP; therefore, for purposes of this EIR, the LOS standard for Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) roadways, which include the CMP roadway network, has been set as any impact that:

- Results in any roadway segment currently meeting its CMP LOS E standard to degrade to an LOS F, or

- Result in more than a 5% increase in the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio for any roadway segment already exceeding its CMP LOS standard, or if already LOS F, under cumulative no project conditions.

For the MTS transit services, the LOS standard has been set as any increase in transit ridership that:

- Results in a change to the 15 to 30 minute headway standard for AC Transit bus service, or
- Results in a change to the 3.75 to 15 minute headway standard for BART.
- The Alameda CTC has not established a standard for Amtrak; therefore, for the purposes of this EIR, the LOS standard is proposed as a change to the existing 60 minute headway standard for Amtrak Capit~~a~~ol Corridor.

18.2.2 Analysis Methodology

The potential impacts to the transportation system were evaluated according to the standards and practices of the City of Hayward and ACTC using the *2000 Highway Capacity Manual* methodologies for intersections, freeways, and local roadways as well as transit headway

For the remaining intersections that would operate below the LOS standard and meet the 5 second threshold, mitigation measures were considered to reduce the impact. Per City practice, an intersection can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level if an infrastructure improvement or traffic volume reduction results in the intersection operating at its minimum threshold or better. If an intersection is currently operating at substandard LOS, the improvement must, at a minimum, return the intersection to its No Project operating conditions to achieve a less-than-significant finding.

Impact 18-1: Project Intersection Impacts. Under the 2035 Project condition, implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in traffic volumes that exceed the City standard for intersection performance. According to City guidelines, this change due to the proposed General Plan would potentially constitute a ***'considerable' project contribution to the significant cumulative impact*** (see criteria for "Intersections" in subsection 18.2.1, "Significance Criteria," above).

Mitigation 18-1. Make the following intersection improvements:

(a) Intersection 13: NB I-880 Ramps / Whipple Road-Industrial Parkway SW. Widen to convert northbound shared through-right lane to separate northbound right turn lane and a northbound through lane. This may require additional right of way of approximately 12 feet.

Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 64.5 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes.

These improvements to the ramp intersection would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward; therefore, the mitigation would require coordination with these jurisdictions for implementation. The buildout of the General Plan would take place over many years; the City will monitor conditions as individual projects are implemented to determine when these mitigations need to be implemented. The proposed mitigations are considered to be feasible after a determination is made for fair share contribution and coordination with Caltrans and other jurisdictions as applicable. The impact is considered to be ***less-than-significant.***

(b) Intersection 18: Industrial Boulevard / WB SR 92 ramps – Cryer St.

(1) Widen to add second northbound left turn lane (which could be done with striping if 10 foot lanes allowed);

(2) Add second receiving lane on on-ramp (ramp would need reconfiguring).

Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 57.2 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour and reduce the impact to a ***less-than-significant level*** with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection, and mitigation would require coordination with AC Transit to ensure there are no impacts to bus stop locations and bus service.

These improvements to the ~~on-~~ramp intersection would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward; therefore, the mitigation would require coordination with other jurisdictions. The buildout of the General Plan would take place over many years; the City will monitor conditions as individual projects are implemented to determine when these mitigations need to be implemented. The proposed mitigations are considered to be feasible after a determination is made for fair share contribution and coordination with Caltrans, AC Transit, and other jurisdictions as applicable. The impact is considered to be ***less-than-significant.*** ~~is considered to be infeasible, and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.~~

(c) Intersection 21: Hesperian Boulevard / Industrial Parkway.

(1) Widen to convert the northbound through-right lane to a third northbound through (NBT) lane and one northbound right (NBR) lane; this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.

(2) Widen to convert eastbound through-right lane (EBTR) to second eastbound thru (EBT) lane and one eastbound right (EBR) lane; this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.

(continued)

Mitigation 18-1 (continued):

(3) Widen to convert southbound through-right (SBTR) to one southbound through (SBT) lane and one southbound right (SBR) lane; this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(4) Add overlap phasing at NBR, EBR, SBR, and WBR movements.

Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 75.7 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes.

In addition, this intersection is located on the Alameda Countywide Bicycle network and resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan. Also, major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection. Mitigation would require coordination with Alameda County and AC Transit to ensure there are no impacts on the bicycle network, pedestrian amenities, bus stop locations, and bus service.

The buildout of the General Plan would take place over many years; the City will monitor conditions as individual projects are implemented to determine when these mitigations need to be implemented. The proposed mitigations are considered to be feasible after coordination with Alameda County and AC Transit. The impact is considered to be ***less-than-significant.***

(d) Intersection 22: Santa Clara Street / Jackson Street.

(1) Widen to add a 4th westbound through lane (WBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(2) Widen to add a 2nd eastbound left turn lane (EBLT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(3) Widen to add a 2nd northbound through lane (NBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(4) Widen to add a 2nd southbound through lane (SBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.

Implementation of these improvements would mitigate both Project level and Cumulative level impacts, and improve conditions to LOS E with 66.9 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 91.0 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour. The mitigations would reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions or return the operations to the No Project condition. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. These improvements to the intersection would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward. At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, and ~~As a result this~~ the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.

(e) Intersection 23: Santa Clara Street / Winton Avenue.

(1) Widen to reconfigure northbound approach to 2 northbound left (NBL), 1 northbound through (NBT), and 1 northbound shared through-right (NBTR); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.

(2) Widen to reconfigure southbound approach to 1 southbound left (SBL), 2 southbound through (SBT), and 1 southbound right (SBR); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.

(3) Widen to reconfigure westbound approach to 1 westbound left (WBL), 2 westbound through (WBT), 1 westbound shared through-right (WBTR); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.

(4) Add overlap on all signal phases except for the northbound-right (NBR) phase.

Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 75.2 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to *less-than-significant* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes.

In addition, this intersection is located on the Alameda Countywide Bicycle network and resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan. Also, major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection. Mitigation would require coordination with Alameda County and AC Transit to ensure there are no impacts on the bicycle network, pedestrian amenities, bus stop locations, and bus service.

The buildout of the General Plan would take place over many years; the City will monitor conditions as individual projects are implemented to determine when these mitigations need to be implemented. The proposed mitigations are considered to be feasible after coordination with Alameda County and AC Transit. The impact is considered to be ***less-than-significant.***

(f) Intersection 25: Santa Clara St / West A St.

(1) Widen to add exclusive northbound right (NBR) at least as far back as Amador Way and widen to have dual left, convert northbound shared through-right (NBTR) to northbound through (NBT) resulting in 2 northbound left (NBL) lanes, 2 northbound through (NBT) lanes, and one northbound right (NBR); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.

(2) Add second eastbound left (EBL) lane; this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.

(3) Add another southbound through (SBT) lane; this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.

(4) Add overlap for right turns on all signal phases~~)~~.

(continued)

Mitigation 18-1 (continued):

Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS D with 50.4 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, this intersection is located on the Alameda Countywide Bicycle network; mitigation would require coordination with Alameda County to ensure there are no impacts to the bicycle network.

The buildout of the General Plan would take place over many years; the City will monitor conditions as individual projects are implemented to determine when these mitigations need to be implemented. The proposed mitigations are considered to be feasible after coordination with Alameda County. The impact is considered to be ***less-than-significant.***

(g) Intersection 31: Foothill Blvd / Mattox Rd.

(1) Reconfigure the southbound (SB) off-ramp lanes to 2 southbound left (SBL) lanes, 3 southbound through (SBT) lanes, and 1 southbound right (SBR);
(2) Add overlaps for SBR and northbound right (NBR).

Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS F with 90.7 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour and to LOS E with 76.9 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, which returns the operations to better than the No Project condition. However, ~~additional~~ significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes.

This intersection is under the jurisdiction of Alameda County. In addition, this intersection is located on the Alameda Countywide Bicycle network and resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan.

~~These improvements to the intersection would be subject to coordination with and approval of Alameda County, and this intersection is not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward; therefore, the mitigation is~~ At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.

Impact 18-2: Cumulative Intersection Impacts. Future growth in Hayward and the region would result in substandard intersection LOS under 2035 conditions with or without the project. According to the significance thresholds, these changes constitute a ***significant cumulative impact*** (see criteria for "Intersections " in subsection 18.2.1, "Significance Criteria," above).

Mitigation 18-2. Make the following intersection improvements:

(a) Intersection 2: Mission Boulevard / A Street.

(1) Widen to add a 4th westbound left turn lane (WBL);
(2) Widen to add a 2nd westbound through lane (WBT);
(3) Widen to add 2 exclusive westbound right turn lanes (WBR);
(4) Widen to add a 2nd southbound through lane (SBT);
(5) Widen to add a 3rd eastbound left turn lane (EBL);
(6) Optimize signal cycle length to 115 seconds.

Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS E with 65.1 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 61.6 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, this intersection is located on the Alameda Countywide Bicycle network and resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan. Also, major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection.

The City has implemented Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) strategies at this location, including signal coordination and adaptive traffic control systems using the Sydney Coordinated Adaptive Traffic Systems (SCATS) system. These strategies could help to improve conditions and reduce impacts. However, at this time, the additional required measures are considered to be infeasible, and the~~As a result this~~ impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.

(b) Intersection 6: SB I-880 Ramps / A Street. Reconfigure eastbound approach to 1 eastbound through (EBT) lane, 1 eastbound through-right (EBTR) lane, and 1 right (EBR) lane and optimize signal timings. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 79.7 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour and LOS E with 77.8 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E. These improvements to A Street would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward; therefore, until Caltrans (and other jurisdictions as applicable) approve the mitigation, the mitigation is considered to be infeasible, and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.

(c) Intersection 8: Mission Boulevard / Carlos Bee Boulevard. Optimize signal cycle length to 115 seconds. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 73.8 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a ***less-than-significant level*** with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

(d) Intersection 11: Mission Boulevard / Industrial Parkway.

(1) Widen to add a 3th southbound through lane (SBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.

(2) Restripe the southbound shared through-right lane as a southbound right turn lane (SBR).

(3) Optimize signal cycle length to 115 seconds.

Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS E with 79.3 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 57.5 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact. The signal cycle length could be optimized to 115 seconds; this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 74.8 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, but the AM peak hour would remain at LOS F with 128.1 seconds of delay.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions during the AM peak hour. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, this intersection resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan, and major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection.

At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, ~~As a result this~~ and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*****.**

(continued)

Mitigation 18-2 (continued):

(e) Intersection 12: Industrial Parkway SW / Industrial Parkway.

(1) Restripe the westbound shared through-right lane as a westbound right turn lane (WBR).
(2) Widen to add 2nd and 3rd westbound through lanes (WBT); this will require approximately 24 feet of additional right of way.
(3) Restripe the eastbound shared through-right lane as an eastbound right turn lane (EBR).
(4) Widen to add 2nd and 3rd eastbound through lanes (EBT); this will require approximately 24 feet of additional right of way.
(5) Widen to add a 2nd southbound through lane (SBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(6) Restripe the southbound shared through-right lane as a southbound right turn lane (SBR).
(7) Widen to add a 2nd northbound through lane (NBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(8) Optimize signal cycle length to 95 seconds.

Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS D with 45.8 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 74.2 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, this intersection resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan.

At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, and the~~As a result this~~ impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*.**

(f) Intersection 14: SB I-880 / Industrial Parkway.

(1) Provide an additional receiving lane on the west side of the intersection to allow overlap phase for southbound right turn lane; this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(2) Widen to add 3rd westbound through lane (WBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(3) Widen to add 3rd eastbound through lane (EBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.

Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS D with 54.6 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS D with 54.9 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, these improvements to the intersection would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward.

At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, ~~As a result this~~ and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*****.**

(g) Intersection 15: Hesperian Boulevard / EB SR 92 Ramps.

(1) Widen to add 3rd northbound through lane (NBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(2) Widen to add 2nd eastbound left turn lane (EBL) ; this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.

Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS B with 19.0 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS D with 50.1 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, these improvements to the intersection would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward.

At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, ~~As a result this~~ and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*****.**

(h) Intersection 16: Hesperian Boulevard / WB SR 92 Ramps.

(1) Widen to add 3rd southbound through lane (SBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.

(2) Widen to add 2nd eastbound left turn lane (EBL); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(3) Widen to add separate eastbound right turn lane (EBR); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(4) Provide overlap phase for eastbound right turn lane.

Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS E with 60.4 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS B with 13.6 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection. Also, these improvements to the intersection would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward.

At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, ~~As a result this~~ and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*****.**

(i) Intersection 17: Industrial Parkway / EB SR 92 Ramps & Sleepy Hollow Avenue.

(1) Widen to add 2nd southbound through lane (SBT); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(2) Widen to add separate southbound right turn lane (SBR); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(3) Widen to add 2nd eastbound right turn lane (EBR); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.

Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS C with 24.3 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 61.0 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, these improvements to the intersection would be subject to the review and approval of other jurisdictions, including Caltrans, and not solely under the jurisdiction of the City of Hayward.

At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, ~~As a result this~~ and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*****.**

(continued)

Mitigation 18-2 (continued):

(j) Intersection 24: Hesperian Boulevard / West Winton Avenue.

(1) Widen to add 2nd westbound left turn lane (WBL); this will require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(2) Optimize signal with a 105 second cycle length.

Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS E with 63.3 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 69.6 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection.

At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, ~~As a result this~~ and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*.**

(k) Intersection 26: Mission Boulevard / Sunset Boulevard.

(1) Widen to add a separate southbound left turn lane (SBL); this may require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(2) Widen to add a separate northbound left turn lane (NBL); this may require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(3) Widen to add a separate eastbound left turn lane (EBL); this may require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(4) Widen to add a separate westbound left turn lane (WSBL); this may require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(5) Optimize signal with a 105 second cycle length.

Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS D with 35.2 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 73.7 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, this intersection resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan, and major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection.

At this time, these measures are considered to be infeasible, ~~As a result this~~ and the impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable*****.**

(l) Intersection 29: Mission Boulevard / D Street.
(1) Widen to add 4th southbound through lane (SBT); this may require approximately 12 feet of additional right of way.
(2) Optimize signal with a 120 second cycle length.

Implementation of this mitigation would improve conditions to LOS E with 60.1 seconds of delay during the AM peak hour, and LOS E with 79.5 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour, and reduce the impact to a *less-than-significant level* with the new General Plan Policy of allowing LOS E.

~~There is no feasible mitigation for this impact.~~ Significant improvements would be required to maintain LOS E conditions. Widening and increasing capacity could require right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. In addition, this intersection resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan, and major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection.

The City has implemented ITS strategies at this location, including signal coordination and adaptive traffic control systems using the SCATS system. These strategies could help to improve conditions and reduce impacts. However, at this time, the additional required measures are considered to be infeasible, and the~~As a result this~~ impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.

(m) Intersection 40: Hesperian Boulevard / Tennyson Road. Widen to reconfigure to 1 northbound left (NBL) lane, 3 northbound through (NBT) lanes, and 1 northbound right (NBR) lane. Implementation of this mitigation would reduce conditions to LOS E with 78.0 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour. In addition, this intersection resides in an area of Countywide Significance as identified in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan, and major AC Transit routes traverse this intersection. ~~However~~At this time, this mitigation is considered to be infeasible because widening and increasing capacity could require significant right-of-way acquisition and could impact the pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation at this location, which does not support the proposed General Plan policies and programs supporting alternative modes. As a result this impact is considered to be ***significant and unavoidable***.

2020 Impacts on MTS and CMP Roadways. New development under the proposed General Plan would add new vehicle trips on the MTS and CMP roadway segments, including during peak commute hours. However, increased numbers of vehicle trips resulting from implementation of the proposed General Plan can be accommodated by existing or projected capacity. These changes to future traffic would represent a ***less-than-significant impact*** (see criteria for "Roadway Impacts" in subsection 18.2.1b, "Significance Criteria," above).

Mitigation. None required.

2035 Impacts on MTS and CMP Roadways. New development under the proposed General Plan would add new vehicle trips on the MTS and CMP roadway segments, including during peak commute hours. However, increased numbers of vehicle trips resulting from implementation of the proposed General Plan can be accommodated by existing or projected capacity. These changes to future traffic would represent a ***less-than-significant impact*** (see criteria for "Roadway Impacts" in subsection 18.2.1b, "Significance Criteria," above).

Mitigation. None required.

In addition, Table 18.9 identifies proposed General Plan policies and implementation programs that would avoid or reduce impacts on roadways.

---

(2) Transit. Some commuters are expected to use the transit system to travel to work, particularly the AC Transit buses, BART trains to and from the Hayward and South Hayward stations, and Amtrak Capit~~a~~ol Corridor.

The transit baseline forecasts for Cumulative 2020 and Cumulative 2035 were extracted for all AC Transit bus routes, BART, and Amtrak trains serving Hayward from the Alameda CTC Countywide Model. The daily ridership was factored into peak hour ridership for Baseline and Plus Project conditions.

Cumulative 2020 Conditions. The proposed General Plan has the potential to generate increases in systemwide ridership for AC Transit, BART, and Amtrak Capit~~a~~ol Corridor (see Table 18.10).

- When compared to 2020 No Project, the ridership on AC Transit is expected to increase with the proposed General Plan. The transit ridership on all AC Transit routes serving Hayward increases by 2.29% overall and varies by individual route. The ridership on one AC Transit bus (Route 86) increases by 24.3% as a result of the proposed General Plan. However, given the available capacity on Route 86 within Hayward, this is not considered an impact. For the other AC Transit routes, the change in future AC Transit ridership is not expected to cause a significant impact to the peak hour bus service that would result in a change beyond the 15 to 30 minute headways standard (significance threshold).

- When compared to 2020 No Project, the ridership on BART is expected to increase with the proposed General Plan. The ridership on any BART line or station does not increase by more than 0.13 % as a result of the proposed General Plan. Therefore, given the future

Table 18.10
TRANSIT CMP ANALYSIS--COMPARISON OF CUMULATIVE 2020 NO-PROJECT AND 2020 PLUS GENERAL PLAN PROJECT PM PEAK HOUR TRANSIT RIDERSHIP

Operator/Route	2020 Ridership - PM Peak Hour				Significant	Requires
	No Project	With Project	Difference	Percent Diff	Impact	Frequency Change
BART						
Hayward Lines						
Berryessa - Richmond	8,550	8,554	3	0.04%	no	no
Daly City - Dublin/Pleasanton	14,257	14,258	1	0.00%	no	no
Daly City - S. Hayward	1,042	1,043	1	0.05%	no	no
Daly City - San Jose	12,317	12,320	3	0.02%	no	no
Sum	**36,167**	**36,174**	**7**	**0.02%**		
Hayward Stations						
Hayward	1,556	1,558	2	0.13%	no	no
South Hayward	2,000	2,001	1	0.06%	no	no
Bay Fair	2,198	2,200	2	0.09%	no	no
Castro Valley	3,220	3,220	0	0.01%	no	no
Sum	**8,974**	**8,979**	**5**	**0.06%**		
Amtrak - Capitaol Corridor	**743**	**748**	**5**	**0.71%**	no	no
AC Transit Routes						
22	-	-	-	0.00%	no	no
32	-	-	-	0.00%	no	no
37	-	-	-	0.00%	no	no
48	143	143	0	0.04%	no	no
60	-	-	-	0.00%	no	no
68	-	-	-	0.00%	no	no
83	214	215	0	0.12%	no	no
85	1,234	1,235	0	0.04%	no	no
86	207	258	50	24.30%	no	no
93	663	663	0	0.02%	no	no
94	109	109	-	0.00%	no	no
95	272	272	(0)	-0.16%	no	no
97	1,688	1,694	7	0.39%	no	no
99	889	888	(1)	-0.16%	no	no
386	61	61	-	0.00%	no	no
M	653	654	0	0.05%	no	no
S	87	88	0	0.51%	no	no
Sum	**6,223**	**6,280**	**57**	**0.91%**		
Total	**52,107**	**52,182**	**75**	**0.14%**		

capacity of the four BART lines that serve the City, the change in future BART ridership is not expected to cause a significant impact to the peak hour BART service that would result in a change beyond the 3.75-15 minute headways standard.

- When compared to 2020 No Project, the ridership on Amtrak Capit~~a~~o̲l Corridor is expected to increase with the proposed General Plan. The ridership on the route or at the Hayward Station does not increase by more than 0.71% as a result of the proposed General Plan. Therefore, given the future capacity of the Amtrak Capit~~a~~o̲l Corridor that serves the City, the change in future Capit~~a~~o̲l Corridor ridership is not expected to cause a significant impact to the peak hour Capit~~a~~o̲l Corridor service that would result in a change beyond the current frequency of service.

Cumulative 2035 Conditions. The proposed General Plan has the potential to generate increases in systemwide ridership for AC Transit, BART, and Amtrak Capit~~a~~o̲l Corridor (see Table 18.11).

- When compared to 2035 No Project, the ridership on AC Transit is expected to increase with the proposed General Plan. The transit ridership on all AC Transit routes serving Hayward increases by 0.91% overall and varies by individual route. The ridership on one AC Transit bus (Route 86) increases by over 50% as a result of the proposed General Plan. However, given the available capacity on Route 86 within Hayward, this is not considered an impact. For the other AC Transit routes, the change in future AC Transit ridership is not expected to cause a significant impact to the peak hour bus service that would result in a change beyond the 15 to 30 minute headways standard.

- When compared to 2035 No Project, the ridership on BART is expected to increase with the proposed General Plan. The ridership on any BART line or station does not increase by more than 0.17 % as a result of the proposed General Plan. Therefore, given the future capacity of the 4 BART lines that serve the City, the change in future BART ridership is not expected to cause a significant impact to the peak hour BART service that would result in a change beyond the 3.75-15 minute headways standard.

- When compared to 2035 No Project, the ridership on Amtrak Capit~~a~~o̲l Corridor is expected to increase with the proposed General Plan. The ridership on the route or at the Hayward Station does not increase by more than 1.7% as a result of the proposed General Plan. Therefore, given the future capacity of the Amtrak Capit~~a~~o̲l Corridor that serve the City, the change in future Capit~~a~~o̲l Corridor ridership is not expected to cause a significant impact to the peak hour Capit~~a~~o̲l Corridor service that would result in a change beyond the current frequency of service.

The proposed General Plan includes policies and programs to support transit (see Table 18.12).
2020 Impact on MTS Transit. New development under the proposed General Plan by 2020 would add new transit trips on the existing bus and rail network, including during peak commute hours. However, increased numbers of transit riders resulting from implementation of the proposed General Plan can be accommodated by existing or projected capacity in 2020. These changes to transit ridership would represent a ***less-than-significant impact*** (see criteria for "Transit Impacts" in subsection 18.2.1b, "Significance Criteria," above.)

Mitigation. None required.

Table 18.11
TRANSIT CMP ANALYSIS--COMPARISON OF CUMULATIVE 2035 NO-PROJECT AND 2035 PLUS GENERAL PLAN PROJECT PM PEAK HOUR TRANSIT RIDERSHIP

Operator/Route	2035 Ridership - PM Peak Hour				Significant	Requires
	No Project	With Project	Difference	Percent Diff	Impact	Frequency Change
BART						
Hayward Lines						
Berryessa - Richmond	21,737	21,748	11	0.05%	no	no
Daly City - Dublin/Pleasanton	20,809	20,811	2	0.01%	no	no
Daly City - S. Hayward	1,002	1,003	2	0.16%	no	no
Daly City - San Jose	23,561	23,569	8	0.03%	no	no
Sum	**67,109**	**67,132**	**22**	**0.03%**		
Hayward Stations						
Hayward	3,322	3,329	6	0.19%	no	no
South Hayward	3,603	3,607	4	0.11%	no	no
Bay Fair	3,759	3,765	6	0.17%	no	no
Castro Valley	5,732	5,733	1	0.01%	no	no
Sum	**16,416**	**16,434**	**17**	**0.10%**		
Amtrak - Capitaol Corridor	**976**	**992**	**17**	**1.70%**	no	no
AC Transit Routes						
22	-	-	-	0.00%	no	no
32	-	-	-	0.00%	no	no
37	-	-	-	0.00%	no	no
48	188	188	0	0.11%	no	no
60	-	-	-	0.00%	no	no
68	-	-	-	0.00%	no	no
83	329	330	1	0.24%	no	no
85	1,571	1,572	1	0.09%	no	no
86	284	442	158	55.85%	no	no
93	782	783	0	0.05%	no	no
94	127	127	-	0.00%	no	no
95	318	316	(1)	-0.44%	no	no
97	1,970	1,991	21	1.05%	no	no
99	1,031	1,026	(5)	-0.45%	no	no
386	92	92	-	0.00%	no	no
M	1,001	1,002	1	0.10%	no	no
S	92	93	1	1.53%	no	no
Sum	**7,784**	**7,962**	**178**	**2.29%**		
Total	**92,285**	**92,520**	**234**	**0.25%**		

not implement the substantial improvements proposed by the 2040 General Plan to bicycle, pedestrian, and transit circulation and connectivity (see chapter 18 tables).

Under this alternative, projected systemwide ridership on AC Transit, BART, and Amtrak Capit~~a~~ol Corridor would be less compared to the 2040 General Plan (see Table 18.11 in chapter 18). Because these transit providers have existing capacity to accommodate the projected increased ridership under the 2040 General Plan, the more efficient use of the transit system under the 2040 General Plan is considered a beneficial effect. This beneficial effect would be reduced under the No Project alternative.

(o) Utilities and Service Systems. This alternative would result in reduced water demand, wastewater generation, and solid waste compared to the 2040 General Plan.

20.1.3 Attainment of Project Objectives

With fewer housing units, less employment, and more auto-oriented development, Alternative 1: No Project--Existing 2002 General Plan would be less effective in achieving the project objectives (listed at the beginning of this chapter), especially objectives #5 and #7.

20.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: OVERALL LOWER DEVELOPMENT DENSITY AND INTENSITY

20.2.1 Principal Characteristics

Alternative 2 assumes adoption of a similar 2040 General Plan, but with an overall lower density and intensity of development in the Planning Area--for example, less new (net) residential development in the Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and less new (net) potential employment in the Planning Area. For the sake of comparison, new potential multi-family residential units and new potential employment would each by reduced by 20 percent compared to the proposed General Plan. Therefore, this alternative would result in 5,920 new multi-family units and 20,620 new jobs, compared to 7,399 new dwelling units and 25,787 new jobs under the 2040 General Plan, a reduction of 1,479 dwelling units and 5,167 jobs.

ABAG projects that Hayward will grow to a total of 60,584 dwelling units by 2040; this alternative would result in about 57,308 units. The Planning Area household population would be approximately 202,000 under the alternative and 206,580 under the 2040 General Plan, a difference of 4,580.

20.2.2 Comparative Impacts and Mitigating Effects

(a) Aesthetics and Visual Resources. With less overall development, Alternative 2 would have reduced impacts compared to the 2040 General Plan with respect to aesthetics and visual resources.

(b) Agricultural Resources. With both the existing and 2040 General Plans subject to development within the established Urban Limit Line, this alternative would result in similar potential impacts on agricultural resources.

(c) Air Quality. Alternative 2 would result in lower air pollutant emissions, and fewer sensitive receptors exposed to toxic air contaminants (TACs), $PM_{2.5,}$ and odors.

(l) Population and Housing. Alternative 2 would result in smaller increases in population, housing, employment, and revenue accruing to the City. There would also be less new housing to meet the community and regional need for market-rate housing and affordable housing.

(m) Public Services. This alternative would result in a corresponding reduction in impacts on fire protection/emergency medical service (EMS), police protection, public schools, libraries, and parks and recreation compared to the 2040 General Plan. However, with less development, fewer development fees to maintain and enhance these public services would be collected.

(n) Transportation and Circulation. For this alternative, trip generation and traffic impacts from new development within the Planning Area would be reduced compared to the 2040 General Plan. The transportation and circulation impacts of the 2040 General Plan are evaluated in chapter 18 (Transportation and Circulation). Buildout under this alternative would avoid the significant impacts of the 2040 General Plan on nine study intersections (see Table 18.3 in chapter 18). In addition, the alternative would implement the substantial improvements proposed by the 2040 General Plan to bicycle, pedestrian, and transit circulation and connectivity (see chapter 18 tables).

Under this alternative, projected systemwide ridership on AC Transit, BART, and Amtrak Capit~~a~~ol Corridor would be less compared to the 2040 General Plan. Because these transit providers have existing capacity to accommodate the projected increased ridership under the 2040 General Plan, the more efficient use of the transit system under the 2040 General Plan is considered a beneficial effect. This beneficial effect would be reduced under Alternative 2.

(o) Utilities and Service Systems. This alternative would result in reduced water demand, wastewater generation, and solid waste compared to the 2040 General Plan.

20.2.3 Attainment of Project Objectives

With fewer housing units and less employment, Alternative 2: Overall Lower Development Density and Intensity would be less effective in achieving the project objectives (listed at the beginning of this chapter), but the alternative still would include the goals, plans, and implementation programs of the 2040 General Plan.

20.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: LESS EMPLOYMENT IN THE INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION CORRIDOR

20.3.1 Principal Characteristics

Alternative 3 assumes adoption of a similar 2040 General Plan, but with less employment in the Industrial Technology and Innovation Corridor--for example, a combination of less new (net) development and less employee-intensive uses (e.g., manufacturing and warehousing at 1 employee per 750 square feet vs. research & development at 1 employee per 450 square feet). For the sake of comparison, this alternative assumes that the net change in employment across the Planning Area (including secondary employment not in the Industrial Corridor) would be reduced by 15 percent compared to the proposed General Plan. Therefore, this alternative would result in approximately 21,920 new jobs, compared to 25,787 new jobs under the 2040

The proactive sustainability policies in the 2040 General Plan (e.g., for on-site stormwater retention and natural filtering) would continue to be implemented (see chapter 13 tables). With less overall development under this alternative, fewer occupants and buildings within the Planning Area would be exposed to flooding and sea level rise risks.

(j) Land Use and Planning. This alternative would have similar impacts with respect to community cohesion and consistency with adopted plans. Both the alternative and the proposed 2040 General Plan include numerous policies to ensure that new development would be compatible and integrated with the established land use pattern, and their implementation would be an additional benefit to land use and planning over existing conditions (see chapter 14 tables).

(k) Noise. Buildout under this alternative would result in less noise than under the 2040 General Plan due primarily to a reduction in the number of new vehicle trips added to local roadways.

(l) Population and Housing. Alternative 3 would result in smaller increases in employment and revenue accruing to the City.

(m) Public Services. This alternative would result in a corresponding reduction in impacts on fire protection/emergency medical service (EMS), police protection, libraries, and parks and recreation compared to the 2040 General Plan. However, with less development, fewer development fees to maintain and enhance these public services would be collected.

(n) Transportation and Circulation. For this alternative, trip generation and traffic impacts from new development within the Planning Area would be reduced compared to the 2040 General Plan. The transportation and circulation impacts of the 2040 General Plan are evaluated in chapter 18 (Transportation and Circulation). Buildout under this alternative would reduce the significant impacts of the 2040 General Plan on nine study intersections (see Table 18.3 in chapter 18). In addition, the alternative would implement the substantial improvements proposed by the 2040 General Plan to bicycle, pedestrian, and transit circulation and connectivity (see chapter 18 tables).

Under this alternative, projected systemwide ridership on AC Transit, BART, and Amtrak Capit~~a~~ol Corridor would be less compared to the 2040 General Plan. Because these transit providers have existing capacity to accommodate the projected increased ridership under the 2040 General Plan, the more efficient use of the transit system under the 2040 General Plan is considered a beneficial effect. This beneficial effect would be reduced under Alternative 3.

(o) Utilities and Service Systems. This alternative would result in reduced water demand, wastewater generation, and solid waste compared to the 2040 General Plan.

20.2.3 Attainment of Project Objectives

With less employment, Alternative 3: Less Employment in the Industrial Technology and Innovation Corridor would be less effective in achieving the project objectives (listed at the beginning of this chapter), especially objective #4. The alternative still would include the goals, plans, and implementation programs of the 2040 General Plan.