

6 Alternatives

The *CEQA Guidelines* require that EIRs identify and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives that are designed to reduce the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project (the Specific Plan) while still satisfying most of the basic project objectives. The *CEQA Guidelines* also set forth the intent and extent of alternatives analysis to be provided in an EIR.

The following discussion evaluates alternatives to the proposed Specific Plan and examines the potential environmental impacts associated with each alternative. Through comparison of these alternatives to the proposed Specific Plan, the relative environmental advantages and disadvantages of each are weighed and analyzed. The *CEQA Guidelines* require that the range of alternatives addressed in an EIR should be governed by a rule of reason. Not every conceivable alternative must be addressed, nor do infeasible alternatives need to be considered (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6[a]). Section 15126.6 of the *CEQA Guidelines* states that the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency or other plans or regulatory limitations, and jurisdictional boundaries. Section 15126.6(b) of the *CEQA Guidelines* states that the discussion of alternatives must focus on alternatives capable of either avoiding or substantially lessening any significant environmental effects of the project, even if the alternative would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly. The alternatives discussion should not consider alternatives whose implementation is remote or speculative, and the analysis of alternatives need not be presented in the same level of detail as the assessment of the proposed Specific Plan.

Based on the *CEQA Guidelines*, several factors need to be considered in determining the range of alternatives to be analyzed in the EIR and the level of analytical detail that should be provided for each alternative. These factors include: (1) the nature of the significant impacts of the proposed Specific Plan, (2) the ability of alternatives to avoid or lessen the significant impacts associated with the proposed Specific Plan, (3) the ability of the alternatives to meet the objectives of the proposed Specific Plan, and (4) the feasibility of the alternatives. The analysis in this EIR shows that the proposed Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to traffic. All other impacts of the Specific Plan can either be mitigated to a level of less than significant or would be less than significant. The alternatives examined herein represent alternatives that are feasible, would generally meet the objectives of the Specific Plan, and that could potentially reduce or avoid the significant and less than significant impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Specific Plan.

As required by Section 15126.6 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, this section of the EIR examines a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Specific Plan. The following alternatives are evaluated in this EIR:

- Alternative 1: No Project/ 2035 General Plan Buildout
- Alternative 2: Residential Focus Alternative
- Alternative 3: Office Focus Alternative

This section also includes a discussion of the “environmentally superior alternative” among the alternatives analyzed.

Table 49 provides a summary comparison of the development characteristics of the proposed Specific Plan and each of the alternatives considered. Detailed descriptions of the alternatives are included in the impact analysis for each alternative. The potential environmental impacts of each alternative are analyzed in Sections 6.1.1 through 6.1.3.

Table 49 Comparison of Specific Plan Alternatives' Buildout Characteristics

Feature	Proposed Specific Plan	Alternative 1: No Project/ 2035 General Plan Buildout	Alternative 2: Residential Focus	Alternative 3: Office Focus
Residential units	2,540 units	1,100 units ¹	3,200 units	1,500 units
Office space	300,000 sf	773 jobs ^{1,2}	0 sf	450,000 sf
Retail	(161,000 sf)	No Change	(161,000 sf)	(161,000 sf)

¹ Source: San Leandro 2035 General Plan EIR, Appendix C, Buildout Methodology (City of San Leandro 2016i)

² Square footage estimate not provided

() denotes reduction

As indicated above, project alternatives should feasibly be able to attain “most of the basic objectives of the project” (Section 15126.6[a] of the *CEQA Guidelines*), even though implementation of the project alternatives might, to some degree, impede the attainment of those objectives or be more costly (Section 15126.6[b] of the *CEQA Guidelines*). The following are the project objectives as described in Section 2, *Project Description*.

1. **More Parks and Open Space.** Increase the amount of parks, green space, plazas, and other public space that encourages pedestrian activity, recreation, and access to nature.
2. **More Walkable Environment.** Improve the pedestrian experience, public space, aesthetics, and design quality throughout the Specific Plan Area to attract visitors, serve residents and promote walking.
3. **Better Mobility and Connectivity.** Improve pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicle connections in the Specific Plan Area through the creation of an interconnected street grid, with a focus on better pedestrian connections between the Bay Fair BART station and the adjacent shopping areas.
4. **Improved Safety and Less Crime.** Improve safety in and around the Specific Plan Area through a range of strategies including increased pedestrian activity; more “eyes on the street;” enhanced and more coordinated policing; better lighting pathways; activation of vacant spaces; and an increased sense of ownership and stewardship by residents, workers, and visitors.
5. **Compatibility with Adjacent Neighborhoods.** Ensure compatibility with the residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Specific Plan Area – including those in unincorporated Alameda County as well as the City of San Leandro – and encourage sensitive design transitions, public amenities, and uses and services that benefit surrounding neighborhoods.
6. **Diversity of uses.** Support a diverse, sustainable mix of uses including retail, housing, workplaces, and community spaces. Encourage a variety of essential goods and services such as grocery stores, pharmacies, banks, laundromats, social services, restaurants, and other businesses.

7. **Diverse and Affordable Housing.** Support both market rate and affordable housing and seek to protect existing residents from involuntary displacement.
8. **Range of Educational Opportunities.** Provide a range of services to provide opportunities for higher education, business incubation, and vocational and employment training programs for all age groups.
9. **Community Facilities.** Provide community facilities necessary to support the level and type of additional growth including schools, community and senior centers, child care centers, and public safety facilities.
10. **Efficient and Shared Parking.** Implement parking management solutions that most efficiently use parking resources, including sharing of public and private parking spaces between different uses and sharing between different use types such as residential, office, and commercial.
11. **BART and Bus Station Improvement.** Support and improve the Bay Fair BART and bus stations as integral amenities for the surrounding neighborhoods, the City, the County, and the region.
12. **Zoning Aligned with Community Vision.** Ensure future zoning is aligned with the community vision, while allowing flexibility to adjust to changing trends and land ownership.
13. **Local and Regional Destination.** Provide excellent public space, outdoor dining, and dynamic retail experiences to create central gathering places that serve local and regional populations.
14. **Infrastructure.** Improve and maintain basic infrastructure such as stormwater management facilities, flood control, and water, sewer, and gas service.
15. **Environmental Sustainability.** Create a sustainable urban environment that incorporates green building features, green infrastructure and ecology, sustainable energy systems, water efficiency and conservation, and sustainable transportation systems.

6.1 Alternative 1: No Project/ 2035 General Plan Buildout

6.1.1 Description

This alternative assumes that the proposed Specific Plan is not adopted. The Specific Plan Area would continue to be designated as B-TOD per the City's 2035 General Plan. The growth assumptions of approximately 1,100 housing units and 773 jobs in the Specific Plan Area under the 2035 General Plan would continue to apply. This alternative assumes in the near-term that little to no growth in the Specific Plan Area would occur. Over time, growth in accordance with the vision of the area set forth in the City's 2035 General Plan would occur, though not to the same extent as would be envisioned under the proposed Specific Plan.

6.1.2 Impact Analysis

The No Project alternative would involve no changes to the existing regulatory controls and land use policies for the Specific Plan Area. The circulation improvements in the Specific Plan Area associated with the proposed Specific Plan would not occur. In addition, the zoning changes would not occur. No development associated with the proposed Specific Plan would occur. As such, this alternative would have no impact with respect to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology, noise, population and

housing, public services, traffic, or utilities and service systems resulting from the proposed Specific Plan, although some impacts in these issue areas would continue to occur in the Specific Plan as a result of under the 2035 General Plan. The 2035 General Plan EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to air quality, GHG emissions, noise, and traffic. These impacts resulted from full buildout in the City related to the General Plan and were not specifically related to buildout in the Specific Plan Area.

Construction impacts associated with the proposed Specific Plan would be avoided, although construction associated with development under the 2035 General Plan would still occur and would result in construction impacts as analyzed in the 2035 General Plan EIR. This alternative would avoid the proposed Specific Plan's significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to traffic. No mitigation measures would be required for the No Project alternative, except those already required for projects in San Leandro by the City's 2035 General Plan EIR. This alternative would not preclude development in the Specific Plan Area in accordance with the City's 2035 General Plan.

Although overall impacts would be lower than those of the proposed Specific Plan, the beneficial effects associated with the proposed Specific Plan (pedestrian facility, bicycle facility, and roadway improvements) would not occur. In addition, the proposed Specific Plan is consistent with City and Bay Area regional goals to facilitate infill development along major transit corridors and to locate housing near jobs and commercial uses in order to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and associated air pollution and GHG emissions. The proposed Specific Plan is designed to encourage a mix of housing and jobs near major transit corridors in infill locations. As discussed in Section 4.6, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, the proposed Specific Plan would reduce per capita VMT compared to development under the 2035 General Plan alone.

The No Project Alternative would not fulfill the Project Objectives, especially as existing development conditions do not provide a high level of connectivity between the BART station and adjacent shopping areas, do not support a diverse mix of land uses, and do not allow for provision of diverse and affordable housing. Overall, although the Specific Plan Area would continue to be designated as B-TOD and the 2035 General Plan policies related to the B-TOD land use would apply, the overall intent for development as envisioned by the 2035 General Plan would not be implemented to the extent that it would under the Specific Plan, which builds on and provides specifics to achieve the vision of the 2035 General Plan's B-TOD Designation.

6.2 Alternative 2: Residential Focus

6.2.1 Description

This alternative would involve an alternative vision for land use in Bay Fair TOD Specific Plan in which the Specific Plan would not support office uses and would instead prioritize residential development in the Specific Plan Area. Office use would no longer be a permitted use in the B-TOD District and development standards and guidelines related to office uses (such as the ground-floor office building frontage guidelines in Chapter 5 of the proposed Specific Plan) would be removed from the Specific Plan. All other policies, standards, and guidelines in the proposed Specific Plan would remain.

Under this alternative, the estimated number of new residential units in the Specific Plan Area would be 3,200 units, a 26 percent increase compared to the 2,540 units assumed under the proposed Specific Plan. This alternative would still involve the removal of approximately 161,000 of retail space.

This alternative would meet most of the project objectives as it would include the policies and standards that support community environmental health, neighborhood compatibility and diverse and affordable housing. However, it would not fulfill all of the Project Objectives, as it would not satisfy Objective 6, “Diversity of Uses,” and would not meet Objective 8, “Range of Educational Opportunities,” Objective 10, “Efficient and Shared Parking,” and Objective 13, “Local and Regional Destination,” to the same extent as the proposed Specific Plan.

6.2.2 Impact Analysis

a. Aesthetics

This alternative would shift the proposed uses in Specific Plan Area from a mix of office and residential uses to a residential focus, thereby increasing the number of residential units and decreasing the amount of office space that would be developed. Like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would facilitate increases in the intensity, scale and visibility of development in the Specific Plan Area, and would include changes to circulation patterns and block sizes. In addition, this alternative would facilitate changes to the visual character of the Specific Plan Area. However, this alternative would not increase building height limits compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, implementation of this alternative would not block or otherwise adversely affect scenic vistas. In addition, this alternative would have the same policies, planning framework, design review criteria, and development standards and guidelines for residential development as the proposed Specific Plan. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and, like the proposed Specific Plan, would be less than significant.

The introduction of light to the Specific Plan Area with this alternative would likely increase under this alternative due to the shift from daytime office uses to residential uses which would require more evening and nighttime lighting. New sources of glare would be comparable to the proposed Specific Plan as the level of development would be comparable to that facilitated by the proposed Specific Plan but would shift uses from a mix of residential and office to residential. Nonetheless, like the proposed Specific Plan, new sources of light and glare would not substantially increase the amount of light and glare in the already urbanized Specific Plan Area, and would be regulated by the City’s adopted 2035 General Plan and Municipal Code requirements. Impacts related to light and glare would therefore be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and would continue to *be less than significant under this alternative*.

b. Air Quality

As discussed above, BAAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Guidelines from 2017 have no plan-level significance thresholds for construction air pollutant emissions. However, the guidelines include project-level thresholds for construction emissions. Temporary construction-related air quality impacts of this alternative would be similar to that of the proposed Specific Plan as the amount of residential construction would increase, there would be no office space construction. However, like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would be required to comply with the 2035 General Plan’s goals and policies specific to reducing air pollutant emissions from design, construction, and operation of new development projects. This alternative would also be required to comply with the 2035 General Plan Mitigation Measure AQ-2B-1, which stipulates PM₁₀ control measures. Therefore, impacts would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and would be significant but mitigable.

This alternative would place a greater number of residences next to high-volume roadways and freeways and therefore would expose more sensitive receptors to sources of toxic air contaminants

(TAC). However, Action EH-3.4.B in the 2035 General Plan requires health risk assessments for residential development and other sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of major sources of TACs and implementation of mitigation measures as needed to reduce exposure to TACs. Compliance with this Action EH-3.4.B would reduce potential health exposure impacts related to TACs. Therefore, although impacts would be increased compared to the proposed Specific Plan, impacts would be *less than significant*.

According to the BAAQMD's 2017 Guidelines, a plan is considered consistent with the 2017 Bay Area Clean Air Plan if it is consistent with current air quality plan control measures and the plan's projected VMT or vehicle trips increase less than or equal to its projected population increase. Like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would be consistent with the control measures in the 2017 Clean Air Plan. Although VMT projections for this alternative are not available, this alternative would increase population while reducing the number of trips compared to the proposed Specific Plan (see Table 52). Therefore, it is assumed this alternative would reduce per capita VMT at the same level as the proposed Specific Plan (compared to the 2035 No Project Conditions) and impacts would be less than significant.

This alternative would not include land uses typically producing objectionable odors, such as agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant.

c. Biological Resources

This alternative would increase the intensity of residential development within the Specific Plan Area and decrease the amount of commercial development. This alternative would involve development in the same area as the proposed Specific Plan. As a result, biological resources impacts would be the same as those resulting from the proposed Specific Plan. Mitigation outlined in Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, would continue to apply and impacts would remain significant but mitigable.

d. Cultural, Tribal Cultural, and Paleontological Resources

This alternative would increase the intensity of residential development within the Specific Plan Area. Nonetheless, this alternative would still involve development of the same areas as the proposed Specific Plan. As a result, cultural resources impacts would be the same as those resulting from the proposed Specific Plan. Mitigation outlined in Section 4.4, *Cultural, Tribal Cultural, and Paleontological Resources* would continue to apply and impacts would remain significant but mitigable.

e. Geology and Soils

This alternative would accommodate 660 more residential units than the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, development under this alternative would expose a greater number of residences to geologic hazards, including groundshaking, liquefaction, and expansion. Like the proposed Specific Plan, development under this alternative would be subject to provisions of the California Building Code (CBC), the City's Municipal Code, and policies contained in the 2035 General Plan which require buildings to be designed to withstand seismic hazards as well as site-specific geotechnical investigations. Adherence to these requirements would reduce the potential for property damage, injury, or death resulting from seismic hazards. Therefore, impacts related to groundshaking and soil

instability would be slightly increased compared to the proposed Specific Plan but would remain less than significant with adherence to existing regulations.

f. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This alternative would accommodate 660 more residential units and no office space development compared to the proposed Specific Plan. The service population (sum of population and employees) of this alternative would be 8,845 (9,120 residents minus 275 jobs as shown in Table 51), which is greater than the proposed Specific Plan’s service population of 7,964 (7,239 residents and 725 employees). As shown in Table 50, GHG emissions associated with this alternative would be lower than those estimated for buildout of the proposed Specific Plan. Impacts related to GHG emissions would be reduced compared to the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant. In addition, this alternative would be generally consistent with the policies of the City’s Climate Action Plan and with the *Plan Bay Area 2040*, the Bay Area’s Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. Therefore, impacts related to consistency with adopted GHG reduction plans would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant.

Table 50 Alternative 2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emission Source	Annual Emissions (Approximate) (MT CO ₂ e)
Stationary	
Area	40
Energy	4,973
Solid Waste	740
Water	748
Mobile (during operations)	
CO ₂ and CH ₄	8,612
N ₂ O	445
Alternative 2 Total	15,558
Alternative 2 Service Population	8,845 persons
Alternative 2 Total / Service Population	1.76 MT CO₂e / service population / year
Threshold	2.32 MT CO ₂ e / service population / year
Threshold Exceeded?	No
Proposed Specific Plan Emissions /Service Population for Comparison	2.27 MT CO₂e / service population / year

Sources: See Appendix B for efficiency metric calculations and for GHG emission factor assumptions

g. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative would increase residential development in the Specific Plan Area compared to the proposed Specific Plan. However, residential uses typically do not involve the storage, disposal or transportation of hazardous materials other than those typically used for cleaning or maintenance. Like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative may also involve mixed-use structures that would place new residences near hazardous waste users. However, as with the proposed Specific Plan,

required adherence to existing regulations and 2035 General Plan policies would reduce impacts to less than significant. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan.

This alternative would also involve demolition, redevelopment, and construction of new structures. Construction associated with future development in the Specific Plan Area could involve transport or handling of hazardous materials including fuels, lubricating fluids, or solvents, or exposure to lead-based paint and asbestos containing materials. However, impacts related to transport or handling of hazardous materials would be similar to those of the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant with adherence to existing regulations. In addition, like the proposed Specific Plan this alternative would not involve new uses that would produce or emit hazardous materials near schools and would not result in exposure of the public or the environment from existing hazardous materials sites. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant.

h. Hydrology and Water Quality

Although this alternative involves a shift in use from a mix of office and residential to residential only, Alternative 2 would still involve redevelopment and construction in an existing urban area that is mostly built-out and covered with impervious surfaces. Construction-related and operational erosion and sedimentation, pollutant discharges, and stormwater runoff levels would therefore be similar under this alternative to the proposed Specific Plan. Compliance with NPDES Permit requirements, City ordinances, and 2035 General Plan policies would ensure that water quality and runoff impacts would remain less than significant, the same as the proposed Specific Plan.

Full buildout of this alternative would not introduce substantial new impervious areas that would interfere with groundwater recharge, similar to the proposed Specific Plan, and would therefore not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. Under this alternative the Specific Plan would still include policies to pursue improvements to the Estudillo Canal to improve stormwater capacity, but implementation would not substantially alter drainage patterns. Impacts to groundwater and drainage would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant.

A portion of the Specific Plan Area is within a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area associated with Estudillo Canal. Because this alternative would increase residential development, additional residences may be placed in affected areas. However, compliance with City Municipal Code standards regarding construction in flood hazard areas, and with the 2035 General Plan policies, would reduce potential effects associated with flood events. Impacts would be the same as under the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant.

i. Land Use and Planning

Under Alternative 2, the overall content of the policies, standards, and guidelines of the Specific Plan would remain the same. Like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would still involve transit oriented development, streetscape improvements to make the Specific Plan Area friendlier to pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users, and improved BART connections in accordance with 2035 General Plan Policy LU-8.10 (Bay Fair Area) and implementing actions LU-8.10.A (Bay Fair Station Transit Village), LU-8.10.B (East 14th Street Streetscape Improvements), and LU-8.10.C (Bay Fair BART Connections). Under Alternative 2, residential uses would be prioritized. Therefore, the proposed Specific Plan would not meet some of the goals of the 2035 General Plan to provide a mix of uses, including office, in the Specific Plan Area. Nonetheless, this alternative would generally be consistent with the goals of the 2035 General Plan related to transit-oriented development in the

Specific Plan Area and is consistent with the B-TOD land use designation. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant.

j. Noise

This alternative would increase residential and decrease non-residential (commercial) buildout in the Plan Area. Nonetheless, because the same type of construction equipment would be used and generally the same overall level of development would occur, noise and vibration levels would be similar to the proposed Specific Plan. However, this alternative would introduce more sensitive receptors to the Specific Plan Area, particularly new multi-family residential development. Similar to the proposed Specific Plan, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-4 from the 2035 General Plan EIR and compliance with the City’s permitted construction hours would reduce construction-related noise and vibration impacts to less than significant levels, the same as the proposed Specific Plan.

Like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would involve development adjacent to residential neighborhoods. Existing and future sensitive receptors within the Specific Plan Area would be exposed to operational noise from buildout under this alternative, and this alternative would introduce additional sensitive receptors to the Specific Plan Area. However, development under this alternative would be subject to the 2035 General Plan’s goals, policies and Land Use and Noise Compatibility Guidelines provided in the Environmental Hazards Element and the City’s Municipal Code requirements. With adherence to existing policies and regulations, similar to the proposed Specific Plan, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

As shown in Table 52, Alternative 2 would generate fewer AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips than the proposed Specific Plan. Consequently, noise level increases associated with vehicle traffic on roadways near and within the Specific Plan Area would be lower. Therefore, impacts would incrementally decrease compared to the proposed Specific Plan and would remain less than significant.

k. Population and Housing

As shown in Table 51, this alternative would increase residential development by 660 units (26 percent) and therefore increase the population by 1,881 residents (26 percent) compared to buildout assumptions under the proposed Specific Plan. Whereas the proposed Specific Plan assumed the addition of an estimated 1,000 new office jobs and the removal of 275 retail jobs, this alternative would only involve the removal of 275 retail jobs. Therefore, this alternative would result in 1,000 fewer jobs than under the proposed Specific Plan.

Table 51 Alternative 2 Population, Jobs and Housing

	Proposed Specific Plan	Alternative 3	Difference	% Change
Population (# residents) ¹	7,239	9,120	1,881	26%
Housing (# units)	2,540	3,200	660	26%
Employment (# jobs) ²	725	(275)	(1,000)	(138%)

¹ Assuming 2.85 residents per household, see Table 21 in Section 4.11, *Population and Housing*

² Source: see Table 24 in Section 4.11, *Population and Housing*

() denotes decrease

Similar to the proposed Specific Plan, the housing and population growth under this alternative would exceed the growth assumptions for the Specific Plan Area under the City's 2035 General Plan of 1,100 units. Population growth associated with the proposed Specific Plan in combination with implementation of the 2035 General Plan could lead to overall growth that would exceed General Plan projections. However, like the proposed Specific Plan, with adoption of this alternative growth would shift from other areas of the City to the Specific Plan Area. In addition, this alternative would implement City and regional goals to put housing near transit centers. Impacts would be less than significant, the same as the proposed Specific Plan.

Similar to the proposed Specific Plan, although this alternative would increase development of new housing in the Specific Plan Area, the increase in the density of residential development may potentially cause displacement of existing residents. However, this alternative would retain the policies and provisions included in the proposed Specific Plan that encourage the protection of residents at risk of displacement in or near the Plan Area. Therefore, impacts related to displacement would be less than significant, the same as the proposed Specific Plan.

I. Public Services, Schools, and Recreation

This alternative would accommodate up to 660 additional housing units compared to the proposed Specific Plan but would not involve development of office space. Because of the increase in the number of residents in the Specific Plan Area, demand for emergency medical, fire, and police services would increase compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Nonetheless, impacts to police services would remain less than significant with adherence to 2035 General Plan policies to ensure adequate police and fire protection services (Policy CSF-1.1 (Levels of Service), CSF-1.5 (Review of Development Plans), and CSF-1.9 (Paramedic Services) policies and with future CEQA review for potential future police facilities, the same as the proposed Specific Plan.

Based on the students per household generation rates used in the public services analysis for the proposed Specific Plan (see Section 4.12, *Public Services*), this alternative would generate approximately 2,240 new students. This represents an increase of 462 students (26 percent) compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, demand for school services would also increase. However, for future residential projects, payment of State-mandated school impact fees would reduce impacts to a *less than significant* level, the same as the proposed Specific Plan. In addition, as shown in Table 26 in Section 4.12, *Public Services, Schools, and Recreation*, schools that serve the Specific Plan Area are not operating at full capacity.

Upon full buildout under this alternative, approximately 9,120 new residents would reside within the Specific Plan Area. Under this alternative, the library space per capita would be 0.77, which is still within the recommended range of 0.7 to 0.9 square feet per capita. However, as discussed in Section 4.12, *Public Services*, the City's library system has adequate capacity to serve the new residents generated by this alternative. Therefore, although impacts to library services would be slightly increased compared to the proposed Specific Plan, they would remain less than significant.

Based on the City's 5:1 ratio for acres of park land for every one thousand residents, the additional 9,120 residents associated with this alternative would generate demand for 45.6 total acres of parkland, which is 9.4 more acres than the proposed Specific Plan. However, like the proposed Specific Plan, payment of in-lieu park fees would result in funding equivalent to the provision parks. In addition, like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would include policies and guidelines to develop more open space and public use space in the Specific Plan Area. Impacts would be *less than significant*, the same as the proposed Specific Plan.

m. Transportation and Traffic

As shown in Table 52, buildout associated with this alternative would generate an estimated 2,002 AM peak hour trips (495 fewer than the proposed Specific Plan) and 2,669 PM peak hour trips (550 fewer than the proposed Specific Plan). All intersections that were not impacted under the proposed Specific Plan remain less than significant. Table 53 provides a comparison of the previously impacted intersections between the Alternatives and the cumulative no-project and the proposed Specific Plan.

Table 52 Alternative 2 Peak Hour Trip Generation

Alternative	Trip Generation		Trip Difference		Trip Percent Difference	
	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
2035 Alternative 2 - Residential Focus	2,002	2,659	(443)	(292)	(18%)	(10%)
2035 Proposed Specific Plan	2,445	2,951	-	-	-	-

Note: Trip difference computed based on comparison to the proposed Specific Plan

() denotes decrease

Source: Kittelson & Associates, Inc.

Table 53 Alternative 2 Intersection Analysis

Intersection	Peak Hour	2035 No-Project (Alt 1)			2035 Alternative 2			2035 Proposed Specific Plan		
		Delay	LOS	V/C	Delay	LOS	V/C	Delay	LOS	V/C
Hesperian Boulevard & Halcyon Drive/Fairmont Drive (#5)	AM	109.3	F	1.16	108.7	F	1.13	116	F	1.17
	PM	95.9	F	1.19	126.2	F	1.23	130.2	F	1.25
E. 14th Street & Fairmont Drive (#7)	AM	86	F	1.04	88.3	F	1.03	95	F	1.09
	PM	132	F	1.21	125.9	F	1.17	129.7	F	1.18
Hesperian Boulevard and Thornally Drive (#10)	AM	126.9	F	0.87	208.1	F	0.95	212.6	F	0.98
	PM	191.4	F	0.93	293.9	F	1.02	292.2	F	1.02

Shaded cell indicated a significant impact.

Source: Kittelson & Associates, Inc.

The impacts at the following intersections would no longer be significant under Alternative 2:

- Hesperian Boulevard & Halcyon Drive/Fairmont Drive during the PM peak hour (Intersection #5)
- East 14th Street & Fairmont Drive during the AM peak hour (Intersection #7)

Therefore the impacts at intersections #5 and #7 would be reduced and would be less than significant. The intersection of Hesperian Boulevard and Thornally Drive (Intersection #10) would remain significantly impacted under Alternative 2. No mitigation measures are available to reduce the impact in the available right-of-way without removal of bike lanes. Therefore, the impact to this intersection would remain significant and unavoidable under Alternative 2, the same as the proposed Specific Plan.

Since this alternative results in fewer trips than those generated under the proposed Specific Plan, impacts at freeway segments and arterial segments would be reduced compared to the proposed

Specific Plan. Impacts to freeway segments would remain less than significant. As shown in Table 54, under Alternative 2, the impact identified at East 14th Street, south of Estudillo Avenue would be reduced to less than significant. However, like the proposed Specific Plan, the impact at Hesperian Boulevard south of East 14th Street would remain significant and unavoidable.

Table 54 MTS Arterial LOS, 2040 Cumulative Conditions, Alternative 2

Segment		Year 2040 Cumulative Conditions		Year 2040 Cumulative Alternative 2	
		AM	PM	AM	PM
Northbound/Eastbound					
East 14 th Street, south of Estudillo Avenue	Volume	1,987	1,295	1,992	1,314
	LOS	F	F	F	F
	V/C Change			0.00	0.01
East 14 th Street, south of Fairmont Drive	Volume	2,309	1,258	2,314	1,268
	LOS	F	D	F	D
	V/C Change			0.00	0.01
Washington Avenue, south of San Leandro Boulevard	Volume	1,351	1,033	1,352	1,028
	LOS	F	F	F	F
	V/C Change			0.00	0.00
Hesperian Boulevard, south of East 14 th Street	Volume	1,771	2,050	1,766	2,064
	LOS	D	D	F	F
	V/C Change			0.00	0.01
Lewelling Boulevard, east of Washington Avenue	Volume	1,553	1,609	1,455	1,490
	LOS	F	F	D	E
	V/C Change			-0.06	-0.07
Southbound/Westbound					
East 14 th Street, south of Estudillo Avenue	Volume	982	1,665	984	1,700
	LOS	D	F	D	F
	V/C Change			0.00	0.02
East 14 th Street, south of Fairmont Drive	Volume	1,124	2,164	1,125	2,185
	LOS	D	F	D	F
	V/C Change			0.00	0.01
Washington Avenue, south of San Leandro Boulevard	Volume	946	1,238	910	1,237
	LOS	F	F	E	F
	V/C Change			-0.04	0.00
Hesperian Boulevard, south of East 14 th Street	Volume	1,513	1,705	1,464	1,713
	LOS	D	D	D	F
	V/C Change			-0.03	0.00
Lewelling Boulevard, east of Washington Avenue	Volume	1,733	1,396	1,669	1,276
	LOS	F	D	F	D
	V/C Change			-0.04	-0.09

*V/C change is round up to 0.03; therefore, the segment operates within the standard.

Bold text indicates substandard operations.

Shaded cell indicates a significant impact.

Source: Kittelson & Associates, Inc., 2017

Like the proposed Specific Plan, because of the significant traffic impacts identified above, AC Transit buses would experience delays due to increased traffic. This impact would be significant and unavoidable, the same as the proposed Specific Plan. However, like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would result in improvements to pedestrian and bicycle facilities and would not significantly impact transit capacity for AC Transit or BART.

n. Utilities and Service Systems

Compared to the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would increase residential development by an estimated 660 units and would not involve development of new office uses in the Specific Plan Area. As shown in Table 55 and based on the wastewater generation factors used in Section 4.14, *Utilities and Service Systems*, this alternative would generate 351,184 gallons of wastewater per day or 0.351 million gallons per day. This represents an increase of 56,279 gallons per day (19 percent) when compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Nonetheless, there is adequate capacity at the Oro Loma Sanitary District (OLSD) treatment plant to accommodate this increase. In addition, implementation actions under Alternative 2 to prepare a wastewater collection system study and construct a wastewater system backbone (the same as under the proposed Specific Plan) would ensure adequate wastewater conveyance capacity is available. Therefore, impacts to wastewater infrastructure and treatment systems would be less than significant, same as the proposed Specific Plan.

Table 55 Alternative 2 Estimated Wastewater Generation

Use	Bay Fair TOD Specific Plan Buildout		Average Wastewater Demand ¹	Expected Wastewater Generation	
				Gallons/Day	Million Gallons/Day
Apartment: High Rise ²	2,400	dwelling unit	110.4	264,960	0.265
Apartment: Low-Rise ²	800	dwelling unit	143.52	114,816	0.115
Subtotal				379,776	0.380
Retail (removal of)	(161,000)	square feet	0.173	(27,853)	(0.0279)
Total Alternative 2				352,193	0.352
Proposed Specific Plan for Comparison				295,914	0.2959

¹ Assume wastewater is 80 percent of water use shown in Table 41

² Assume 75 percent high-rise apartments and 25 percent low-rise apartments for the specific Plan area.

() denotes subtraction

As shown in Table 56, based on the water use rates shown in Section 4.14, *Utilities and Service Systems*, water demand would increase by 69,047 gallons per day (19 percent) under this alternative compared to the proposed Specific Plan. As shown in Table 43 in Section 4.14 and summarized in EBMUD’s WSA, based on the supply availability and reliability assessments in the 2015 UWMP, EBMUD has, and will have, adequate water supplies to serve existing and projected demand within the Specific Plan Area under Alternative 2 during normal and wet years. However, deficits are projected for multi-year droughts (EBMUD 2017b). Nonetheless, with implementation of policies contained in the proposed Specific Plan (which would also be included under Alternative 2) to encourage use of reclaimed water, and other water conservation measures, the City’s 2035 General Plan ensures projects are approved only when sufficient water is available and water conservation efforts would be required in the event of a multi-year drought. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, the same as the proposed Specific Plan.

Table 56 Alternative 2 Water Demand

Use	Bay Fair TOD Specific Plan Buildout		Average Water Demand ¹ (gpd/unit)	Average Daily Water Demand (gpd)
	Quantity	Unit		
Apartment: High Rise	2,400	dwelling unit	138	331,200
Apartment: Low-Rise	800	dwelling unit	179	143,200
Subtotal				474,400
Retail (removal of)	(161,000)	square feet	0.22	(35,420)
Total Alternative 2				438,980
Proposed Specific Plan for Comparison				369,933

¹ Flowrate factors are based on reference material provided by EBMUD (see Table 42).

² Assume 75 percent high-rise apartments and 25 percent low-rise apartments for the Specific Plan area.

() denotes subtraction

As shown on Table 44, based on the solid waste generation rates used for the proposed Specific Plan in Section 4.14, *Utilities and Service Systems*, this alternative would generate approximately 1.35 tons of solid waste per day (accounting for a 50 percent waste diversion rate). This represents an increase of 0.25 tons per day more (23 percent) when compared to buildout under the proposed Specific Plan. Nonetheless, as described in Section 4.14.1(c), landfills that serve the Specific Plan Area would be able to accommodate this increase in solid waste. Impacts would continue to be less than significant.

Table 57 Alternative 2 Solid Waste Generation

Use	Bay Fair TOD Specific Plan Buildout		Generation Rate ²	Solid Waste (pounds per day)	Solid Waste (tons per day)	Solid Waste (cubic yards per day)*
	Quantity	Units				
Apartments	3,200	dwelling units	4.0 pounds/ unit/day	12,800	6.4	12.8
Retail (removal of)	(161,000)	square feet	0.046 pounds/square foot/day	(7,406)	(3.7)	(7.4)
Alternative 2 Total				5,394	2.7	5.4
Alternative 2 Total Assuming 50% Diversion Rate				2,697	1.35	2.7
Proposed Specific Plan Total Assuming 50% Diversion Rate for Comparison				2,277	1.1	2.2

¹ The employees for retail uses within the Plan Area also takes into consideration the removal of 161,000 square feet of retail uses or 275 employees. Refer to Population and Housing, Section 4.11.

² Source for Generation rates <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates#Residential>

* Based on the conversion factor described under Table 4.15-1, County-Service Landfill Capacity for “landfill density” Municipal Solid Waste, of approximately 750 to 1,250 pounds per cubic yard, or an average of 1,000 pounds per cubic yard.

() denotes subtraction

6.3 Alternative 3: Office Focus

6.3.1 Description

This alternative would still involve adoption of the Bay Fair TOD Specific Plan, but would prioritize more office development in the Specific Plan Area. Near the Bay Fair BART station and in the Bayfair Center, only office uses with some retail uses would be allowed. Residential with some retail would be allowed in other areas such as the Fairmont Square area northwest of Fairmont Drive, on the Fashion Fair Plaza site, on the King Parcel, along Hesperian Boulevard, and in other locations.

As with the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would also include removal of an estimated 161,000 square feet of retail space. However, under this scenario, an estimated 450,000 square feet of office space would be developed in the Specific Plan Area, a 50 percent increase compared to the increase of 300,000 square feet of office use assumed under the proposed Specific Plan. Further, an estimated 1,500 residential units would be developed compared to the 2,540 units assumed under the proposed Specific Plan (a 40 percent decrease).

Similar to Alternative 2, this alternative would meet most of the project objectives. However it would not satisfy Objective 6 “Diversity of Uses” as it would not support mixing of land uses throughout the Specific Plan Area but would intentionally separate residential and office space uses, especially near the BART station.

6.3.2 Impact Analysis

a. Aesthetics

This alternative would shift the proposed uses in Specific Plan Area from a mix of office and residential uses to an office focus. Like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would facilitate increases in the intensity, scale and visibility of development in the Specific Plan Area compared to existing conditions, and would include changes to circulation patterns and block sizes. In addition, this alternative would facilitate changes to the visual character of the Specific Plan Area. However, this alternative would not increase building height limits compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, implementation of this alternative would not block or otherwise adversely affect scenic vistas. In addition, this alternative would have the same policies, planning framework, design review criteria, and development standards and guidelines for office and residential development as the proposed Specific Plan. Like the proposed Specific Plan, impacts would be less than significant.

The introduction of light and glare to the Specific Plan Area with this alternative would be comparable to the proposed Specific Plan as the level of development would be comparable to that facilitated by the proposed Specific Plan but would shift uses from a mix of residential and office to mostly office. Like the proposed Specific Plan, new sources of light and glare would not substantially increase the amount of light and glare in the already urbanized Specific Plan Area, and would be regulated by the City’s adopted 2035 General Plan and Municipal Code requirements. Lastly, Ground-Floor Office Building Frontage Guideline 3 in Chapter 5 of the Specific Plan says that glazing should be non-reflective. This would continue to apply to new office uses under this alternative. Impacts related to light and glare would therefore continue to be less than significant under this alternative, the same as the proposed Specific Plan.

b. Air Quality

Temporary construction-related air quality impacts of this alternative would be similar to that of the proposed Specific Plan as the though the amount of residential construction would decrease, the amount of office construction would increase. However, like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would be required to comply with the 2035 General Plan's goals and policies specific to reducing air pollutant emissions from design, construction, and operation of new development projects. This alternative would also be required to comply with the 2035 General Plan Mitigation Measure AQ-2B-1, which stipulates PM₁₀ control measures. Therefore, impacts would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and would be significant but mitigable.

This alternative would place fewer residences next to high-volume roadways and freeways and therefore would expose fewer sensitive receptors to sources of toxic air contaminants (TAC). Therefore, impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed Specific Plan and would remain less than significant.

According to the BAAQMD's 2017 CEQA Guidelines, a plan is considered consistent with the 2017 Bay Area Clean Air Plan if is consistent with the Clean Air Plan control measures and the plan's projected VMT or vehicle trips increase less than or equal to its projected population increase. Like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would be consistent with the control measures in the 2017 Clean Air Plan. Although VMT projections for this alternative are not available, this alternative would decrease population but would also reduce the number of trips compared to the proposed Specific Plan (see Table 60). Therefore, it is assumed this alternative would reduce per capita VMT compared to the 2035 No Project Conditions, the same as the proposed Specific Plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

This alternative would not include land uses typically producing objectionable odors, such as agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant.

c. Biological Resources

This alternative would increase the intensity of non-residential development within the Plan Area and decrease the amount of residential development. This alternative would involve development of the same areas as the proposed Specific Plan (the Specific Plan Area). As a result, biological resources impacts would be the same as those resulting from the proposed Specific Plan. Mitigation outlined in Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, would continue to apply and impacts would remain significant but mitigable.

d. Cultural, Tribal Cultural, and Paleontological Resources

This alternative would increase the intensity of non-residential development within the Specific Plan Area. Nonetheless, this alternative would still involve development of the same areas as the proposed the Specific Plan Area. As a result, cultural resources impacts would be the same as those resulting from the proposed Specific Plan. Mitigation outlined in Section 4.4, *Cultural, Tribal Cultural, and Paleontological Resources* would continue to apply and impacts would remain significant but mitigable.

e. Geology and Soils

This alternative would decrease residential development by 1,040 units and increase office space development by 150,000 square feet compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, development under this alternative would expose fewer residences and additional non-residential structures to geologic hazards, including groundshaking, liquefaction, and expansion. Like the proposed Specific Plan, development under this alternative would be subject to provisions of the California Building Code (CBC), the City’s Municipal Code, and policies contained in the 2035 General Plan which require buildings to be designed to withstand seismic hazards as well as site-specific geotechnical investigations. Adherence to these requirements would reduce the potential for property damage, injury, or death resulting from seismic hazards. Therefore, impacts related to groundshaking and soil instability would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant with adherence to existing regulations.

f. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This alternative would accommodate 950 fewer residential units and 150,000 more square feet of office space with 500 more employees compared to the proposed Specific Plan. The service population (sum of population and employees) of this alternative would be 5,500 (4,275 residents plus 1,225 employees), which is lower than the proposed Specific Plan’s service population of 7,964. As shown in Table 10, GHG emissions associated with this alternative would be lower than those estimated for buildout of the proposed Specific Plan. Impacts related to GHG emissions would be reduced compared to the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant. Because this alternative also involves infill and TOD, it would also be generally consistent with the City’s Climate Action Plan and the regional *Plan Bay Area 2040*. Therefore, impacts related to consistency with adopted GHG reduction plans would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant.

Table 58 Alternative 3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emission Source	Annual Emissions (Approximate) (MT CO ₂ e)
Stationary	
Area	19
Energy	4,371
Solid Waste	557
Water	636
Mobile (during operations)	
CO ₂ and CH ₄	6,149
N ₂ O	318
Alternative 3 Total	12,050
Alternative 3 Service Population	5,500 persons
Alternative 3 Total / Service Population	2.19 MT CO ₂ e / service population / year
Threshold	2.32 MT CO ₂ e / service population / year
Threshold Exceeded?	No
Proposed Specific Plan Emissions /Service Population for Comparison	2.27 MT CO₂e / service population / year
Sources: See Appendix B for efficiency metric calculations and for GHG emission factor assumptions	

g. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative would increase office development in the Specific Plan Area compared to the proposed Specific Plan. However, office uses typically do not involve the storage, disposal or transportation of hazardous materials other than those typically used for cleaning or maintenance. Like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative may also involve mixed-use structures that would place new residences near hazardous waste users. However, as with the proposed Specific Plan, required adherence to existing regulations and 2035 General Plan policies would reduce impacts to less than significant. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan.

This alternative would also involve demolition, redevelopment, and construction of new structures. Construction associated with future development in the Specific Plan Area could involve transport or handling of hazardous materials including fuels, lubricating fluids, or solvents, or exposure to lead-based paint and asbestos containing materials. However, impacts related to transport or handling of hazardous materials would be similar to those of the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant with adherence to existing regulations. Like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would not involve new uses that would produce or emit hazardous materials near schools and would not result in exposure of the public or the environment from existing hazardous materials sites. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant.

h. Hydrology and Water Quality

Although this alternative involves a shift in use from a mix of office and residential to a focus on office uses, Alternative 2 would still involve redevelopment and construction in an existing urban area that is mostly built-out and covered with impervious surfaces. Construction-related and operational erosion and sedimentation, pollutant discharges, and stormwater runoff levels would therefore be similar under this alternative to the proposed Specific Plan. Compliance with NPDES Permit requirements, City ordinances, and 2035 General Plan policies would ensure that water quality and runoff impacts would remain less than significant, the same as the proposed Specific Plan.

Full buildout of this alternative would not introduce substantial new impervious areas that would interfere with groundwater recharge, similar to the proposed Specific Plan, and would therefore not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. Under this alternative, the Specific Plan would still include policies to pursue improvements to the Estudillo Canal to improve stormwater capacity, but implementation would not substantially alter drainage patterns. Impacts to groundwater and drainage would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant.

A portion of the Specific Plan Area is within a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area associated with Estudillo Canal. Like the proposed Specific Plan, development under this alternative would be required to comply with City Municipal Code standards regarding construction in flood hazard areas, and with the 2035 General Plan policies, which would reduce potential effects associated with flood events. Impacts would be the same as under the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant.

i. Land Use and Planning

Under Alternative 3, the overall content of the policies, standards, and guidelines of the Specific Plan would remain the same. Like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would still involve

transit oriented development and streetscape improvements to make the Specific Plan Area friendlier to pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users, and improved BART connections in accordance with 2035 General Plan Policy LU-8.10 (Bay Fair Area) and implementing actions LU-8.10.A (Bay Fair Station Transit Village), LU-8.10.B (East 14th Street Streetscape Improvements), and LU-8.10.C (Bay Fair BART Connections). Under Alternative 3, office and retail would be prioritized near BART and residential would only be allowed in other areas such as the Fairmont Square area northwest of Fairmont Drive, on the Fashion Fair Plaza site, on the King Parcel, and along Hesperian Boulevard. Although this alternative would still be consistent with most policies in the 2035 General Plan, it would meet goals related to a mix of uses and provision of housing to a lesser extent than the proposed Specific Plan in providing only 1,500 residential units (as opposed to 2,540 units in the proposed Specific Plan). Nonetheless, this alternative would generally be consistent with the goals of the 2035 General Plan related to transit-oriented development in the Specific Plan Area. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and would be less than significant.

j. Noise

This alternative would decrease residential and increase non-residential (office) buildout in the Specific Plan Area compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Noise and vibration levels would be similar to the proposed Specific Plan as the same type of construction equipment would be used. The overall duration of noise and vibration associated with construction would not change as available land would be maximized for non-residential uses. However, this alternative would introduce fewer sensitive receptors to the Plan Area. Similar to the proposed Specific Plan, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-4 from the 2035 General Plan EIR and compliance with the City's permitted construction hours would reduce construction-related noise and vibration impacts to less than significant levels, the same as the proposed Specific Plan.

Like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would involve development adjacent to residences and other noise-sensitive receptors. Existing and future sensitive receptors within the Specific Plan Area would be exposed to operational noise from buildout under this alternative, although this alternative would introduce fewer sensitive receptors to the Specific Plan Area compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Development under this alternative would be subject to the 2035 General Plan's goals, policies and Land Use and Noise Compatibility Guidelines provided in the Environmental Hazards Element and the City's Municipal Code requirements. With adherence to existing policies and regulations, impacts would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan and would *be* less than significant.

As shown in Table 60, Alternative 3 would generate fewer AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips than the proposed Specific Plan. Consequently, noise level increases associated with vehicle traffic on roadways near and within the Specific Plan Area would be lower. Therefore, impacts would incrementally decrease compared to the proposed Specific Plan and would remain less than significant.

k. Population and Housing

Alternative 3 would result in an increase of an estimated 1,500 units, or 4,275 residents, and 1,225 new jobs in the Specific Plan Area compared to existing conditions (Table 59). Compared to the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would result in 1,040 fewer units, or 2,964 fewer residents, and 500 additional jobs.

Table 59 Alternative 3 Population, Jobs and Housing

	Proposed Specific Plan	Alternative 3	Difference	% change
Population (# residents) ¹	7,239	4,275	(2,964)	(40%)
Housing (# units)	2,540	1,500	(1,040)	(41%)
Employment (# jobs) ²	725	1,225	500	69%

¹ Assuming 2.85 residents per household, see Table 21 in Section 4.11, *Population and Housing*

² Source: The Natelson Company, Inc. 2001, 300 median square feet for employee for high-rise office and 585 median square feet per employee for retail/service. Assumes addition of 450,000 square feet of office (450,000 sf / 300 sf per employee = 1,500 employees) and removal of 161,000 square feet of office space (161,000 sf / 585 sf per employee = 275 employees).

() denotes decrease

Similar to the proposed Specific Plan, the housing and population growth under this alternative would exceed the growth assumptions for the Specific Plan Area under the City’s General Plan, although to a lesser extent than under the proposed Specific Plan. This alternative would also exceed the jobs projections for the Specific Plan Area compared to the City’s 2035 General Plan. Population and employment growth associated with the proposed Specific Plan in combination with implementation of the 2035 General Plan could lead to overall growth that would exceed General Plan projections. However, like the proposed Specific Plan, implementation of this alternative growth would shift from other areas of the City to the Specific Plan Area. In addition, this alternative would implement City and regional goals to put housing near transit centers. Impacts would be less than significant, similar to the proposed Specific Plan.

Similarly to the proposed Specific Plan, Alternative 3 would increase development of new housing in the Specific Plan Area which may potentially cause displacement of existing residents. However, this alternative would retain the policies and provisions included in the proposed Specific Plan that encourage the protection of residents at risk of displacement in or near the Plan Area. Therefore, impacts related to displacement would be less than significant, similar to the proposed Specific Plan.

I. Public Services, Schools, and Recreation

This alternative would result in 950 fewer residential units than the proposed Specific Plan but increase non-residential development by 150,000 square feet. Because this alternative would result in fewer residents in the Specific Plan Area compared to the proposed Specific Plan, potential impacts with respect to police and fire department response times would be reduced. Impacts would continue to be less than significant.

Based on the students per household generation rates used in the public services analysis for the proposed Specific Plan (see Section 4.12, Public Services), this alternative would generate approximately 1,050 new students, a reduction of 728 students compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, demand for school services would also decrease. With payment of State-mandated school impact fees, impacts to schools would be less than significant under this alternative, similar to the proposed Specific Plan.

This alternative would reduce the number of residential units compared to the proposed Specific Plan, and therefore would reduce population within the Specific Plan Area compared to full buildout of the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, the demand for libraries, parks and recreational facilities would be reduced compared to the proposed Specific Plan and impacts to libraries, parks and recreation facilities would be reduced. Impacts would remain less than significant.

m. Transportation and Traffic

As shown in Table 60, this alternative would involve 1,998 AM peak hour trips (447 fewer than the proposed Specific Plan) and 2,397 PM peak hour trips (554 fewer than the proposed Specific Plan).

Table 60 Alternative 3 Peak Hour Trip Generation

Alternative	Trip Generation		Trip Difference		Trip Percent Difference	
	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
2035 Alternative 3 - Office Focus	1,998	2,397	(447)	(554)	-18%	-19%
2035 Proposed Specific Plan	2,445	2,951	0	0	0%	0%

Source: Kittelson & Associates, Inc., 2017

Traffic impacts were assessed by Kittelson & Associates (2017) at the study intersections for the project alternatives based on the relative change of trip generation between the alternatives and the proposed Specific Plan. All intersections that were not impacted under the proposed Specific Plan remain less than significant. Table 61 provides a comparison of the previously impacted intersections between Alternative 3 and the cumulative no-project and proposed Specific Plan.

Table 61 Alternative 3 Intersection Analysis

Intersection	Peak Hour	2035 Alternative 3			2035 Proposed Specific Plan		
		Delay	LOS	V/C	Delay	LOS	V/C
Hesperian Boulevard & Halcyon Drive/Fairmont Drive (#5)	AM	108.6	F	1.13	116	F	1.17
	PM	122.6	F	1.22	130.2	F	1.25
E. 14th Street & Fairmont Drive (#7)	AM	88.2	F	1.03	95	F	1.09
	PM	122.7	F	1.16	129.7	F	1.18
Hesperian Boulevard and Thornally Drive (#10)	AM	208.1	F	0.95	212.6	F	0.98
	PM	295.2	F	1.02	292.2	F	1.02

Source: Kittelson & Associates, Inc., 2017

Shaded cell indicates a significant impact.

The impacts at the following intersections would no longer be significant under Alternative 3:

- Hesperian Boulevard & Halcyon Drive/Fairmont Drive during the PM peak hour (Intersection #5)
- East 14th Street/Fairmont Drive during the AM peak hour (Intersection #7)

Therefore, the impacts at intersections #5 and #7 would be reduced and would be less than significant. The intersection of Hesperian Boulevard and Thornally Drive (Intersection #10) would remain significantly impacted under Alternative 3. No mitigation measures are available to reduce the impact in the available right-of-way without removal of bike lanes. Therefore, the impact to this intersection would remain significant and unavoidable under Alternative 3, the same as under the proposed Specific Plan.

Since this alternative results in fewer trips than those generated under the proposed Specific Plan, impacts at freeway segments and arterial segments would be reduced compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Impacts to freeway segments would remain less than significant. As shown in Table 62, under Alternative 3, the impact identified at East 14th Street, south of Estudillo Avenue would be

City of San Leandro
Bay Fair Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Specific Plan

reduced to less than significant. However, the impact at Hesperian Boulevard south of East 14th Street would remain significant and unavoidable, the same as the proposed Specific Plan.

Table 62 MTS Arterial LOS, 2040 Cumulative Conditions, Alternative 3

Segment		Year 2040 Cumulative Conditions		Year 2040 Cumulative Alternative 3	
		AM	PM	AM	PM
Northbound/Eastbound					
East 14 th Street, south of Estudillo Avenue	Volume	1,987	1,295	1,992	1,295
	LOS	F	F	F	F
	V/C Change			0.00	0.00
East 14 th Street, south of Fairmont Drive	Volume	2,309	1,258	2,314	1,258
	LOS	F	D	F	D
	V/C Change			0.00	0.00
Washington Avenue, south of San Leandro Boulevard	Volume	1,351	1,033	1,352	1,028
	LOS	F	F	F	F
	V/C Change			0.00	0.00
Hesperian Boulevard, south of East 14 th Street	Volume	1,771	2,050	1,766	2,050
	LOS	D	D	F	F
	V/C Change			0.00	0.00
Lewelling Boulevard, east of Washington Avenue	Volume	1,553	1,609	1,455	1,490
	LOS	F	F	D	E
	V/C Change			-0.06	-0.07
Southbound/Westbound					
East 14 th Street, south of Estudillo Avenue	Volume	982	1,665	983	1,664
	LOS	D	F	D	F
	V/C Change			0.00	0.00
East 14 th Street, south of Fairmont Drive	Volume	1,124	2,164	1,125	2,164
	LOS	D	F	D	F
	V/C Change			0.00	0.00
Washington Avenue, south of San Leandro Boulevard	Volume	946	1,238	910	1,237
	LOS	F	F	E	F
	V/C Change			-0.04	0.00
Hesperian Boulevard, south of East 14 th Street	Volume	1,513	1,705	1,464	1,705
	LOS	D	D	D	F
	V/C Change			-0.03	0.00
Lewelling Boulevard, east of Washington Avenue	Volume	1,733	1,396	1,669	1,276
	LOS	F	D	F	D
	V/C Change			-0.04	-0.09

*V/C change is round up to 0.03; therefore, the segment operates within the standard.

Bold text indicates substandard operations.

Shaded cell indicates a significant impact.

Source: Kittelson & Associates, Inc., 2017

Like the proposed Specific Plan and due to the significant traffic impacts identified above, AC Transit buses would experience delays due to increased traffic. This impact would be significant and unavoidable, the same as the proposed Specific Plan. However, like the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would result in improvements to pedestrian and bicycle facilities and would not significantly impact transit capacity for AC Transit or BART.

n. Utilities and Service Systems

Compared to the proposed Specific Plan, this alternative would reduce residential buildout by 1,040 units (40 percent) and would increase non-residential buildout by 150,000 square feet (50 percent). As shown on Table 63, wastewater generation would be reduced by 112,267 gallons per day (38 percent) under this alternative compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed Specific Plan and would remain less than significant.

Table 63 Alternative 3 Estimated Wastewater Generation

Use	Bay Fair TOD Specific Plan Buildout	Average Wastewater Demand ¹	Expected Wastewater Generation	
			Gallons/Day	Million Gallons/Day
Office	450,000 square feet	0.0744	33,480	0.0335
Residential ²				
Apartment: High Rise	1,125 dwelling unit	110.4	124,200	0.1242
Apartment: Low-Rise	375 dwelling unit	143.52	53,820	0.0538
Subtotal			211,500	0.2115
Retail (removal of)	(161,000) square feet	0.173	(27,853)	(0.0279)
Alternative 3 Total			183,647	0.1836
Proposed Specific Plan for Comparison			295,914	0.2959

¹ Assume wastewater is 80 percent of water use shown in Table 41.

² Assume 75 percent high-rise apartments and 25 percent low-rise apartments for the specific Plan area.

Note: numbers may not add up due to rounding. () denotes subtraction

As shown in Table 64 and based on the water use factors used in Section 4.14, *Utilities and Service Systems*, Alternative 3 would require an estimated 229,599 gallons of water per day. This represents a reduction of 140,334 gallons per day (38 percent) when compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, impacts related to water supply would be reduced compared to the proposed Specific Plan and would remain less than significant.

Table 64 Alternative 3 Estimated Water Demand

Use	Bay Fair TOD Specific Plan Buildout		Average Water Demand ¹ (gpd/unit)	Average Daily Water Demand (gpd)
	Quantity	Unit		
Office	450,000	square feet	0.093	41,850
Residential ²				
Apartment: High Rise	1,125	dwelling unit	138	155,250
Apartment: Low-Rise	375	dwelling unit	179.4	67,275
Subtotal				264,375
Retail (removal of)	(161,000)	square feet	0.216	(34,776)
Alternative 3 Total				229,599
Proposed Specific Plan Total for Comparison				369,933

¹ Flowrate factors are based on reference material provided by EBMUD (see Table 42)

² Assume 75 percent high-rise apartments and 25 percent low-rise apartments for the Specific Plan area.

() denotes subtraction

As shown in Table 65 and based on the solid waste generation rates used for the proposed Specific Plan shown in Section 4.14, *Utilities and Service Systems*, this alternative would generate approximately 0.725 tons of solid waste per day (accounting for a 50 percent waste diversion rate). This represents a decrease of 0.375 tons per day (34 percent) compared to buildout under the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed Specific Plan and would continue to be less than significant.

Table 65 Alternative 3 Solid Waste Generation

Use	Bay Fair TOD Specific Plan Buildout		Generation Rate ²	Solid Waste (pounds per day)	Solid Waste (tons per day)	Solid Waste (cubic yards per day)*
	Quantity	Units				
Office ¹	450,000	square feet	6 pounds/1,000 square feet/day	2,700	1.35	2.7
Multi-Family Apartment	1,500	dwelling units	4.0 pounds/ unit/day	6,000	3.8	6.0
Subtotal				8,700	5.15	8.7
Retail (removal of)	(161,000)	square feet	0.046 pounds/square feet/day	(7,406)	(3.7)	(7.4)
Alternative 3 Total				1,294	1.45	1.3
Alternative 3 Total Assuming 50% Diversion Rate				647	0.725	0.65
Proposed Specific Plan Total Assuming 50% Diversion Rate for Comparison				2,277	1.1	2.2

¹ The employees for retail uses within the Plan Area also takes into consideration the removal of 161,000 square feet of retail uses or 275 employees. Refer to Population and Housing, Section 4.11.

² Source for Generation rates <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates#Residential>

* Based on the conversion factor described under Table 4.15-1, County-Service Landfill Capacity for "landfill density" Municipal Solid Waste, of approximately 750 to 1,250 pounds per cubic yard, or an average of 1,000 pounds per cubic yard.

() denotes subtraction

6.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA requires the identification of the environmentally superior alternative among the options studied. When the “No Project” alternative is determined to be environmentally superior, CEQA also requires identification of the environmentally superior alternative among the development options.

Table 66 indicates whether each alternative’s environmental impact is greater, lesser, or similar to the proposed Specific Plan. As shown therein, the No Project Alternative would reduce all of the proposed Specific Plan impacts and would be environmentally superior to the proposed Specific Plan because development anticipated in the Specific Plan Area under the proposed Specific Plan would exceed development anticipated under the 2035 General Plan. Although overall impacts would be lower than those of the proposed Specific Plan, the beneficial effects associated with the proposed Specific Plan (pedestrian facility, bicycle facility, and roadway improvements) would not occur. In addition, the No Project Alternative would not fulfill the Project Objectives, especially as existing development conditions do not provide a high level of connectivity between the BART station and adjacent shopping areas, do not support a diverse mix of land uses, and do not allow for provision of diverse and affordable housing. Overall, although the Specific Plan Area would continue to be designated as the B-TOD land use designation and the 2035 General Plan policies related to the B-TOD zone would apply, the overall intent for development as envisioned by the 2035 General Plan may not be implemented without the policies, standards, and guidelines of the proposed Specific Plan.

Among the other alternatives being considered, the Office Focus Alternative (Alternative 3) could be considered environmentally superior, as it would reduce impacts related to traffic and utilities, due primarily to the reduction in housing units. However, this alternative would not eliminate the significant and unavoidable impact at the intersection of Hesperian Boulevard and Thornally Drive. No mitigation measures are available to reduce the impact in the available right-of-way without removal of bike lanes. Therefore, the impact to this intersection would remain significant and unavoidable under Alternative 3. In addition, the impact at Hesperian Boulevard south of East 14th Street would remain significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed Specific Plan. Because of the significant traffic impacts, the significant impacts related to transit operations would also remain under this Alternative 3. This alternative would generally meet most of the project objectives, but would meet Objective 6 (to provide a diversity of uses) to a lesser degree than the proposed project.

Table 66 Impact Comparison of Alternatives

Issue	Proposed Specific Plan Impact Classification	Alternative 1: No Project / 2035 General Plan	Alternative 2: Residential Focus	Alternative 3: Office Focus
Aesthetics	Less than Significant	- (No impact)	= (Less than Significant)	= (Less than Significant)
Air Quality	Significant but Mitigable	- (No impact)	+ (Significant but Mitigable)	- (Significant but Mitigable)
Biological Resources	Significant but Mitigable	- (No impact)	= (Significant but Mitigable)	= (Significant but Mitigable)
Cultural Resources	Significant but Mitigable	- (No impact)	= (Significant but Mitigable)	= (Significant but Mitigable)
Geology and Soils	Less than Significant	- (No impact)	+ (Less than Significant)	- (Less than Significant)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Less than Significant	- (No impact)	- (Less than Significant)	- (Less than Significant)
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less than Significant	- (No impact)	= (Less than Significant)	= (Less than Significant)
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less than Significant	- (No impact)	= (Less than Significant)	= (Less than Significant)
Land Use and Planning	Less than Significant	- (No impact)	= (Less than Significant)	= (Less than Significant)
Noise	Significant but Mitigable	- (No impact)	= (Significant but Mitigable)	= (Significant but Mitigable)
Population and Housing	Less than Significant	- (No impact)	+ (Significant and Unavoidable)	- (Less than Significant)
Public Services, Schools, and Recreation	Less than Significant	- (No impact)	+ (Less than Significant)	- (Less than Significant)
Transportation and Traffic	Significant and Unavoidable	- (No impact)	- (Significant and Unavoidable)	- (Significant and Unavoidable)
Utilities and Service Systems	Less than Significant	- (No impact)	+ (Less than Significant)	- (Less than Significant)

* Impact classifications are shown for the greatest impact in the issue area (i.e., if Class II and III impacts were identified in the issue area, the table indicates the overall impact in that issue area as Class II).
 - impact would be lower (better) than that of the proposed Specific Plan
 + impact would be greater (worse) than that of the proposed Specific Plan
 = impact would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan