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A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR
903 MANOR BOULEVARD RESIDENTIAL PROJECT AT
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Notice is Hereby Given that the City of San Leandro is considering a recommendation that the project herein identified will have no significant environmental impacts in compliance with Section 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines. A copy of the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration, Initial Study, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program are on file in the San Leandro Community Development Department, 835 East 14th Street, San Leandro, California 95477. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, hard copies will be mailed upon request rather than accessible to the public at a physical location. If you need a hardcopy please send a self-addressed 10”x12” envelope with pre-paid postage to City of San Leandro, Planning Division, Attn: Andrew Mogensen, Planning Manager, 835 E. 14th Street, San Leandro, CA 94577. It is also available on the City’s Website at City of San Leandro, Community Development Department, Planning Services, Plans & CEQA Documents: https://www.sanleandro.org/depts/cd/plan/polplanstudiesceqa/default.asp.

REVIEW PERIOD: The 20-day review period is from May 15, 2020 to June 4, 2020. Comments on the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration should be provided in writing to the San Leandro Community Development Department, 835 East 14th Street, San Leandro, California 94577 by June 4, 2020 at 4:00 p.m. or email AMogensen@sanleandro.org.

This proposed finding does not constitute approval or denial of the project itself, it only determines if the project could have a significant environmental impact. Projects that could have a significant impact must have an Environmental Impact Report prepared to evaluate those possible impacts in compliance with Section 15064 of the CEQA Guidelines. If you wish to challenge the City’s action on this Mitigated Negative Declaration in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised in written correspondence. For further information concerning this project, please contact Andrew Mogensen at (510) 577-3325.

PROJECT LOCATION: 903 Manor Boulevard, San Leandro, California 94579

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project would involve the demolition of the existing Manor Bowl commercial building, and the development of 39 three-story townhomes within six buildings (proposed Buildings A through F) on the project site, site totaling approximately 100,000 square feet. Each building would be approximately 37.5 feet in height. The project includes four Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible units and six below market rate units. The applicant has applied for a Planned Development, Site Plan Review, Tentative Map, General Plan Map Amendment, and Zoning Map Amendment entitlements. As part of the project, the site’s General Plan land use map designation would be amended to General Commercial; the existing lot would also be divided into seven separate lots. The proposed density is 17.0 dwelling units (DU) per acre.

DECISION MAKING AUTHORITY: City of San Leandro Planning Commission and Board of Zoning Adjustments, and City Council

HEARING DATE: July 2, 2020, Planning Commission and Board of Zoning Adjustments Meeting
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The City of San Leandro, as the Lead Agency, prepared this Initial Study for the 903 Manor Boulevard Residential Project ("proposed project" or "project") in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 15000 et. seq.), and the regulations and policies of the City of San Leandro, California.

1. **Project Title**

903 Manor Boulevard Residential Project

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address**

City of San Leandro
Community Development Department
835 East 14th Street
San Leandro, California 94577

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number**

Andrew Mogensen, AICP, Planning Manager
(510) 577-3325

4. **Project Location**

The project site is located in the City of San Leandro, near the southern border of the City, as shown in Figure 1. The project site occupies approximately 2.3 acres on Assessor’s Parcel Number 80H-1541-036, located at 903 Manor Boulevard, on the north side of Manor Boulevard between its intersections with Zelma Street and Norton Street, as shown on Figure 2. The site includes a 30-foot public roadway easement, which is developed with Manor Boulevard and the adjacent sidewalk. The project site is approximately 240 feet south of Washington Manor Park and is served primarily by Manor Boulevard, with regional access provided by Interstate 880 (I-880) and I-238. The project site is approximately 1.7 miles from the San Francisco Bay.

5. **Project Sponsor’s Name and Address**

Chris Zaballos
ERC SC, LLC
6683 Owens Drive
Pleasanton, California 94588
City of San Leandro
903 Manor Boulevard Residential Project

Figure 1 Regional Location

[Map showing regional location with San Francisco, Oakland, and other cities marked, and a star indicating the project location.]

Imagery provided by Esri and its licensors © 2019.
Figure 2  Project Location
6. General Plan Designation

The San Leandro General Plan designates the site as Neighborhood Commercial, which allows for small shopping centers or clusters of street front buildings with local-serving businesses and services.

7. Zoning

The City of San Leandro zoning designation of the site is Commercial Community District, which allows for a variety of commercial uses, such as retail stores, ambulance services, restaurants, neighborhood food markets, travel services, and business and professional offices.

8. Project Description

The project would involve the demolition of the existing Manor Bowl commercial building, and the development of 39 three-story townhomes within six buildings (proposed Buildings A through F) on the project site, site totaling approximately 100,000 square feet. Figure 3 provides an overview of the proposed site plan. Each building would be approximately 37.5 feet in height. The project includes four Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible units and six below market rate units. The applicant has applied for a Planned Development, Site Plan Review, Tentative Map, General Plan Map Amendment, and Zoning Map Amendment entitlements. As part of the project, the site’s General Plan land use designation would be amended to General Commercial; the existing lot would also be divided into seven separate lots. The proposed density is 17.0 dwelling units (DU) per acre. The planned project includes approximately 3,493 square feet of open space. The Planned Development application includes a waiver for the provision of open space, as the required amount of open space per the zoning code is not met by the proposed site plan.

On-site circulation would be provided by new roadways, accessed by Manor Boulevard to the south. The main access roadway (proposed Street A) would travel north-south along the eastern boundary of the site, and two east-west roadways (proposed Street B and Court A) would provide access to townhome garages. The northernmost east-west roadway (proposed Street B) would loop around Building E and intersect with the main north-south roadway twice. Concrete walkways would provide pedestrian access between street and internal surface parking spaces and townhome entrances. Bicycle parking would include four bicycle lockers.

The project would provide a total of 78 garage spaces (including 39 electric vehicle charging spaces). These spaces would be in addition to a total of 17 on-site surface parking spaces, which would include three electric vehicle charging stations and one stall compliant with the access requirements of the ADA. Two off-site surface parking spaces would also be located along Manor Boulevard (the curb along the site’s Manor Boulevard frontage is currently entirely red-striped).

The project would include bioretention facilities throughout the site, totaling approximately 2,628 square feet and located adjacent to proposed buildings, sidewalks, and curbs. The project includes a total of approximately 10,672 square feet of landscaping, located around the perimeter of the site and between each proposed building. While the five existing trees located along the eastern project site boundary would be removed, approximately 110 trees would be planted on the site. The landscaping plan is provided as Figure 4.
Figure 3  Proposed Site Plan

Source: RJA, 2019
Figure 4  Proposed Landscaping Plan
A walking path would be constructed along the western project site boundary, adjacent to Buildings A, C, and D. A private concrete patio area, located next to Building E, would include bistro tables and chairs for residents to use.

The site is served by the East Bay Municipal Utilities District (EBMUD) for water supply, Oro Loma Sanitary District (OLSD) for wastewater treatment, the City of San Leandro for stormwater, Alameda County Fire Department (ACFD) for fire protection, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) for gas and electricity, and AT&T and Comcast for telecommunications services.

Construction is anticipated to require approximately 3,150 cubic yards of cut and approximately 7,650 cubic yards of fill. Project construction would last approximately 12 months.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

The project site is currently developed with Manor Bowl, a 30-lane bowling alley, which is a private recreational use. The site is surrounded by urban development, primarily consisting of single-family residences, with some commercial and multi-family development located along the project site’s western and southeastern boundaries. The site is bordered by Manor Boulevard to the south, residential uses along Norton Street to the east, residential uses along Devonshire Avenue to the north, and commercial uses (including restaurants, a post office, and small retail stores) at the corner of Zelma Street and Manor Boulevard to the west. Washington Manor Park is located approximately one block north of the project site. Manor Boulevard provides local access to the site, with regional access provided by I-880 and I-238. The project site is currently developed with Manor Bowl and its associated parking lot. The site is generally flat, with limited vegetation consisting of landscaped hedges along the Manor Boulevard frontage and small trees along the eastern project site boundary. The land surrounding the project site is also generally flat, with typical residential landscaping, often including grass lawns and street trees. Estudillo Canal passes under Manor Boulevard approximately 750 feet east of the project site and flows toward the San Francisco Bay.

The zoning districts immediately surrounding the project site are Residential Single-Family, Residential Multi-Family (RM-1800, 24 dwellings per acre; and RM-3000 Planned Development, 14.5 dwellings per acre), and Commercial Community, with most of the surrounding uses designated as Residential Single-Family. Surrounding General Plan land use designations include Low-Density Residential, Neighborhood Commercial, and High-Density Residential.

Figure 5 and Figure 6 provides photographs of the surrounding neighborhood, Figure 7 provides views of the project site, and Figure 8 provides architectural renderings of the proposed buildings fronting Manor Boulevard.
Figure 5  Photographs of the Surrounding Neighborhood

Photograph 1. Typical single-family residence architecture on Manor Boulevard south of the project site.

Photograph 2. Adjacent multi-family housing development on Zelma Street facing east.
Figure 6 Additional Photographs of the Surrounding Neighborhood

Photograph 1. Multi-family residences across Manor Boulevard from the project site.

Photograph 2. Adjacent commercial center along Manor Boulevard facing northeast.
Figure 7  Existing Photographs of the Project Site and Manor Boulevard

Photograph 1. View of the project site from Manor Boulevard looking north.

Photograph 2. Manor Boulevard adjacent to the project site looking east towards Manor Boulevard and Fleming Street.
Figure 8  Architectural Renderings of the Proposed Project

Photograph 1. View of the project site frontage from Manor Boulevard facing east.

Photograph 2. View of the project site frontage from Manor Boulevard facing west.

10. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required**

Approval is not required from public agencies other than the lead agency.

11. **Have California Native American Tribes Traditionally and Culturally Affiliated with the Project Area Requested Consultation Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1?**

No tribes have requested consultation from the City of San Leandro pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1.
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

This project would potentially affect the environmental factors checked below, involving at least one impact that is “Potentially Significant” or “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- □ Aesthetics
- □ Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- □ Air Quality
- ■ Biological Resources
- ■ Cultural Resources
- □ Energy
- □ Geology/Soils
- □ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- □ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- □ Hydrology/Water Quality
- □ Land Use/Planning
- □ Mineral Resources
- ■ Noise
- □ Population/Housing
- □ Public Services
- □ Recreation
- □ Transportation
- ■ Tribal Cultural Resources
- □ Utilities/Service Systems
- □ Wildfire
- ■ Mandatory Findings of Significance

Determination

Based on this initial evaluation:

- □ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- ■ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- □ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

- □ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “less than significant with mitigation incorporated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potential significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Andrew J. Mogensen

Printed Name

Date

Planning Manager

Title
Environmental Checklist

1 Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? □ □ ■ □

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? □ □ □ ■

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? □ □ ■ □

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area? □ □ ■ □

The City of San Leandro’s visual character includes its natural setting and physical development pattern. The city is mostly developed, bordered by Castro Valley to the east, San Francisco Bay to the west, Oakland to the north, and areas of unincorporated Alameda County communities including San Lorenzo and Ashland to the south. The City is predominantly developed with well-defined suburban residential neighborhoods. Three major freeways provide access to the City: I-238, the MacArthur Freeway (I-580), and the Nimitz Freeway (I-880). Much of the City’s residential land uses are located along the shoreline adjacent to large areas of open space with recreation uses along the east side. Large swaths of industrial land uses are located along the west side of I-880 and south of Marina Boulevard (City of San Leandro 2016a). Building heights in residential, commercial, and industrial areas generally range from one to two stories, surrounded by yards and wide streets. In comparison, building heights in the major activity centers of San Leandro can be up to five stories. Industrial and commercial areas visually feature parking and storage uses, with industrial buildings as proximate visual landmarks (City of San Leandro 2016a).
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

The project site is located in a fully urbanized area of the city, surrounded by single-family residences to the north, south, and east; a two-story multi-family development to the southeast; and a commercial development and three-story multi-family apartment complex to the west. The single-family residences surrounding the project site are all one story, while the multi-family apartment complex is three stories. The commercial center to the west is a single-story building developed in a strip-mall type design with a large surface parking lot along Manor Boulevard and Zelma Street. The north and east perimeters of the property have commercial businesses. The existing development on the project site includes a single-story commercial building in the northern portion of the property, with the southern portion consisting of a large surface parking lot.

Views surrounding the project site are urban, characterized by predominantly one-story single-family residences and the adjacent single-story commercial and multi-story residential development to the west and southeast.

The project is located in the Washington Manor neighborhood. The San Leandro 2035 General Plan designates significant views, including views looking west to the San Francisco Bay and the hills above I-580, and views looking east to the foothills from the hills near I-580. Partial pedestrian views of a small portion of the eastern foothills are accessible from public vantage points along the project site frontage. The 2035 General Plan also identifies major gateways and key gateway streets, major activity areas, and well-defined edges as areas where the City can enhance visual interest and create a sense of place. According to the 2035 General Plan, there are no identified significant views, major gateways, key gateway streets, or major activity areas in the project vicinity (City of San Leandro 2016a).

The project site is located mid-block on Manor Boulevard between Norton Street and Zelma Street. The applicant proposes to develop three-story townhouse-condominium buildings up to 37.5 feet in height. Two of the buildings (Building A and B) would front Manor Boulevard with driveway access to additional Buildings C through F along the east side of the project site. The proposed project would be roughly two stories taller than surrounding existing buildings, and the height of the new buildings would block partial views of the eastern foothills. Views of the foothills in this area would typically be experienced by motorists or pedestrians travelling along Manor Boulevard, which would be short in duration. Because the existing views of the foothills from the project site are limited, the elimination of this view from Manor Boulevard along the project site frontage would not cause a substantial change in overall views of the foothills within the project vicinity. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on scenic vistas.

Less Than Significant Impact

Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No state designated scenic highways are in the project vicinity. However, I-580, located approximately 3 miles west of the project site, is designated as eligible. At this distance, intervening structures and vegetation currently obstruct views of the project site from I-580. The project site is not visible from a state scenic highway. No trees, rock outcroppings, or other scenic resources exist on the project site, including historic buildings (see Section 5, Cultural Resources). Therefore, the project would not damage scenic resources in a state scenic highway and no impact would occur.

No Impact
Environmental Checklist

Aesthetics

Initial Study – Mitigated Negative Declaration

Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

The project site is in a fully urbanized area of the City. No General Plan scenic quality policies are relevant to the project site, as included policies apply only to ocean-front properties. The primary existing public views for the project site are along Manor Boulevard. The project would not be visible from other adjacent public streets. The following analysis is specific to Manor Boulevard. Table 1 provides San Leandro 2035 General Plan existing visual character goals and policies and summarizes the project’s compliance with these policies.

Table 1  2035 General Plan Project Consistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Visual Character Goal or Policy</th>
<th>Project Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-2.6: Preservation of Low-Density Character. Preserve the low-density character of San Leandro’s predominantly single-family neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Consistent. The project site is located in a neighborhood consisting of one-story single-family residences, with densities in the neighborhoods averaging approximately five units per acre. The site is adjacent to one-story single-family residences, a one-story commercial center, and three-story multi-family apartment complex. The proposed project would add 39 three-story townhomes distributed among eight separate building complexes on a 2.1-acre parcel, resulting in a site density substantially greater than that of the surrounding neighborhood. Though the project would be greater in height and density than the surrounding single-family residences, the project would not remove or relocate any existing single-family residences. In addition, the proposed scale would be consistent with the adjacent multi-family apartment complex to the west of project site, and the proposed architectural style would be similar to the ranch-style development found in the Washington Manor neighborhood with hip and valley rooflines, stucco, wood siding, and flat façade faces with box windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-2.8: Alterations, Additions, and Infill. Ensure that alterations, additions and infill development are compatible with existing homes and maintain aesthetically pleasing neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Consistent. The proposed project includes both common and private open space as part of development. Landscaping would be provided along the site perimeter and within common areas. These design features, as well as the proposed balconies and articulated frontage design, would avoid boxy and massive presentation to the street. Additionally, high quality construction materials would be used, including variations of colored stucco (including greens, blues, and greys in addition to lighter colors), “wood look” siding, fiber cement siding, and slate concrete roof tiles. These variations in building material types elevate the visual quality of the project by providing variations in design and color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CD-6.2: Recognizing Architectural Context. In areas without a well-established architectural aesthetic or consistent design palette, encourage contemporary and cutting-edge design. In areas which have an established or more traditional design theme or rhythm, encourage infill development that increases architectural cohesion and reinforces the prevalent style or styles.</td>
<td>Consistent. The project site is located in a neighborhood consisting of one-story single-family residences, with densities in the neighborhoods averaging approximately five units per acre. The site is adjacent to one-story single-family residences, a one-story commercial center, and three-story multi-family apartment complex. The proposed project would add 39 three-story townhomes distributed among eight separate building complexes on a 2.1-acre parcel, resulting in a site density substantially greater than that of the surrounding neighborhood. Though the project would be greater in height and density than the surrounding single-family residences, the project would not remove or relocate any existing single-family residences. In addition, the proposed scale would be consistent with the adjacent multi-family apartment complex to the west of project site, and the proposed architectural style would be similar to the ranch-style development found in the Washington Manor neighborhood with hip and valley rooflines, stucco, wood siding, and flat façade faces with box windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CD-6.3: Multi-Family Design. Establish high standards of architectural and landscape design for multi-family housing development. Boxey or massive building designs should be avoided, ample open space and landscaping should be provided, and high-quality construction materials should be used.</td>
<td>Consistent. The proposed project includes both common and private open space as part of development. Landscaping would be provided along the site perimeter and within common areas. These design features, as well as the proposed balconies and articulated frontage design, would avoid boxy and massive presentation to the street. Additionally, high quality construction materials would be used, including variations of colored stucco (including greens, blues, and greys in addition to lighter colors), “wood look” siding, fiber cement siding, and slate concrete roof tiles. These variations in building material types elevate the visual quality of the project by providing variations in design and color.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City of San Leandro
### 903 Manor Boulevard Residential Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Visual Character Goal or Policy</th>
<th>Project Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy LU-2.9: Density Transitions.</strong> Avoid abrupt transitions from high density to low density housing. Where high density development occurs, encourage such projects to step down in height and mass as they approach nearby lower density areas.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The project would result in medium-high density development at 17 units per acre. The layout of the proposed parking and main site access along the eastern side of the property boundary would provide a buffer between the proposed buildings and the existing single-family residences to the east. Along Manor Boulevard, proposed landscaping and setbacks along the front of the property would soften the transition from the surrounding single-family single-story residence to the three-story townhome buildings along the front of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy LU-2.11: Privacy and Views.</strong> Encourage residential alterations, additions, and new homes to be designed in a manner that respects the privacy of nearby homes and preserves access to sunlight and views. Wherever feasible, new or altered structures should avoid the disruption of panoramic or scenic views.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The project’s proposed site design would preserve the privacy of nearby residences to the north and east of the project site and would not disrupt panoramic or scenic views. Sunlight access to nearby residences on the north and east sides of the project would be slightly decreased during winter due to the proposed project’s height and massing. However, the distance between the proposed buildings and the existing single-family residences (approximately 21 feet from to the northern property line) would preserve access to sunlight during most of the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CD-5.4: Architectural Consistency.</strong> In established neighborhoods, protect architectural integrity by requiring infill housing, replacement housing, and major additions or remodels to be sensitive to and compatible with the prevailing scale and appearance of adjacent development.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The proposed buildings would be similar in scale to the adjacent apartment complex to the west and would maintain architectural consistency with the Washington Manor neighborhood in terms of general roof shape and palette.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CD-6.6: Garage Door Visibility.</strong> Minimize the visibility of garage doors in new single family and multi-family residential construction.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The proposed project’s design would site all garage doors interior to the project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy CD-6.7: Architectural Interest.</strong> Encourage new structures to incorporate architectural elements that create visual interest such as trellises, awnings, overhangs, patios, and window bays. Avoid solid or blank street-facing walls.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The project’s proposed architectural design would incorporate elements that create visual interest such as peaked roofs, overhangs, and private balconies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of San Leandro 2016a

As shown in Table 1, the proposed project would be consistent with applicable regulations governing scenic quality. Additionally, the project would be compliant with the Community Commercial (CC) zoning of the site, as described below:

- **Density no more than 24 units per gross acre:** The project proposes 39 DU on a 2.3-acre project site, or 17.0 units per acre.
- **Height no more than 50 feet:** Proposed buildings would be up to 37.5 feet in height.
- **Side yard setbacks of 0 feet:** 10.3-foot minimum side setback provided.
- **Front yard setback of 10 feet:** 10.5-feet minimum front setback provided.

The project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. The proposed project would provide an infill residential...
development within the neighborhood in contrast to the existing commercial building and surface parking lot. Therefore, impacts to existing visual character would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

d. *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?*

The project site is in an urban area with moderate levels of existing lighting and is currently developed with a commercial building and surface parking lot. Existing light sources include lighting from adjacent residences, from the existing on-site parking lot and exterior lighting sources, and from the adjacent commercial center. Streetlights and vehicle lights along both Manor Boulevard and Zelma Street also contribute to the existing light environment.

The primary source of glare in the project area is the sun’s reflection off light-colored and reflective building materials and finishes, and from metallic and glass surfaces of parked vehicles. The windows of the proposed new residences could generate glare from reflected sunlight during certain times of the day. Headlights of vehicles entering and exiting the project site at night would be similar to existing conditions and would not affect nearby light-sensitive receptors.

The project site is in an urban environment with numerous existing sources of light and glare. The project would not substantially alter this condition. Lighting installed on the project site would be required to comply with San Leandro Municipal Code (SLMC) requirements, including height limitations on outdoor lighting and requirements to direct light sources to prevent lighting adjacent streets, shield light sources, and utilize indirect or diffused security lighting (SLMC Sections 4-1670 and 4-1732). Therefore, impacts related to light and glare would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**
## Agriculture and Forestry Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)); timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526); or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **a.** Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- **b.** Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?
- **c.** Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)); timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526); or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?
d. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

The project site and surrounding area is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land, with no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance located near the project site (California Department of Conservation 2019). The project site and surrounding area is also not under a Williamson Act contract (Bay Area Open Space Council 2006). Similarly, the project site and surrounding area do not contain forest land or timberland, as the area is fully developed with urban land uses. Additionally, the City of San Leandro does not designate or zone any land for agricultural use (City of San Leandro 2016b, City of San Leandro 2017a). Because the project site and surrounding area currently contains urban development, is not designated as important farmland or forestland, and is not under a Williamson Act contract, the project would have no impact on the conversion of farmland, forest land, or timberland to non-agricultural or non-forest uses.

NO IMPACT
### 3 Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An Air Quality and Health Risk Assessment Memorandum was prepared by Ramboll on July 30, 2019 for the project and peer reviewed by Rincon Consultants in January 2020. The following analysis incorporates the findings of this memorandum, which has been included as Appendix AQ to this report.

**Air Quality Standards and Attainment**

The project site is located within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB), which is under the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). As the local air quality management agency, the BAAQMD is required to monitor air pollutant levels to ensure that state and federal air quality standards are met and, if they are not met, to develop strategies to meet the standards.

Depending on whether or not the standards are met or exceeded, the basin is classified as being in “attainment” or “nonattainment.” Under state law, air districts are required to prepare a plan for air quality improvement for pollutants for which the district is in non-compliance. The BAAQMD is in non-attainment for the state and federal ozone standards, the state and federal PM$_{2.5}$ (particulate matter up to 2.5 microns in size) standards, and the state PM$_{10}$ (particulate matter up to 10 microns in size) standards (BAAQMD 2020). The health effects associated with criteria pollutants for which the basin is in non-attainment are described in Table 2.
Table 2  Health Effects Associated with Non-Attainment Criteria Pollutants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Adverse Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>(1) Short-term exposures: (a) pulmonary function decrements and localized lung edema in humans and animals and (b) risk to public health implied by alterations in pulmonary morphology and host defense in animals; (2) long-term exposures: risk to public health implied by altered connective tissue metabolism and altered pulmonary morphology in animals after long-term exposures and pulmonary function decrements in chronically exposed humans; (3) vegetation damage; and (4) property damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended particulate matter (PM$_{10}$)</td>
<td>(1) Excess deaths from short-term and long-term exposures; (2) excess seasonal declines in pulmonary function, especially in children; (3) asthma exacerbation and possibly induction; (4) adverse birth outcomes including low birth weight; (5) increased infant mortality; (6) increased respiratory symptoms in children such as cough and bronchitis; and (7) increased hospitalization for both cardiovascular and respiratory disease (including asthma).a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$)</td>
<td>(1) Excess deaths from short- and long-term exposures; (2) excess seasonal declines in pulmonary function, especially in children; (3) asthma exacerbation and possibly induction; (4) adverse birth outcomes, including low birth weight; (5) increased infant mortality; (6) increased respiratory symptoms in children, such as cough and bronchitis; and (7) increased hospitalization for both cardiovascular and respiratory disease, including asthma.a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a More detailed discussions on the health effects associated with exposure to suspended particulate matter can be found in the following documents: United States Environmental Protection Agency, Air Quality Criteria for Particulate Matter, October 2004. Source: United States Environmental Protection Agency, https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants

Air Quality Management

The BAAQMD is primarily responsible for assuring that national and state ambient air quality standards are attained and maintained in the Bay Area. The BAAQMD is also responsible for adopting and enforcing rules and regulations concerning air pollutant sources, issuing permits for stationary sources of air pollutants, inspecting stationary sources of air pollutants, responding to citizen complaints, monitoring ambient air quality and meteorological conditions, awarding grants to reduce motor vehicle emissions, conducting public education campaigns, as well as many other activities. The BAAQMD has jurisdiction over much of the nine-county Bay Area, including Alameda County.

The BAAQMD adopted the 2017 Clean Air Plan (2017 Plan) as an update to the 2010 Clean Air Plan. The 2017 Plan provides a regional strategy to protect public health and protect the climate. Consistent with the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets adopted by the state, the 2017 Plan lays the groundwork for a long-term effort to reduce Bay Area GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. To fulfill state ozone planning requirements, the 2017 control strategy includes all feasible measures to reduce emissions of ozone precursors—reactive organic gases and nitrogen oxides—and reduce transport of ozone and its precursors to neighboring air basins. In addition, the 2017 Plan builds upon and enhances the BAAQMD’s efforts to reduce emissions of fine particulate matter and toxic air contaminants (BAAQMD 2017a).

BAAQMD Screening Criteria

The BAAQMD recommends that lead agencies determine appropriate air quality emissions thresholds of significance based on substantial evidence in the record. The BAAQMD’s significance thresholds in the May 2017 CEQA Guidelines for project operations within the SFBAAB are the most appropriate thresholds for use in determining air quality impacts of the proposed project. The
BAAQMD developed screening criteria to provide lead agencies and project applicants with a conservative indication of whether a project could result in potentially significant air quality impacts. If a project meets all the screening criteria, then the lead agency or applicant would not need to perform a detailed air quality assessment of their project’s air pollutant emissions. These screening levels are generally representative of new development on greenfield sites without any form of mitigation measures taken into consideration (BAAQMD 2017b).

The screening criteria for operational criteria pollutant emissions of condo/townhouse developments is 451 DU. For construction-related emissions, the screening criteria is 240 DU.

BAAQMD also provides a preliminary screening methodology to conservatively determine whether a proposed project would exceed carbon monoxide thresholds. A project would result in a less than significant impact related to local carbon monoxide concentrations if it meets the following criteria:

- The project is consistent with an applicable congestion management program established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, regional transportation plan, and local congestion management agency plans;
- The project traffic would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour;
- The project traffic would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal mixing is substantially limited (e.g., tunnel, parking garage, bridge underpass, natural or urban street canyon, below-grade roadway).

a. **Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

A project would generally conflict with or potentially obstruct implementation of an air quality management plan if it would not support the primary goals of the plan, if it does not include applicable control measures from the plan, or if it would disrupt or hinder implementation of the plan (BAAQMD 2017b). The 2017 Plan includes goals and measures to increase the use of electric vehicles, promote the use of on-site renewable energy, and encourage tree planting. The project includes features that are consistent with these goals and measures, including the provision of bicycle parking, 39 electric vehicle charging spaces, solar-ready buildings, and planting 110 new trees. Further, as discussed in responses to question (b) below, the project not would exceed BAAQMD significance thresholds related to air quality emissions. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of an applicable air quality plan. This impact would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

b. **Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?**

c. **Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

Project construction would result in temporary construction emissions and long-term operational emissions. Construction activities such as the operation of construction vehicles and equipment over unpaved areas, grading, trenching, and disturbance of stockpiled soils have the potential to generate fugitive dust (PM$_{10}$) through the exposure of soil to wind erosion and dust entrainment. In addition, exhaust emissions associated with heavy-duty construction equipment would potentially
degrade regional air quality. However, the proposed project is below the BAAQMD construction screening criteria for townhomes, as it would develop 39 DU, which is below the 240 DU criteria. Therefore, impacts from construction emissions would be less than significant.

Long-term emissions associated with operational impacts would include emissions from vehicle trips (mobile sources), natural gas and electricity use (energy sources), and landscape maintenance equipment, consumer products, and architectural coating associated with on-site development (area sources). However, the proposed project is below the BAAQMD operational screening criteria for townhomes, as it would develop 39 DU, which is below the 451 DU criteria. Therefore, impacts from operational emissions would be less than significant.

Toxic air contaminants (TAC) are a defined set of air pollutants that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. Common sources of TACs and PM_{2.5} include gasoline stations, dry cleaners, diesel backup generators, truck distribution centers, freeways, and other major roadways (BAAQMD 2017b). The project does not propose construction of gas stations, dry cleaners, highways, roadways, or other sources that could be considered permitted or non-permitted source of TAC or PM_{2.5} in proximity to receptors. In addition, the project would result in a net decrease of 72 daily vehicle trips (refer to Section 17, Transportation), which is below the BAAQMD-recommended TAC emissions estimate threshold of 10,000 vehicles per day. The project does not contain any other significant sources of TAC emissions. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant source of TAC emissions.

Construction health risks for future residents on the site were calculated by Ramboll using AERMOD, a model developed by the United States Environmental Protection Agency. This model is based on the 2015 Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments, published by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. The BAAQMD’s HRA Guidelines formally adopted this publication (Appendix AQ). Based on calculations conducted by Ramboll, construction activities would result in a maximum cancer risk of 5.9 in 1 million (below the 10 in 1 million threshold), non-cancer hazard index of 0.01 (below the 1.0 threshold), and maximum PM_{2.5} concentration of 0.03 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³) (below the 0.3 µg/m³ threshold). Therefore, health risk impacts associated with project construction would be less than significant.

Ramboll also estimated cumulative health risk at the project site and determined that the combined impact from all sources would result in a cancer risk of 31 in 1 million (below the 100 in 1 million cumulative threshold), a combined non-hazard index of 0.007 (below the 10.0 cumulative threshold), and a combined maximum PM_{2.5} concentration of 0.36 µg/m³ (below the 0.8 µg/m³ cumulative threshold). Additionally, because the project is below the BAAQMD screening threshold for townhome developments, the project would not exceed BAAQMD-established thresholds. Therefore, cumulative health risk impacts would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

d. Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Table 3-3 in the BAAQMD’s 2017 CEQA Guidelines provides odor screening distances for land uses that have the potential to generate substantial odor complaints. These uses include wastewater treatment plants, landfills or transfer stations, refineries, composting facilities, confined animal facilities, food manufacturing, smelting plants, and chemical plants (BAAQMD 2017b). None of these identified uses would occur within the project site. The proposed project would not generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people during operation.
During construction activities, heavy equipment and vehicles would emit odors associated with vehicle and engine exhaust both during normal use and when idling. However, these odors would be temporary and would cease upon completion. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. This impact would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**
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## 4 Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Biological Assessment was prepared by Zentner Planning and Ecology (Zentner) in July 2019 for the project and peer reviewed by Rincon Consultants in December 2019. The following analysis incorporates the findings of this report, which has been included as Appendix BIO to this report.

The project site contains five cypress trees (*Hesperocyparis* sp.) along the eastern edge of the parking lot, a juniper hedge (*Juniperus* sp.) between the parking lot and Manor Boulevard to the south, and a nightshade shrub (*Solanum* sp.) at the project site’s southeast corner. A narrow strip of dirt surrounds the bowling alley to the east, north, and west. This dirt area is heavily compacted and disturbed with little to no vegetation present. Only common ruderal species (such as bristly ox tongue [*Helminthotheca echioides*], foxtail barley [*Hordeum murinum*], ripgut brome [*Bromus diandrus*], and geranium [*Geranium molle*]) are present in this area. These are the only plants that were observed during Zentner’s July 3, 2019 site visit.

Wildlife observed on the project site included bird species using the building and trees for cover, foraging, and possibly nesting; however, no active bird nests were observed, and nesting habitat is limited on the project site. Other urban-adapted wildlife expected to pass through the site include western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*), striped skunk (*Mephitis mephitis*), racoon (*Procyon lotor*) and opossum (*Didelphis virginiana*).

Zentner found no wetlands, waters of the United States, or waters of the State of California on the project site, and noted no hydrophytic vegetation, no hydric soils, no evidence of ponding, and no wetland hydrology (Appendix BIO).

a. **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

Located in an urbanized area, the project site is developed and heavily disturbed. Although special-status species have been identified within 5 miles of the project site on the California Natural Diversity Database, no special-status plant or animal species were observed during the site visit. Despite the urbanized nature of the project site, the site does contain potential habitat for nesting raptors and migratory birds and roosting bats. Therefore, mitigation measures would be required to reduce potential impacts to nesting raptors and migratory birds and roosting bats.

**Mitigation Measures**

**BIO-1 Nesting Bird Pre-Construction Survey**

If project construction begins between February 1 and September 1 (the migratory bird nesting season), a pre-construction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 14 days prior to the start of construction, to ensure that no nesting birds or raptors are disrupted by the project. The survey shall include a review of all trees, shrubs, and structures on the property that provide potential nesting habitat for bird or raptor species, including a buffer of 150 feet for passerines and 500 feet for raptors. If an active nest is encountered, the qualified biologist shall establish an appropriate protective buffer around the nest, to ensure that the nest inhabitants do not become distressed. The protective buffer shall remain in place until the nest is no longer active, as determined by the qualified biologist.
**BIO-2 Roosting Bat Pre-construction Survey**

Prior to building demolition, a roosting bat survey shall be completed by a qualified biologist to determine the presence of bat species on the project site. The biologist shall examine all buildings, structures, trees, and shrubs that will be removed during construction and demolition. If any active roosts are present, the qualified biologist shall identify an appropriate construction-free buffer around the active roosts, and no construction shall occur within the construction-free buffer during the maternity season (April 15 to August 15) or during the overwintering season (October 15 to February 28). A qualified biologist shall safely evict roosting bats outside of these seasons.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, impacts to nesting birds and bat species would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

b. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

c. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

d. *Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*

The project site is located in an urbanized area, and the site is developed and heavily disturbed. The site does not contain any special-status habitats, wetlands, or other waters. Because the site is surrounded by urban development, it does not provide a wildlife movement corridor. There would be no impact to riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, protected wetlands, or wildlife movement corridors as a result of the project.

**NO IMPACT**

e. *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

f. *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

The five existing trees along the eastern project site boundary would be removed as part of the project; however, as shown in Figure 4, approximately 110 new trees would be planted on site. Because none of the existing trees are street trees, the SLMC Chapter 5-2 regarding street tree removal and replanting does not apply to the project. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans that are applicable to the project site. There would be no impact.

**NO IMPACT**
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5 Cultural Resources

Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5? □ □ ■ □

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? □ ■ □ □

c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? □ □ ■ □

This section is based on the findings of a Cultural Resources Memorandum prepared by Rincon Consultants on February 6, 2020 (Appendix CUL).

To identify previous cultural resources work and previously recorded cultural resources and previous conducted studies within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site, Rincon requested a search of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) at Sonoma State University on January 3, 2020. The CHRIS records search also included a review of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), the California Points of Historical Interest list, the California Historical Landmarks list, the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility list, and the California State Historic Resources Inventory list. A summary of the results of the CHRIS records search is included in Appendix CUL.

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources for this project, Rincon also requested a Sacred Lands File search and a list of Native American tribal organizations and individuals who may have knowledge of sensitive cultural resources in or near the project site from the Native American Heritage Commission. The Commission’s response stated the Sacred Lands File search results were negative for site-specific information and included a list of seven Native American contacts who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project site and vicinity. Rincon mailed letters to each of the provided contacts requesting information regarding cultural resources. No responses from Native American contacts as of the date of the Cultural Resources Memorandum (February 6, 2020).

Archival research focused on the review of a variety of primary and secondary source materials relating to the history and development of the project site and its surroundings. Sources included, but were not limited to, historic maps and photographs, contemporary newspaper articles, and written histories of the area.

A cultural resources survey of the project site conducted by Rincon Cultural Resource Specialist Hannah Haas, MA, RPA, included a visual inspection of all accessible portions of the project site, examination of exposed ground surface for artifacts and ecofacts, identification of any soil discoloration, visual inspection of ground disturbances, and visual inspection of all built...
environment features. Observations were recorded using detailed notes and digital photographs. Resources were recorded and evaluated on California Department Parks and Recreation 523 Series forms, which are included in Appendix CUL.

a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

The project site contains one building of 45 or more years of age: Manor Bowl, a 1960 commercial bowling center with a Mid-Century Modern-influenced style. The property is located in the Washington Manor neighborhood of San Leandro. As recently as 1958, the project site was occupied by the Old Farm Nursery, a commercial nursery. By August 1959, Old Farm Nursery had closed, and plans were made for the construction of Manor Bowl. Manor Bowl’s January 1960 opening coincided with the popularity of multi-use bowling centers in suburban America (Appendix CUL).

Manor Bowl’s multi-use amenities reflected a “country club of the people” approach to bowling center design (Appendix CUL). Features of the property made it a site of both nighttime entertainment and community engagement. Aside from bowling lanes, the property offered a bar, coffee shop, meeting rooms, and a “kiddie nursery” (Oakland Tribune 8/6/1959; 1/5/1960). While Manor Bowl’s multi-use character was typical of the postwar bowling center property type, its design lacked the architectural flair of other bowling centers. Manor Bowl displays a few architectural elements typical of the Mid-Century Modern architectural style. These include a horizontal emphasis, low-slung roof, stack-bond brick cladding, and pattern block screens. The building has few other distinguishing architectural features of the Mid-Century Modern architectural style (GEI 2017).

**Evaluation**

Manor Bowl is recommended ineligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR, or for local designation as a City Landmark or Merit Resource under any eligibility criteria (Appendix CUL). The property was constructed as Manor Bowl in 1960, during the suburban expansion of San Leandro and amid the booming popularity of multi-use bowling centers in postwar America. Research for this study did not suggest the property played an important role in either event or that it was important in any events significant to the history of the city, region, state, or nation. As a result, the property is recommended ineligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR under Criteria A/1 or for local designation as a City Landmark of Structure of Merit under Criteria A/A.

The individual mostly closely associated with Manor Bowl is Dudley Knapp, a founder of Manor Enterprises and its first president. Neither Knapp nor any other individual associated with Manor Bowl made singular historical contributions to local, regional, state, or national history (Appendix CUL). The property is therefore recommended ineligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR under Criteria B/2 or for local designation as a City Landmark of Structure of Merit under Criteria B/B.

Architecturally, the property is an undistinguished bowling center with modest Mid-Century Modern-style architectural elements. Generally utilitarian in design, it lacks any distinguishing architectural features and is a common example of a Mid-Century Modern-era bowling alley. Because it does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values, it is recommended ineligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR under Criteria C/3 or for local designation as a City Landmark of Structure of Merit under Criteria C/C or D/D.
A review of available evidence and records search results did not indicate the property may yield important information about prehistory or history. As such, it is recommended ineligible for listing for the NRHP and CRHR under Criteria D/D or for local designation as a City Landmark of Structure of Merit under Criteria E/E.

Finally, the property is not recommended eligible for listing as a contributor to any existing or potential historic district.

**Conclusions**

Manor Bowl is recommended ineligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR or for designation as City of San Leandro City Landmark or Structure of Merit. As such, it does not qualify as a historical resource and its demolition would not result in a significant adverse impact as defined by CEQA. Further, the CHRS records search and a review of City of San Leandro historic resources listings failed to identify any other cultural resources, including historic districts, close to the project site.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

The records search, Sacred Lands File search, Native American scoping, and pedestrian survey did not identify any archaeological resources on the project site (Appendix CUL). The entire project site is developed, and ground visibility was obscured by buildings or non-native ornamental vegetation or was inaccessible. No archaeological resources are known to exist in the project vicinity and Rincon did not identify any information to suggest that the project area may be sensitive for archaeological resources. However, there is always the potential for previously unknown archaeological resources to be discovered during construction activities. Therefore, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would be required to reduce impacts.

**Mitigation Measure**

**CUL-1 Unanticipated Discovery of Archaeological Resources**

If cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work within 50 feet of the find shall be halted, and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology (National Park Service 1983) shall be contacted immediately to evaluate the find. If the discovery proves to be significant under CEQA, additional work such as data recovery excavation, Native American consultation, and archaeological monitoring may be warranted to mitigate any significant impacts.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, impacts to archeological resources would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

c. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

While no known human remains are present on the project site, the project is required to adhere to regulations regarding the unanticipated discovery of human remains, as follows. If human remains are found, existing regulations outlined in the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 state that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a
determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the County Coroner must be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify a most likely descendant. The most likely descendant shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of being granted access and provide recommendations as to the treatment of the remains to the landowner.

Therefore, the project would be required to comply with regulations regarding discovered human remains. This would ensure the project would have a less than significant impact on human remains.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
6 Energy

Would the project:

a. Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?
   - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
   - [ ] Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
   - [ ] Less than Significant Impact
   - [ ] No Impact

b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?
   - [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
   - [ ] Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
   - [ ] Less than Significant Impact
   - [ ] No Impact

Energy consumption accounts for energy consumed during project construction and operation, such as fuel consumed by vehicles, natural gas consumed for heating and/or power, and electricity consumed for power. The analysis of energy consumption herein involves the quantification of anticipated vehicle and equipment fuel, natural gas, and electricity consumption during project construction and operation, to the extent feasible, as well as a qualitative discussion of the efficiency, necessity, and potential for wastefulness of that energy consumption.

a. Would the project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

The proposed project would involve the use of energy during construction and operation. Energy use during construction would be primarily from fuel consumption to operate heavy equipment, light-duty vehicles, machinery, and generators. Temporary grid power may be provided to construction trailers or electric construction equipment. Table 3 illustrates the anticipated energy consumption from construction equipment and vehicles, including construction worker trips to and from the project site. Project construction would require approximately 3,021 gallons of gasoline and 32,467 gallons of diesel fuel. Table 3 also provides the anticipated annual operational energy consumption from vehicles.

Table 3  Project Construction and Operation Energy Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Fuel Consumption (Gallons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Equipment and Hauling Trips</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Worker Vehicle Trips</td>
<td>3,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Vehicle Trips (Annual)</td>
<td>21,803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A: Not applicable
Sources: Appendix AQ for CalEEMod default values for fleet mix and average distance of travel; Appendix NRG for energy calculation sheets.
Project construction would be required to comply with the SLMC, which incorporates the California Green Building Standards Code. This code includes specific requirements related to recycling, construction materials, and energy efficiency standards that would apply to project construction to minimize wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary energy consumption.

In addition to transportation energy use, project operation would require permanent grid connections for electricity and natural gas. Approximately 665 million British thermal units per year (MMBtu/yr) of electricity would be used for lighting and large appliances within the residential units. Approximately 886 MMBtu/yr of natural gas would be used primarily for heating the proposed buildings. The proposed residential buildings would total approximately 74,624 square feet, which is an average energy use intensity (EUI) of 0.0208 MMBtu per square foot. According to the United States Energy Information Administration, average EUI for residences in the Pacific region of the United States is 0.0314 MMBtu per square foot (United States Energy Information Administration 2018a; United States Energy Information Administration 2018b). Therefore, the project’s EUI for residential buildings would be below the average EUI in the Pacific region; project operation would not result in significant impacts due to the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, and impacts would be less than significant.

In accordance with Section 150.1(b)14 of the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, the project would be required to be solar-ready or include the installation of photovoltaic systems on all low-rise residential buildings (up to three stories), equal to the expected electricity usage. The project identifies potential locations for solar panels on the rooftops of each proposed building. Therefore, this requirement would serve to reduce the project’s consumption of nonrenewable energy resources.

Due to the large number of materials and manufacturers involved in the production of construction materials, including manufacturers in other states and countries, upstream energy use cannot be estimated reasonably or accurately. However, it is reasonable to assume that manufacturers of building materials such as concrete, steel, lumber, or other building materials would employ energy conservation practices in the interest of minimizing the cost of doing business.

Overall, project operation would result in consumption of fuels from vehicle trips, and electricity and natural gas from proposed buildings. Project energy consumed would represent an incremental increase in energy usage compared to existing conditions, and the proposed project would implement energy-efficient components to reduce energy demand. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

b. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Table 4 provides San Leandro 2035 General Plan energy efficiency goals and policies and summarizes the project’s compliance with these policies.
### Table 4  Project Compliance with Energy Efficiency Goals and Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy Efficiency Goal or Policy</th>
<th>Project Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy OSC-7.1: Recycling.</strong> Actively promote recycling, composting, and other programs that reduce the amount of solid waste requiring disposal in landfills.</td>
<td>Consistent. The project would be served by Waste Management of Alameda County for garbage collection, recycling, and composting services (Appendix WM). The provision of these services to the proposed townhomes would encourage recycling and composting of typical household waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy OSC-7.3: Drought-Tolerant Landscaping.</strong> Encourage the use of native vegetation and Bay-friendly landscaping and enforce the State Department of Water Resources Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO).</td>
<td>Consistent. As described in the landscape plan, proposed landscaping would require less water than the maximum applied water allowance, per Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy OSC-7.4: Development Standards.</strong> Maintain local planning and building standards that require the efficient use of water through such measures as low-flow plumbing fixtures and water-saving appliances. Require water conservation measures as a condition of approval for major developments.</td>
<td>Consistent. The project would be required to comply with the SLMC, which incorporates the California Green Building Standards Code. Measures such as low-flow plumbing fixtures and water-saving appliances are included in the California Green Building Standards Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy OSC-7.8: Green Building.</strong> Promote green building in new construction and remodels.</td>
<td>Consistent. The project would be required to comply with the SLMC, which incorporates the California Green Building Standards Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy OSC-7.9: Reducing Greenhouse Gases Through Land Use and Transportation Choices.</strong> Locate and design new development in a manner which maximizes the ability to use transit, walk, or bicycle for most trips, reduce dependence on fossil fuel powered vehicles, and reduce vehicle miles travelled.</td>
<td>Consistent. As described in Section 17, Transportation, the project would result in fewer vehicle trips than the existing uses and thus would reduce vehicle miles travelled (VMT).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy OSC-8.2: Planning and Building Practices.</strong> Encourage construction, landscaping, and site planning practices that minimize heating and cooling costs and ensure that energy is efficiently used. Local building codes and other City regulations and procedures should meet or exceed state and federal standards for energy conservation and efficiency and support the City’s greenhouse gas reduction goals.</td>
<td>Consistent. The planting of trees adjacent to proposed buildings would shade the buildings, resulting in lower heating and cooling requirements as the trees provide a measure of insulation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4, the project would be compliant with applicable energy efficiency goals and policies. Therefore, potential impacts associated with renewable energy and energy efficiency would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**
This page intentionally left blank.
7 Geology and Soils

Would the project:

a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
   1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? □ □ ■ □
   2. Strong seismic ground shaking? □ □ ■ □
   3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? □ □ ■ □
   4. Landslides? □ □ ■ □

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? □ □ ■ □

c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? □ □ ■ □

d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? □ □ ■ □

e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? □ □ □ ■

f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? □ ■ □ □
A Preliminary Feasibility Evaluation was prepared by Quantum Geotechnical, Inc. in September of 2018 for the project. The following analysis incorporates the findings of this report, which has been included as Appendix GEO to this report. Additionally, a letter dated November 5, 2019, from Quantum Geotechnical, Inc. indicates that the project plans were updated to incorporate recommendations from the 2018 report.

The City of San Leandro is located in the United States Geological Survey’s San Leandro and Hayward Quadrangle 7.5-minute topographic map. The area is typified by low topographic relief, with gentle slopes to the southwest in the direction of San Francisco Bay. By contrast, the San Leandro Hills, directly northeast of the city, have more pronounced topographic relief, with elevations that locally approach 1,000 feet above mean sea level (City of San Leandro 2016a). According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Survey, soils on the project site consist of Danville silty clay loam (United States Department of Agriculture 2019).

a.1. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

As with any site in the Bay Area region, the project site is susceptible to strong seismic ground shaking in the event of a major earthquake. The project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and there are no known faults crossing or projecting toward the site (California Geological Survey 2003). The closest active fault to the project site is the Hayward Fault located approximately 2 miles to the northeast. This fault is capable of producing strong seismic ground shaking at the project site. The proposed project would be required to comply with State of California standards for building design through the CBC (California Code of Regulations, Title 24), which requires various measures of all construction in California to account for hazards from seismic shaking. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse impacts associated with surface fault rupture. Impacts would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

a.2. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?

c. Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

The San Francisco Bay Area region is one of the most seismically active areas in the country. While seismologists cannot predict earthquake events, the Third Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast estimates the likelihood that California will experience a magnitude 8 or larger earthquake in the next 30 years is about 7.0 percent (Southern California Earthquake Center 2017). The estimated rate of earthquakes of magnitude 6.7 has gone down by 30 percent, with the expected frequency decreased to once every 6.3 years. This decreased likelihood of magnitude 6.7 earthquakes is balanced by an increased likelihood of magnitude 8 earthquakes.

The project site is located in an area of relatively high seismic potential. The faults in the area are capable of generating earthquakes that could produce strong to violent ground shaking at the project site. The active fault nearest the site is the Hayward fault, which is located approximately 2 miles to the northeast. The effects of earthquake-related ground shaking could include damage to
structures, as well as damage to streets and utilities. However, compliance with the current CBC requirements would ensure that the proposed structures would be able to: (1) resist minor earthquakes without damage; (2) resist moderate earthquakes without structural damage, but with some non-structural damage; and (3) resist major earthquakes without collapse, but with some structural as well as nonstructural damage. By adhering to State and City building code requirements, the direct or indirect impacts from development of the proposed project as they relate to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

According to the Geotechnical Feasibility Evaluation, the project site has a high liquefaction potential (Appendix GEO). The factors known to influence liquefaction potential include grain size, relative density, groundwater conditions, effective confining pressures, and intensity and duration of ground shaking. Loose, saturated, near-surface, cohesionless soils exhibit the highest liquefaction potential, while dense, cohesionless soils and cohesive soils exhibit low to negligible liquefaction potential. However, Appendix GEO found that the deep soil boring did not encounter layers of loose sandy soil below the groundwater table and concluded that the potential for liquefaction is minimal.

Lateral spreading and earthquake-induced landslides involve lateral ground movements caused by seismic shaking. These lateral ground movements are often associated with a weakening or failure of an embankment or soil mass overlying a layer of liquefied sands or weak soils. Due to the relatively flat site topography and lack of liquefiable material (Appendix GEO), lateral spreading is unlikely at the site. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic shaking and seismic related ground failure would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

a.3. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

As described under question (c), above, the project site has a high liquefaction potential (Appendix GEO) but is not considered susceptible to liquefaction as the deep soil boring did not encounter liquefiable soils below the groundwater table (Appendix GEO). Therefore, impacts from ground failure involving liquefaction would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

a.4. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?

The project site and surroundings are generally level, and no steep slopes are located near the site. Therefore, there is no potential for landslides at the site. Impacts from landslides would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

The project site is developed and generally level, which limits the potential for substantial soil erosion. Soils are exposed to the highest potential for erosion during the grading and excavation phases of construction. Project-related ground-disturbing activities would include excavation and grading for foundations, building pads, access roads, and utility trenches. Temporary erosion could occur during project construction. The project would be required to comply with SLMC Chapter 7-12 which requires all land-disturbing activities be undertaken in a manner designed to minimize erosion
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and loss of topsoil. This includes dust suppression, spill prevention, drainage maintenance, and prevention of flooding or material deposition onto adjacent sites.

Implementation of site-specific best management practices, including those listed above, and compliance with SLMC Chapter 7-12 would ensure that project impacts associated with soil erosion and the loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

d.  *Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?*

Expansive soils are soils that, due to their composition and moisture content, have a potential to undergo significant changes in volume, in the form of either shrinking or swelling. Periodic shrinking and swelling of expansive soils can cause extensive damage to buildings, structures, and roads. The project site contains highly expansive clay soils near the surface (Appendix GEO). However, compliance with California Building Code regulations and appropriately designed foundations, flatwork, and pavements would minimize potential project impacts associated with expansive soils. This includes foundational designs that prevent uplift of the supported structure and resist forces exerted on the foundation due to soil volume changes (refer to Section 1808.6.1 of the California Building Code). This requirement can be met by a post-tensioned slab foundation designed to tolerate expansive soil movements (Appendix GEO). The proposed project would be required to comply with State of California standards for foundation design through the California Building Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

e.  *Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*

The San Leandro municipal sewer system serves the project site currently and would continue to do so with project implementation. An existing public sewer main is located in the Norton Street right-of-way, approximately 120 feet from the project site. The project would involve an extension of this existing sewer line along Manor Boulevard to serve the project. The project would not require the use of septic tanks, or the use of alternative wastewater disposal systems. There would be no impact.

**NO IMPACT**

f.  *Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

The project would involve demolition of the existing building and paved parking lot, and limited excavation to accommodate new building foundations and utility connections. According to geologic mapping by Graymer (2000), the project area is mapped as Holocene-age natural levee deposits (Qhl), with additional Holocene-age alluvial and basin deposits mapped at the surface within the project’s vicinity. Surficial Holocene-age deposits that are less than 5,000 years old are too young to contain paleontological resources (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology [SVP] 2010), and are thus assigned a low paleontological sensitivity as defined by SVP (SVP 2010). However, late Holocene deposits may grade into middle and early Holocene or Pleistocene-age deposits (i.e., deposits older than 5,000 years) at unknown depths within the project area. Middle and early Holocene and
Pleistocene-age deposits have yielded numerous scientifically significant paleontological resources throughout California, including within Alameda County (Agenbroad 2003; Bell et al. 2004; Jefferson 1985, 2010; Maguire and Holroyd 2016; Merriam 1911; Paleobiology Database 2020; Reynolds et al. 1991; Savage 1951; Savage et al. 1954; Scott and Cox 2008; Springer et al. 2009; Tomiya et al. 2011; Wilkerson et al. 2011; Winters 1954; University of California Museum of Paleontology [UCMP] 2020). The UCMP online fossil locality database contains records of a diverse assemblage of Pleistocene-age vertebrate fauna from Alameda County including: saber-toothed cat, lion, wolf, fox, short-faced bear, badger, sea otter, mammoth, mastodon, ground sloth, horse, tapir, peccary, ox, bison, antelope, deer, camel, llama, rabbit, rodent, shrew, mole, bird, lizard, snake, turtle, frog, toad, salamander, fish, gastropod, bivalve, and plant fossils (UCMP 2020). Middle to early Holocene and Pleistocene-age deposits are generally assigned a high paleontological sensitivity because of the extensive fossil record throughout California.

The depth to middle to early Holocene and Pleistocene-age deposits within the project area is uncertain but is likely greater than 3 feet below ground surface based on the moderate distance between the project site and the basin’s margins to the northeast. Additionally, the geotechnical analysis determined that the project site is variably capped with artificial fill in portions of the project site to depths of approximately 3 feet (or more) below ground surface, with native surficial deposits present immediately below the surface elsewhere in the project site (Quantum Geotechnical, Inc. 2018).

Grading for the project is anticipated to be limited to the uppermost 2 to 3 feet of sediments through mostly artificial fill and late Holocene-age surficial deposits. Excavated material would consist primarily of soils disturbed during original site preparation for and construction of the existing building. The project area has a low paleontological sensitivity at these depths and impacts to paleontological resources are therefore not expected, but the potential exists for previously unidentified paleontological resources to be discovered during excavation if ground disturbances impact middle to early Holocene and Pleistocene-age deposits at depths greater than 3 feet below ground surface. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

**Mitigation Measures**

**GEO-1 Unanticipated Discovery of Paleontological Resources**

In the event an unanticipated fossil discovery is made during the course of project development, then in accordance with SVP (2010) guidelines, it is the responsibility of any worker who observes fossils within the project site to stop work within 50 feet of the find and notify a qualified professional paleontologist who shall be retained to evaluate the discovery, determine its significance and if additional mitigation or treatment is warranted. Work in the area of the discovery will resume once the find is properly documented and authorization is given to resume construction work. Any significant paleontological resources found during construction monitoring will be prepared, identified, analyzed, and permanently curated in an approved regional museum repository.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce impacts to paleontological resources to less than significant levels.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**
This page intentionally left blank.
## 8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An Air Quality and Health Risk Assessment Memorandum was prepared by Ramboll on July 30, 2019 for the project and peer reviewed by Rincon Consultants in January 2020. The following analysis incorporates the findings of this memorandum, which has been included as Appendix AQ to this report.

### Setting

Project implementation would generate GHG emissions through the burning of fossil fuels or other emissions of GHGs, thus potentially contributing to cumulative impacts related to climate change. In response to an increase in man-made GHG concentrations over the past 150 years, California has implemented Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the “California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.” AB 32 codifies the statewide goal of reducing emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 (essentially a 15 percent reduction below 2005 emission levels) and the adoption of regulations to require reporting and verification of statewide GHG emissions. Furthermore, on September 8, 2016, the governor signed Senate Bill 32 into law, which requires the state to further reduce GHGs to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. Senate Bill 32 extends AB 32, directing the California Air Resources Board to ensure that GHGs are reduced to 40 percent below the 1990 level by 2030.

On December 14, 2017, the California Air Resources Board adopted the 2017 Scoping Plan, which provides a framework for achieving the 2030 target. The 2017 Scoping Plan does not provide project-level thresholds for land use development. Instead, it recommends that local governments adopt policies and locally-appropriate quantitative thresholds consistent with a statewide per capita goal of six metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) by 2030 and two metric tons CO₂e by 2050 (California Air Resources Board 2017). As stated in the 2017 Scoping Plan, these goals may be appropriate for plan-level analyses (city, county, subregional, or regional), but not for specific individual projects because they include all emissions sectors in the state.

Most individual projects do not generate sufficient GHG emissions to directly influence climate change. However, physical changes caused by a project can contribute incrementally to cumulative effects that are significant, even if individual changes resulting from a project are limited. The issue of climate change typically involves an analysis of whether a project’s contribution towards an
impact would be cumulatively considerable. “Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064[h][1]).

**San Leandro Climate Action Plan**

The City of San Leandro’s Climate Action Plan (CAP) is based on the Local Governments for Sustainability 5-Milestone process, which include establishing an inventory of citywide GHG emissions, setting reduction targets and goals, establishing and implementing a CAP, and monitoring and evaluating progress. The vision of the CAP is to guide San Leandro towards a sustainable future that reduces GHG emissions from current levels, while promoting economic prosperity for present and future generations. The CAP documents the programs San Leandro has created since 2005 and considers new programs and actions that may be implemented to meet the City’s GHG reduction target of 25 percent below 2005 emissions levels by 2020 (City of San Leandro 2009).

**Screening Criteria**

In the 2017 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, the BAAQMD outlines an approach to determine the significance of projects. The BAAQMD recommends that lead agencies determine appropriate GHG emissions thresholds of significance based on substantial evidence in the record. The BAAQMD’s significance thresholds in the updated May 2017 CEQA Guidelines for project operations within the SFBAAB are the most appropriate thresholds for use in determining GHG emission impacts of the proposed project. The BAAQMD developed screening criteria to provide lead agencies and project applicants with a conservative indication of whether a project could result in potentially significant GHG emission impacts. If all screening criteria are met by a project, then the lead agency or applicant would not need to perform a detailed assessment of their project’s GHG emissions. These screening levels are generally representative of new development on greenfield sites without any form of mitigation measures taken into consideration (BAAQMD 2017b).

The screening criteria for GHG emissions of condo/townhome developments is 78 DU. Therefore, for the purpose of this analysis, it was assumed that the project would result in a less than significant impact and would not require additional analysis if it would involve the addition of fewer than 78 DU.

**a. Would the project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**

Project construction would generate temporary short-term GHG emissions through travel to and from the worksite and from the operation of construction equipment such as graders, backhoes, and generators. Site preparation and grading typically generate the greatest amount of emissions due to the use of grading equipment and soil hauling. Construction of the project would result in 39 new dwelling units, which is below the BAAQMD screening criteria of 78 DU for GHG emissions. Nonetheless, the project applicant would be required to comply with all BAAQMD rules and regulations regarding emission control measures. Impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**
b. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Table 5 evaluates the project’s consistency with the applicable GHG reduction measures outlined in the CAP and shows the proposed project would be consistent with those measures. The CAP includes specific goals and policies to meet estimated reductions for compliance with state GHG reduction goals, and the project would comply with these goals and polices.

**Table 5  Project Consistency with the San Leandro Climate Action Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Leandro CAP Goal</th>
<th>Project Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3.3: Increase residential, commercial, and industrial renewable energy use</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> Per the California Energy Commission (CEC) 2019 <em>Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings</em> (CEC 2018), new residential buildings are required to be solar ready, effective January 1, 2020. The project would comply with this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3.4: Promote green building practices in both the new construction and remodel market</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The project would be required to comply with the SLMC, which incorporates the California Green Building Standards Code. Specifically, the project would be required to include measures such as low-flow plumbing fixtures and water-saving appliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4.1: Encourage development which promotes walkable communities</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The site is located approximately 0.28 mile east of AC Transit Route 34 bus stops, and Manor Boulevard is bordered by pedestrian sidewalks. A Class III bike route is proposed along Manor Boulevard in the City of San Leandro General Plan. The project includes four bicycle parking lockers located throughout the site. Project residents would have a variety of transportation options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4.3: Promote and accommodate alternative, environmentally friendly methods of transportation, such as walking and bicycling</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The project includes three EV surface parking spaces, as well as 39 garage EV parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4.5: Encourage the use of fuel-efficient vehicles, low carbon fuels and more efficient traffic operations</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The project includes landscaping, such as the planting of trees and shrubs, within the project site along site boundaries and near proposed buildings, which would enhance the on-site green space. The proposed project includes approximately 8,387 square feet of open space, 3,493 square feet of which would be private and 4,894 square feet of which would be publicly accessible. Private open space includes the proposed deck areas of each unit, which vary in size between 77 and 100 square feet per unit. Publicly accessible open spaces would be located along the northern site boundary, the southern half of the western site boundary, and in the eastern-central portion of the site where the concrete patio would be located (refer to Figure 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5.1: Increase recycling and composting in the residential sector</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The project would be served by Waste Management of Alameda County for garbage collection, recycling, and composting services. The provision of these services to the proposed townhomes would encourage recycling and composting of typical household waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5.3: Promote waste reduction and material re-use in the community</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The project would be served by Waste Management of Alameda County for garbage collection, recycling, and composting services. The provision of these services to the proposed townhomes would encourage recycling and composting of typical household waste.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project would be required to comply with the SLMC, which incorporates the California Green Building Standards Code. This code includes specific requirements related to recycling, construction materials, and energy efficiency standards that would apply to project construction to minimize wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary energy consumption.
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The project would also comply with the City’s 2035 General Plan goals and policies. For example, it would comply with Goal OSC-7 by providing recycling services to the future residents, reducing landscaping water demand by planting plants with low water requirements, and installing low-flow fixtures and water-saving appliances; and Goals T-1 and T-3 by providing access to alternate modes of transportation, including transit, bicycling, and pedestrian facilities.

Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with state regulations intended to reduce GHG emissions statewide and would be consistent with applicable GHG reduction plans. Impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
## Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located in an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment was prepared by Tetra Tech, Inc. on September 25, 2019 for the project and peer reviewed by Rincon Consultants in January 2020. The following analysis incorporates the findings of this report, which has been included as Appendix HAZ. Appendix HAZ contains a search of federal, state, and local regulatory databases. This search revealed ten sites (including two historic dry cleaners, six asbestos-disposal sites, one leaking underground storage tank, and one waste and oil disposal site) within 1,250 feet of the project site, none of which included recognized environmental conditions.

a. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

b. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Construction

Project construction may include the temporary transport, storage, and use of potentially hazardous materials including fuels, lubricating fluids, cleaners, or solvents. As the proposed project may involve the disturbance of soil, grading and excavation could also result in the upset of hazardous materials at the site. Furthermore, demolishing the existing building could result in upset and release of hazardous materials into the environment.

Project construction would require heavy construction equipment, the operation of which could result in a spill or accidental release of hazardous materials, including fuel, engine oil, engine coolant, and lubricants. Project construction would also include temporary transport, storage, and use of potentially hazardous materials including cleaners and solvents. The transport of any hazardous materials would be subject to federal, state, and local regulations, which would minimize risks associated with the transport hazardous materials. Construction activities that involve hazardous materials would be required to transport such materials along roadways designated for that purpose in the City and County, thereby limiting risk of upset during transportation. Additionally, spills would be addressed by existing laws and regulations regarding cleanup and abatement procedures.

As described in Appendix HAZ, the project site may have been used previously for agricultural operations indicating potential for residual agricultural chemicals in the soil; however, there is no evidence of misuse, dumping, or improper storage of chemicals from this previous use. The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, such as the State Water Resources Control Board’s GeoTracker database; the United States Environmental Protection Agency’s Resource Conservation and Recovery Act facilities list, Integrated Compliance Information System database, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit program, and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (Superfund site) database; or the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database. Therefore, ground-disturbing activities are not anticipated to expose construction workers to soil contaminated with agricultural chemicals above environmental safety limits.

The existing building was constructed prior to 1970, and as such may contain asbestos-containing material (ACM), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB), and/or lead-based paint (LBP). Because the building was constructed before the federal ban on PCBs, it is possible that PCBs are present in light ballasts. Demolition could result in health hazard impacts to workers if not remediated prior to
construction activities. However, demolition and construction would be required to comply with BAAQMD Regulation 11, Rule 2, which governs the proper handling and disposal of ACM for demolition, renovation, and manufacturing activities in the Bay Area. These activities would also need to comply with California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (CalOSHA) regulations regarding lead-based materials. The California Code of Regulations, Section 1532.1, requires testing, monitoring, containment, and disposal of lead-based materials such that exposure levels do not exceed CalOSHA standards. The DTSC has classified PCBs as a hazardous waste when concentrations exceed 50 parts per million in non-liquids; consequently, the DTSC requires that materials containing those concentrations of PCBs be transported and disposed of as hazardous waste. Any light ballast removed would be evaluated for the presence of PCBs and managed appropriately. Compliance with BAAQMD, CalOSHA, and DTSC policies regarding ACM, LBP, and PCBs, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

**Operation**

Residential uses such as those proposed typically do not use or store large quantities of hazardous materials other than those typically used for household cleaning, maintenance, and landscaping. Therefore, the proposed project would not involve the use, storage, transportation, or disposal of hazardous materials in significant quantities. Impacts would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

c. *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?*

Washington Manor Middle School is located approximately 0.2 mile southwest of the project site at 1170 Fargo Avenue. Construction activities may involve the use, storage, or transport of hazardous material, but the transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials associated with construction are subject to applicable federal, state, and local regulations to minimize the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Furthermore, implementation of rules regarding the proper handling of ACM and LBP, as discussed under questions (a) and (b) above, would ensure emissions of ACM or LBP particles do not affect nearby schools during demolition activities.

Project operation would not involve the handling of hazardous materials, substances, or wastes other than those typically used for household cleaning, maintenance, and landscaping. Handling of hazardous materials is subject to applicable federal, state, and local regulations to reduce emissions of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, through adherence to applicable regulations, impacts would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

d. *Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

As discussed in Appendix HAZ, the project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, such as the State Water Resources Control Board’s GeoTracker database; the United States Environmental Protection Agency’s Resource Conservation and Recovery Act facilities list, Integrated Compliance Information System database, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit program, and Comprehensive
Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (Superfund site) database; or the DTSC EnviroStor database. No impact would occur.

**NO IMPACT**

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

The project site is approximately 4.1 miles from the Oakland International Airport and approximately 2.2 miles from the Hayward Executive Airport. However, the project site is only within the Oakland International Airport’s Influence Area (Alameda County Community Development Agency 2012: Figure 3-1). As stated previously, the project would not involve the handling of hazardous materials, substances, or wastes other than those typically used for household cleaning, maintenance, and landscaping. Handling of hazardous materials is subject to applicable federal, state, and local regulations to reduce emissions of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. The project site is not located within a 60 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contour (Alameda County Community Development Agency 2012: Figure 3-3), and therefore would not result in excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

f. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The project would not impair or interfere with the City’s Emergency Operations Plan because no roads would be closed during construction or operation (City of San Leandro 2017b). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

g. Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?

The project site is in an urban area of San Leandro, bordered by existing residential and commercial uses. According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE; CAL FIRE 2007, CAL FIRE 2008), the project site is not adjacent to or near a fire hazard severity zone. As a result, no risk of exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires would occur.

**NO IMPACT**
## 10 Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The generally level, developed project site is located approximately 0.2 mile west of the Estudillo Canal and approximately 0.6 mile north of San Lorenzo Creek, which flows in an easterly direction towards San Francisco Bay. Most of the project site is in Flood Zone AE (a 100-year flood zone with base flood elevations determined) identified by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map Number 06001C0259G, with the central third of the site in Flood Zone X (outside the 100-year and 500-year floodplains) (FEMA 2009).

a. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Construction

All development projects in San Leandro must comply with the City’s Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (SLMC Chapter 3-15), which requires the use of erosion and sediment controls to protect water quality while a site is under construction. During project construction, construction contractors are required to comply with best management practices to filter materials and retain dirt and debris from flowing into the City’s storm sewer system.

Furthermore, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit establishes specific requirements to minimize and treat stormwater runoff from new and redevelopment projects. Compliance with state, regional, and local standards and regulations would reduce potential water quality impacts during project construction to a less than significant level.

Operation

The proposed project would result in approximately 70,348 square feet (approximately 77 percent of the project site) of impervious surfaces on the project site, which is similar to the existing amount of impervious surfaces on site. Impervious surfaces generally increase stormwater runoff, reduce groundwater infiltration, and pollute stormwater runoff generated on the project site during operation.

Provision C.3 of the Alameda County Municipal Regional Stormwater Discharge Permit addresses post-construction stormwater requirements for new development and redevelopment projects that add and/or replace 10,000 square feet or more of impervious area, or special land use categories that create and/or replace 5,000 square feet of impervious surfaces. These “regulated” projects are required to meet certain criteria: (1) incorporate site design, source control, and stormwater treatment measures into the project design; (2) minimize the discharge of pollutants in stormwater runoff and non-stormwater discharge; and (3) minimize increases in runoff flows as compared to pre-development conditions. Common methods of compliance include installation of Low Impact Development technology such as bioretention basins or rain gardens, which redirect stormwater from stormwater drains to planters where runoff is absorbed and filtered.

The project would be a regulated project under the Municipal Regional Stormwater Discharge Permit and would be required to comply with Provision C.3 to reduce post-construction stormwater pollution. Compliance with applicable City ordinances, state, and regional standards and regulations for construction and operation would ensure that project would not result in a violation of any water quality or sustainable groundwater management plans. The project would also include the construction of bioretention areas throughout the project site, sized to provide adequate stormwater treatment on site. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on water quality.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
b. Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

The project site is located above the Santa Clara Valley-East Bay Plain Groundwater Basin, which experiences saltwater intrusion from the San Francisco Bay as well as subsidence (California Department of Water Resources 2020). As discussed in Section 19, Utilities and Service Systems, the proposed project would receive its water from EBMUD. The regional water system collects water from the Mokelumne River in the Sierra Nevada and from protected local watersheds in the East Bay and Peninsula. Therefore, water supply to the project site would not rely on groundwater supplies. The proposed project would not include installation of new groundwater wells or use of groundwater from existing wells. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the groundwater table. The project would not result in an exceedance of safe yield or a significant depletion of groundwater supplies. Impacts related to groundwater would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

c.(i) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

c.(ii) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

c.(iii) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Estudillo Canal is approximately 0.2 mile east of the project site, and San Lorenzo Creek is approximately 0.6 mile south of the project site. Neither of these waterways flow through or next to the site. The project site is currently developed, and project construction would not alter the course of these waterways (no other surface water features are identified in the project area). The project site connects to an existing stormwater drainage system located in the Estudillo Canal Watershed. Stormwater runoff in the project area currently flows through existing city stormwater drains to Estudillo Canal and eventually to the San Francisco Bay (Alameda County Flood Control District 2020).

The project would involve the construction of impervious surfaces on the project site; however, the project includes bioretention facilities throughout the site, which are sized to provide adequate stormwater treatment on-site. Because the project would retain stormwater on-site and would not increase stormwater runoff, on- or off-site erosion or siltation would not occur during project operation.

Following filtration through the proposed bioretention areas, stormwater from the project site would enter the City’s existing stormwater conveyance system. While the project would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, the project would be required to comply with all applicable
local ordinances, including the SLMC and Provision C.3 of the Alameda County Municipal Regional Stormwater Discharge Permit. Therefore, the proposed project would not create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of the existing stormwater conveyance infrastructure or otherwise result in erosion or siltation on or near the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

c.(iv) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would impede or redirect flood flows?

d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Most of the project site falls within Flood Zone AE (a 100-year flood zone with base flood elevations determined) identified by FEMA, with the central third of the site in Flood Zone X (outside the 100-year and 500-year floodplains) (FEMA 2009: Flood Insurance Rate Map Number 06001C0259G). The project would involve the construction of new residential buildings, which are required to have the lowest floor elevation elevated above the determined base flood elevation. This would alter the flood zone boundaries on-site but would not alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would substantially impede or redirect flood flows. Inclusion of the bioretention facilities would provide adequate storm drainage from flood events. Additionally, the City of San Leandro participates in the National Flood Insurance Program, which provides affordable insurance to property owners that helps reduce flooding impacts. Impacts from flooding would be less than significant.

The project is outside a mapped tsunami inundation zone, with the nearest zone approximately 0.9 mile to the west (California Department of Conservation 2009). The nearest inland body of water is Lake Chabot, which is approximately 2.9 miles northeast of the project site. There would be no impact from tsunamis or seiches on the project site.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

e. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

The Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin includes the project site within the plan boundaries. The plan includes goals for beneficial uses of water in the region. The project would not conflict with these goals or otherwise degrade the water quality of surface water and groundwater in the area, as bioretention facilities would be installed as part of the project to improve the water quality of stormwater runoff. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of applicable plans, and impacts would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
# 11 Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community?

b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The project site is zoned as a Commercial Community District and designated as Neighborhood Commercial in the 2035 General Plan. The proposed project would include a zoning map amendment to add a Planned Development Overlay District to the project site and a General Plan Map Amendment to change the land use designation to General Commercial. A planned development project must have a minimum net area of 10,000 square feet. The project site is bordered by Manor Boulevard to the south, Residential Single-Family District-zoned properties to the east and north, and Commercial Community and Residential Multi-Family District zones (24 dwellings per gross acre) to the west (City of San Leandro 2019d).

The project site sits in the center of the Washington Manor neighborhood. Densities in this area average about five units per acre, with built improvements consisting primarily of one-story, single-family ranch style residences. This area is generally considered to be fully built out (City of San Leandro 2016a).

a. *Would the project physically divide an established community?*

The project would continue the existing residential development pattern of the area and would not separate connected neighborhoods or land uses. The project would not introduce new roadways outside of the project site, linear infrastructure, or other development features that would divide an established community or limit movement, travel, or social interaction between established land uses. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community.

**NO IMPACT**

b. *Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

As mentioned previously, the project site has a zoning designation of Commercial Community. The project includes requests for Planned Development Overlay, General Plan Map Amendment from Neighborhood Commercial to General Commercial, Site Plan Review, and Tentative Map approval.
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City of San Leandro General Plan

The project site has a 2035 General Plan land use designation of Neighborhood Commercial. As described above, the project includes a general map plan amendment to change the land use designation from Neighborhood Commercial to General Commercial. With the addition of a Planned Development to the General Commercial designation, as described in the City’s 2035 General Plan Land Use Element:

Some of the zoning districts in this designation permit residential uses, subject to conditional use permit requirements and a maximum net density of 24.2 units per acre. In such cases, maximum FARs also applies. Residential uses are not permitted in all districts due to the potential for conflicts with heavier commercial activities and the need to retain land for local services and revenue generation. (City of San Leandro 2016a)

The project would result in residential development at 17 units per acre and would be surrounded on three sides by single-family residences with a commercial shopping center and multi-family apartment complex to the west. The proposed project would be consistent with the land uses envisioned at this type of location under the 2035 General Plan.

City of San Leandro Zoning Ordinance

As noted above, the project would require approval of a Planned Development Overlay District. The purpose of the Planned Development Overlay is to allow developers of large parcels flexibility in the way they meet overall community density and land use goals without being bound by certain prescriptive zoning requirements designed primarily for small parcels. Applications for a Planned Development are subject to the City’s discretionary review process and must be approved by the City Council to ensure that the new development will be compatible with the surrounding area (Section 3-1012).

According to San Leandro Zoning Code, the multi-family residential buildings are allowed within Commercial Community districts. Assuming the request for a Planned Development Overlay and General Plan Map Amendment are approved, the proposed project and its use would be consistent with applicable zoning regulations. Impacts would be less than significant (Section 2-692).

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
12 Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>□ □</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</td>
<td>□ □</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nearest quarry is approximately 4 miles east of the project site, on Lake Chabot Road and it ceased operation in the 1980s. While the quarry site contains additional rock resources, future quarrying activity is considered unlikely (City of San Leandro 2016a).

a. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

b. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

The project site is not used for mining and is not zoned for mining uses. The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known or locally important mineral resource. Thus, no impact would occur.

**NO IMPACT**
This page intentionally left blank.
13 Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project result in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□                                           □                                           □                                           □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□                                           □                                           □                                           □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to excessive noise levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□                                           □                                           □                                           □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An Environmental Noise Assessment was prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. on July 23, 2019 for the project and peer reviewed by Rincon Consultants in January 2020. The following analysis incorporates the findings of this report, which has been included as Appendix NOI to this report.

**Noise and Vibration Setting**

**Ambient Noise**

Noise can be defined as unwanted sound. Noise level measurements include intensity, frequency, and duration, as well as time of occurrence. Noise level (or volume) is generally measured in decibels (dB) using the A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA). The A-weighting scale is an adjustment to the actual sound pressure levels to be consistent with that of human hearing response, which is most sensitive to frequencies around 4,000 Hertz (about the highest note on a piano) and less sensitive to low frequencies (below 100 Hertz).

Sound pressure level is measured on a logarithmic scale with the 0-dBA level based on the lowest detectable sound pressure level that people can perceive (an audible sound that is not zero sound pressure level). Based on the logarithmic scale, a doubling of sound energy is equivalent to an increase of 3 dBA, and a sound that is 10 dBA less than the ambient sound level has no effect on ambient noise. Because of the nature of the human ear, a sound must be about 10 dBA greater than the ambient noise level to be judged as twice as loud. In general, a 3 dBA change in the ambient noise level is noticeable, while 1-2 dBA changes generally are not perceived. Quiet suburban areas
typically have noise levels in the range of 40-50 dBA, while areas adjacent to arterial streets are typically in the 50-60 dBA range. Normal conversational levels are usually in the 60-65 dBA range and ambient noise levels greater than 65 dBA can interrupt conversations.

Noise levels from point sources, such as those from individual pieces of machinery, typically attenuate (or drop off) at a rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance from the noise source. Noise levels from lightly traveled roads typically attenuate at a rate of about 4.5 dBA per doubling of distance. Noise levels from heavily traveled roads typically attenuate at about 3 dBA per doubling of distance. Noise levels may also be reduced by intervening structures; generally, a single row of buildings between the receptor and the noise source can reduce noise levels by about 5 dBA, while a solid wall or berm can reduce noise levels by 5 to 10 dBA (Federal Transit Administration [FTA] 2018). The manner in which residences in California are constructed generally provides a reduction of exterior-to-interior noise levels of approximately 20 to 25 dBA with closed windows.

The duration of noise is important because sounds that occur over a long period are more likely to be an annoyance or cause direct physical damage or environmental stress. One of the most frequently used noise metrics that considers both duration and sound power level is the equivalent noise level (\(L_{eq}\)). The \(L_{eq}\) is defined as the single steady A-weighted level that is equivalent to the same amount of energy as that contained in the actual fluctuating levels over a period of time (essentially, the average noise level). Typically, \(L_{eq}\) is summed over a one-hour period. \(L_{max}\) is the highest RMS (root mean squared) sound pressure level within the measurement period, and \(L_{min}\) is the lowest RMS sound pressure level within the measurement period.

The period during which noise occurs is also important, as nighttime noise tends to disturb people more than daytime noise. Community noise is usually measured using the Day-Night Average Level (\(L_{d-n}\)), which is the 24-hour average noise level with a 10-dBA penalty for noise occurring during nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) hours. It is also measured using CNEL, which is the 24-hour average noise level with a 5-dBA penalty for noise occurring from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. and a 10-dBA penalty for noise occurring from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The \(L_{dn}\) and CNEL typically do not differ by more than 1 dBA. In practice, CNEL and \(L_{dn}\) are often used interchangeably.

Some land uses are more sensitive to ambient noise levels than other uses due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. For example, residences, motels, hotels, schools, libraries, churches, nursing homes, auditoriums, museums, cultural facilities, parks, and outdoor recreation areas are more sensitive to noise than commercial and industrial land uses. The closest noise-sensitive receptors to the project site are the adjacent residences to the north and west.

Noise regulations and ordinances typically establish allowable noise levels for different land uses and define exempt noise activities. Table 6 shows the allowable noise levels for different land uses in the city. SLMC Section 4-1-1115 provides restrictions for construction activities adjacent to or across the street from residential uses. Under the SLMC, construction is restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and between 8:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekends. All construction activities adjacent to or across the street from residential uses are prohibited on federal holidays. The SLMC also restricts sustained operation of mechanical devices from between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., unless the device is enclosed within a sound insulated structure, preventing the noise from being plainly audible from any residential property line.


### Table 6  City of San Leandro Noise and Land Use Compatibility Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Noise Exposure Levels (CNEL, dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normally Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential – Low Density Single Family, Duplex, Mobile Homes</td>
<td>&lt;60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential- Multiple Family</td>
<td>&lt;65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Lodging, Motels, Hotels</td>
<td>&lt;65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes</td>
<td>&lt;70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Amphitheaters</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Arena, Outdoor Spectator Sports</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>&lt;70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Cemeteries</td>
<td>&lt;75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Buildings, Businesses, Commercial and Professional</td>
<td>&lt;70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities, Agricultural</td>
<td>&lt;75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: NA = not applicable  
Source: City of San Leandro 2016a

#### Vibration

Vibration levels are usually expressed as single-number measure of vibration magnitude, in terms of velocity or acceleration, which describes the severity of the vibration without the frequency variable. The peak particle velocity (PPV) is defined as the maximum instantaneous positive or negative peak of the vibration signal, usually measured in inches per second. Since it is related to the stresses experienced by buildings, PPV is often used in monitoring of blasting vibration. Although PPV is appropriate for evaluating the potential of building damage, it is not suitable for evaluating human response. It takes some time for the human body to respond to vibrations. In a sense, the human body responds to an average vibration amplitude (FTA 2018). Because vibration waves are oscillatory, the net average of a vibration signal is zero. Thus, the RMS amplitude is used to describe the “smoothed” vibration amplitude (FTA 2018). The RMS of a signal is the square root of the average of the squared amplitude of the signal, usually measured in inches per second. The average is typically calculated over a one-second period. The RMS amplitude is always less than the PPV and is always positive. Decibel notation is used to compress the range of numbers required to describe vibration. The general human response to different levels of groundborne vibration velocity levels as well as typical effects of vibration on buildings is described in Table 7.
Table 7 Human Response to Different Levels of Groundborne Vibration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vibration Velocity Level, PPV (in/sec)</th>
<th>Human Reaction</th>
<th>Effect on Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Barely perceptible</td>
<td>No effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Distinctly perceptible</td>
<td>Vibration unlikely to cause damage of any type to any structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Distinctly perceptible to strongly perceptible</td>
<td>Recommended upper level of the vibration to which ruins and ancient monuments should be subjected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Strongly perceptible</td>
<td>Virtually no risk of damage to normal buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Strongly perceptible to severe</td>
<td>Threshold at which there is a risk of damage to older structures such as those with plastered walls or ceilings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Severe – Vibrations considered unpleasant</td>
<td>Threshold at which there is a risk of damage to newer structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix NOI

Continued vibration of building components can also take the form of an audible low-frequency rumbling noise, which is referred to as groundborne noise. Groundborne noise is usually only a problem when the originating vibration spectrum is dominated by frequencies in the upper end of the range (60 to 200 Hertz), or when foundations or utilities, such as sewer and water pipes, connect the structure and the vibration source.

The City of San Leandro does not have adopted thresholds for levels at which vibration would cause significant effects. Therefore, thresholds provided by the FTA were used for this analysis. The FTA provides a construction vibration impact criterion of 0.5 PPV for structural damage for modern buildings.

Measured Ambient Noise Level

Illingworth and Rodkin conducted short- and long-term ambient noise level measurements along the north, east, and south project site boundaries (Appendix NOI). Table 8 provides the noise monitoring results at these three sites.

Table 8 Noise Monitoring Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Measured Noise Levels (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$L_{\text{max}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST-1</td>
<td>260 feet from center of Manor Blvd (eastern site boundary)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT-1</td>
<td>25 feet from center of Manor Blvd (southern site boundary)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT-2</td>
<td>425 feet from center of Manor Blvd (northern site boundary)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Calculated from average difference in measured $L_{\text{eq}}$ noise levels from LT-1 and LT-2 to ST-1.

Note: ST = short-term noise measurement; LT = long-term noise measurement

Source: Appendix NOI
Environmental Checklist

Noise

Initial Study – Mitigated Negative Declaration

a. Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Construction

Project construction would result in the temporary elevation of noise levels at the project site and surrounding areas. Construction-related noise impacts typically occur when activities take place during noise-sensitive times of the day (e.g., early morning, evening, or nighttime hours), when construction activities occur immediately adjacent to noise sensitive land uses, or when construction durations last over extended periods. Most demolition and construction noise is between 80 to 90 dBA at 50 feet from the source (Appendix NOI: Table 10).

To the north, single-family residential property lines and buildings would be as close as 20 and 40 feet, respectively, from the perimeter of project buildings. To the east, single-family residential property lines and buildings would be as close as 60 and 90 feet, respectively, from the perimeter of project buildings. Considering these distances, construction noise levels during excavation and finishing work could reach levels of 90 to 96 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the closest residential property lines and levels of 83 to 86 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the closest residential building. Thus, construction noise levels would exceed 60 dBA $L_{eq}$ and the existing ambient noise level by at least 5 dBA $L_{eq}$ during excavation and finishing. However, as construction moves away from residences or into shielded locations, noise exposures would be lower. Based on this, noise generated by construction activities would temporarily elevate noise levels at adjacent noise-sensitive receptors. However, because the noisiest activities (i.e., site demolition and grading work) are expected to be completed within a month, and typical residential building construction (adjacent to the property line of sensitive receivers) are expected to be completed in approximately 11 months, noise impacts on any one adjacent residence would be concluded within one year.

Average construction noise levels during ground clearing and excavation could reach 85 dBA $L_{eq}$ with maximum noise levels reaching 87 to 92 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the closest adjacent residences to the project site. As construction moves away from residences or into shielded locations, noise exposures would be lower; construction noise levels would exceed 65 dBA $L_{eq}$ and 75 dBA $L_{max}$ during construction at the closest residences. However, given that construction noise would exceed standards, Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would be required to reduce those impacts.

Operation

Traffic

Project vehicular traffic would not increase noise levels substantially in the area as project site-related traffic would decrease from existing conditions (Section 17, Transportation). Typically, for a project to result in a perceptible increase in roadway noise, it must generate a 3-dBA increase in the ambient noise level. A doubling of trips would result in an increase of 3-dBA to the existing ambient noise environment (FTA 2018). Vehicular traffic noise levels are not expected to increase measurably above existing levels as a result of the project (increase would be less than 1 dBA $L_{dn}$). This impact would be less than significant.

Equipment Noise

Mechanical equipment associated with the proposed residential building would include Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) systems. The primary outdoor noise producing component
for residential HVAC systems is the outdoor condensing units, which based on a review of project plans will be located as close as 25 feet from the northern property line and 55 feet from the eastern property line. The proposed HVAC units would be installed at ground level adjacent to each unit, within or adjacent to proposed porches. The average A-weighted sound level of typical outdoor condensing units for moderate-sized residences typically ranges from 67 to 68 dBA at 3 feet from the units (Appendix NOI). Sound from a fixed-point noise source such as an outdoor condenser typically attenuates at a rate of 6 dBA per distance doubling this would result in sound levels of 49 to 50 dBA at 25 feet. Additionally, the project includes an 8-foot high, solid wood fence on the property lines shared with the existing single-family residential uses to the north and east. Therefore, it is expected that noise from project HVAC systems would be lowered by a minimum of 8 dBA on the properties of these adjacent uses. It is expected that, even with continuous operation, the project-generated HVAC noise would produce an hourly average level of less than 42 dBA on the adjacent single-family residential properties. Therefore, this level would be less than the existing average ambient \( L_{90} \) noise level measure at the northern property line, furthest from existing site and traffic noise sources (noise monitoring site LT-2, see Table 8) and HVAC noise would not be significant.

**Parking Noise**

The project also includes a driveway and parking areas adjacent to the property line shared with the single-family residential uses to the east. This project element has the potential to introduce a new and dissimilar type of noise source into the existing noise environment, in particular at the residential uses on the northern part of the eastern property line, which previously bordered the bowling alley instead of the existing parking lot. Noise associated with driveway and parking activities is typically dominated by the sounds of passing cars, engine starts, and door slams. At 40 feet (which is the average distance of a parked car to the property line), noises from parking activities such as engine starts and door slams would range from 54 to 64 dBA, and at 15 feet (which is the approximate distance from the driveway centerline to the property line), cars traveling at 15 to 20 miles per hour would produce sound levels of 61 to 66 dBA. Considering these levels and the sound attenuation provided by the proposed 8-foot, solid wood fence on the property line discussed above, noise from parking activities would range from 46 to 56 dBA, and auto pass-by noise would range from 53 to 58 dBA. These maximum noise levels from automobile parking and driveway activities on a typical day would occur less than 15 minutes out of any hour, given the size of the proposed project. This level of activity would result in an equivalent hourly \( L_{eq} \) of less than 50 dBA on the adjacent single-family residential properties, a level that is less than the existing average hourly daytime noise level measured at the residential property line furthest from existing site and traffic noise sources (noise monitoring site LT-2, see Table 8). Parking noise would not be significant.

**Mitigation Measure**

**NOI-1 Construction Noise Best Management Practices**

- Pursuant to SLMC, noise-generating activities including construction traffic at the construction site or in areas adjacent to the construction site shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, and to between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays, with no construction on Federal holidays.
- Machinery shall not be cleaned or serviced past 7:00 p.m. or prior to 7:00 a.m. Monday through Friday or 8:00 a.m. on Saturdays and Sundays.
• Install a temporary construction noise barrier with a height of 8 feet above grade on the project property lines shared with the residential properties to the north and east before loud construction activities begin and keep in place until construction within 150 feet of the barrier location is complete. The placement of the barriers should not allow clear line of sight, or openings for site access between the site activities and adjacent residential land uses. The barriers may be composed of mass loaded construction blankets on temporary fencing or solid plywood construction barriers and should have a minimum surface weight of 1.0 lb/ft² and an equivalent STC rating of 25 or more.

• Muffle and maintain all equipment used on site. All internal combustion engine-driven equipment shall be fitted with mufflers that are in good condition. The use of effective mufflers shall result in non-impact tools generating a maximum noise level of 80 dB when measured at a distance of 50 feet.

• Utilize “quiet” models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.

• Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction project area.

• Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.

• Prohibit construction workers’ radios that are audible on adjoining properties.

• Restrict noise-generating construction activities at the site or in areas adjacent to the construction site to the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

• Limit the allowable hours for the delivery of materials or equipment to the site and truck traffic coming to and from the site for any purpose to Monday through Friday between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.

• Do not allow any construction or construction-related activities at the project site on weekends and holidays.

• Allowable construction hours shall be posted clearly on a sign at the construction site.

• The construction contractor shall designate a “noise disturbance coordinator” who will be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. A telephone number for the disturbance coordinator shall be conspicuously posted at the construction site. The Disturbance Coordinator shall:
  - Receive and act on complaints about construction disturbances during site clearing, excavation, infrastructure installation, road building, residential construction, and site other construction activities.
  - Determine the cause(s) and implement remedial measures as necessary to alleviate significant problems.
  - Clearly post his/her name and phone number(s) on a sign at the construction site.
  - Notify area residents of construction activities, schedules, and potential impacts.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would reduce average (Leq) construction related noise levels to less than 65 dBA levels at exterior areas of residential uses in the project vicinity and maximum (Lmax) construction related noise levels to less than 75 dBA at the exterior facades of residences in the project vicinity. Therefore, construction related noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**
Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Project operation would not be a source of vibration. However, project construction would result in some vibration that may be felt on properties in the project vicinity from demolition, site preparation, foundation work, and building-framing activities. Based on a review of the existing site, surrounding uses, and the proposed site plan, residential buildings and businesses adjacent to the project will be located within 12 to 30 feet of vibration-inducing parking lot removal and building demolition activities, and 12 to 40 feet from site excavation and grading activities. These site activities may produce substantial vibration and can be expected to result in periods where vibration within residences and businesses adjacent to the site exceed the 0.04 in/sec PPV annoyance threshold. However, the erection of the buildings and structures themselves is not anticipated to be a source of substantial vibration, with the exception of sporadic events such as dropping of heavy objects. On-site construction is expected to occur over a 20-month period. Considering this, construction vibration is only expected to have the potential to impact neighboring uses for a one-month period and would not result in perceptible vibration for most of project construction period.

All adjacent buildings appear to be of normal type construction, with no indications of structural sensitivity. Groundborne vibration levels exceeding 0.50 in/sec PPV would thus have the potential to result in damage to these adjacent buildings. As shown in Table 9, construction equipment would generate vibration of up to 0.44 PPV at 12 feet and 0.13 PPV at 40 feet, and all construction activities would be below the 0.50 PPV threshold. Vibration impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

### Table 9  Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>PPV at 12 feet (in/sec)</th>
<th>PPV at 40 feet (in/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Roller (undefined tonnage)</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-ton Vibratory Roller</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoe Ram</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caisson Drilling</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded Trucks</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix NOI

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
c.  For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Hayward Executive Airport is the nearest private airstrip, approximately 2.2 miles south of the project site. The nearest public airport is the Oakland International Airport, 3.8 miles northwest of the project site. The project site is not within 2 miles of a public or private airstrip or airport, and thus no impacts would occur.

NO IMPACT
This page intentionally left blank.
# Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ■ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the California Department of Finance, San Leandro has an estimated population of 89,825, with 32,606 housing units, as of January 2019 (DOF 2019). The average number of persons per household is estimated at 2.89. Based on the City’s 2035 General Plan, the projected population in 2035 would be 101,250 persons occupying 36,868 households (City of San Leandro 2016a).

**a. Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

The proposed project would replace an existing commercial building with 39 new townhome units. Therefore, the project would directly generate population growth. Based on a per-person household rate of 2.89 (DOF 2019), the project would add an estimated 113 new residents to the city. The project would increase the population of San Leandro to 89,938, an increase that falls well within the growth to 101,250 persons projected by the 2035 General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce directly nor indirectly substantial, unplanned population growth.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**b. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

The project site currently contains a commercial building utilized as a bowling alley. The proposed project is an infill development project that would replace the existing commercial building with 39 townhomes. No residences would be demolished as part of the project. Therefore, the project would not displace existing people or housing.

**NO IMPACT**
## 15 Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Alameda County Fire Department (ACFD), through a contract with the City, provides fire protection to the project site and responds to all fires, hazardous materials spills, and medical emergencies (including injury accidents) in the project area and the city. The ACFD operates five fire stations and one training facility in San Leandro and is divided into four branches: Operations, Communication and Special Operations, Administrative Support Services, and Fire Prevention. In addition to fire and emergency response, the ACFD provides permitting, inspection, and planning services through the Fire Prevention Branch. The City’s 2035 General Plan establishes a goal of a total response time (reflex) of five minutes for 90 percent of emergency incidents (City of San Leandro 2016a).

The San Leandro Police Department (SLPD) provides police protection services in San Leandro. The Police Chief and two police captains administer SLPD, presiding over the Bureau of Operations and the Bureau of Services. The Bureau of Operations houses two units: the Patrol and Traffic Unit and the Investigations Unit. The Bureau of Services houses the Professional Standards and Support Services Units (SLPD 2020). As of 2019, SLPD had 93 sworn officers with a ratio of approximately 1.03 officers per 1,000 residents which is slightly lower than the SLPD’s desired ratio of 1.04 per 1,000 residents (City of San Leandro 2016a).

Schools nearest the project site include Washington Manor Middle School, 0.23 mile southwest of the project site; Corvallis Elementary School, 0.38 mile northwest of the project site; and Woodroe Woods School, 0.35 mile southeast of the project site.
The San Leandro Public Library currently operates one main facility, the San Leandro Main Library, and three branch facilities in the city: Manor Branch, South Branch, and Mulford-Marina Branch (City of San Leandro 2016a). The nearest library facility to the project site is the Manor Branch, at 1241 Manor Boulevard, 0.3 mile directly east of the project site.

Existing parks and recreation facilities in the city and project-related impacts on parks and recreation facilities are discussed in Section 16, Recreation.

a.1. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, or the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives?

ACFD Station 13, located at 637 Fargo Avenue, is approximately 0.6 mile from the project site and currently serves the project site. Project construction would be required to comply with applicable California Fire Code standards for residential developments (California Code of Regulations, Title 25, Part 9). Station 13 houses one engine company and services an area of approximately 3.25 square miles, which is densely populated with predominantly single-family dwellings and also covers portions of I-880 and I-238 (ACFD 2020). The project site is located in a developed area and involves replacement of a commercial use with residential uses. According to the ACFD Standards of Coverage Review conducted in 2017, the department has adequate services and infrastructure to meet existing and future demand (Alameda County 2017). While the project would increase the number of residents served by ACFD, the increase would not result in a substantial change to performance objectives for Station 13 and would not require the need for new facilities or to physically alter Station 13 to maintain performance objectives. The proposed townhomes would be similar in terms of demand from ACFD services to the existing multi-family housing adjacent to the project site. Therefore, there would be no need for new or expanded fire department facilities to serve the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

a.2. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities, or the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives?

The project would add approximately 113 new residents at the project site, which would increase demand for police protection services. The SLPD maintains a ratio of 1.03 sworn officers per 1,000 residents and aims to provide a ratio of 1.04 officers per 1,000 residents (City of San Leandro 2016a). Despite the addition of 113 new residents, this ratio would remain at 1.03 officers per 1,000 residents with the addition of the proposed project. Existing police service would not result in the need for new or expanded police facilities beyond the existing need for additional officers. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
a.3. **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered schools, or the need for new or physically altered schools, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives?**

The project’s additional residents would increase the number of students attending schools operated by the San Leandro Unified School District. The project would generate approximately 13.6 new students, per a generation rate of 0.35 students per housing unit (City of San Leandro 2016a). The applicant for the proposed project would be required to pay school development fees, as dictated by state law, prior to the issuance of building permits. According to Government Code Section 65996 (3)(h), payment of such fees constitutes full mitigation of any school impacts under CEQA. Therefore, any impacts from the increase in school enrollment would be offset by the required payment of development fees. This impact would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

a.4. **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks, public facilities, or the need for new or physically altered parks, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives?**

Project-related impacts to parks are discussed in Section 16, *Recreation*. The project would not result in a new park or require the physical altering of an existing park or public facility. Impacts would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

a.5. **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of other new or physically altered public facilities, or the need for new or physically altered public facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives?**

The project would add 113 new residents to San Leandro, thereby increasing demand for library services. The 2035 General Plan EIR noted that buildout of the 2035 General Plan would result in 14,790 new residents in the city by 2040 and the San Leandro Public library would need to increase the hours of library operation to accommodate future demand (City of San Leandro 2016a). The number of residents introduced by the project represents less than one percent of the growth anticipated in the 2035 General Plan EIR and would not be constitute significant or unplanned growth. Therefore, the impact related to the provision of library services under the proposed project would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**
This page intentionally left blank.
### 16 Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 2019, the City of San Leandro provides and manages approximately 23 parks (City of San Leandro 2016a). It also manages two community centers. Parks nearest the project site include Washington Manor Park, approximately 0.1 mile north and Floresta Park, approximately 1 mile northeast. Washington Manor Park is 15 acres in size and features a new aquatic center and community room, tennis courts, barbecue pits, basketball courts, playground apparatuses, two softball areas and an open grassy field (City of San Leandro 2019c). Floresta Park offers both picnic and play areas (City of San Leandro 2019b).

The project site is currently home to a private recreational bowling facility, Manor Bowl. Manor Bowl operates a 30-lane facility and is the last bowling alley in the city of San Leandro.

**a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

The project would add an additional 113 residents to the area. In addition, the removal of the bowling alley as a private recreational facility has the potential to slightly increase the use of other existing recreation facilities. However, to address the additional park needs that would be produced by the proposed project, the applicant is required to comply with City requirements for park land dedication and/or payment of a park land acquisition fee, and a park improvement fee (SLMC Section 7-1-855). The applicant would pay a park land acquisition and a park improvement fees at the time of building permit issuance. The City considers payment of park fees as adequate mitigation of development impacts to nearby recreation facilities (City of San Leandro 2016a). Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**
b. *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

The proposed project would not include construction of new public recreation facilities. While the project would include 4,894 square feet of publicly accessible open space and 3,493 square feet of private open space for residents, maintenance of this space would be the ongoing responsibility of the project. Since public and private open space is a component of the project, the environmental consequences of its construction and operation are comprehensively assessed throughout this document. Where appropriate, measures to mitigate the project’s effects have been included, which would mitigate any impact associated with construction of the project’s open space. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**
## 17 Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact (with Mitigation Incorporated)</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible use (e.g., farm equipment)?

d. Result in inadequate emergency access?

A Trip Generation Memorandum was prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. on October 11, 2019 for the project. The following analysis incorporates the findings of this memorandum, which has been included as Appendix TRP to this report.

a. **Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?**

Table 10 provides the estimated trip generation of the project and the existing trip generation for Manor Bowl, based on trip generation rates published in the *Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual*, 10th Edition. As shown therein, the net peak hour trips to and from the project site would decrease or remain the same with demolition of the bowling alley and construction of townhomes. The detached single-family residential land use trip generation estimate was used because the Institute of Transportation Engineers does not have a trip generation estimate for townhomes, and this provides a conservative estimate of generated trips as it has the highest trip generation rate of the residential land use types.

AC Transit Route 34 provides bus service twice hourly in each direction between 6:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m. to the intersection Farnsworth Street and Manor Boulevard, located 0.28 mile west of the project site. Route S also provides service to this intersection but is limited to the hours between 4 p.m. and 8 p.m. on weekdays. There are no bicycle routes or lanes adjacent to the project site (although a future Class III bicycle route is proposed in the City of San Leandro General Plan), with the nearest bicycle-friendly roadways located approximately 0.3 mile from the site along Fargo Avenue and Farnsworth Street. Sidewalks for pedestrian usage are located along Manor Boulevard adjacent to the project site, as well as nearby residential streets.
Table 10  Estimated Project Vehicle Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITE Land Use</th>
<th>Weekday Peak Hour</th>
<th>Total Daily Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing: 437 Bowling Alley</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed: 210 Single Family Detached Housing¹</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Trips (16)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The ITE manual does not include a category for attached townhomes with individual garages. The use of the single-family detached housing category presents a conservative analysis because it has the highest rate of trips per unit.
² The total daily trips for the existing land use was calculated based on an assumption that the peak hour trips represent 1/10th of the total daily trips. This calculation was used in order to estimate the net daily trips from removal of the bowling alley and addition of the proposed townhomes.
Parentheses () indicate a reduction in trips.
Source: Appendix TRP

The City of San Leandro General Plan designates Manor Boulevard adjacent to the site for a future Class III bicycle route and contains goals and policies for the development of pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly roadways, including complete streets and bicycle circulation considerations. The project would not impede the development of these features along Manor Boulevard or nearby roadways. The introduction of townhomes to the project site would not increase vehicle traffic beyond existing conditions (Table 10), and residents would have access to existing adjacent pedestrian facilities, and proposed bicycle storage lockers. Impacts would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

The City of San Leandro has not adopted vehicle miles travelled (VMT) thresholds. In lieu of adopted thresholds, a comparison of VMT from the existing and proposed project uses was conducted. Although the project is not near a high-quality transit corridor, the net trip generation as a result of the project would decrease during the AM peak hour and remain the same during the PM peak hour. Therefore, VMT from project site uses can be reasonably assumed to remain the same or experience a slight decrease due to the reduction in total trips. Impacts would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

c. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible use (e.g., farm equipment)?

d. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Two driveways on Manor Boulevard offers access to the existing bowling alley. The project would remove the western driveway and reconfigure the eastern driveway, which would serve as the entrance to on-site roadways and vehicle circulation. The proposed driveway would be approximately 26 feet in width (meeting the SLMC Section 3-10-515 20-foot requirement) and would meet the City’s minimum driveway visibility requirements (San Leandro Zoning Code Section 4-1728). Proposed townhome buildings would be set back from Manor Boulevard in accordance

¹ A project is within a high-quality transit corridor if it is within 0.5 mile of a major transit stop, which is served every 15 minutes.
with SLMC and landscaping on either side of the driveway would consist primarily of low ornamental shrubs, which would not obstruct line of sight for vehicles entering and exiting the project site.

The proposed circulation on the project site includes adequate turn-around space for large vehicles (such as waste collection vehicles) and emergency vehicles. The project would not alter off-site roadways, create new roadway conflicts, or obstruct emergency access to nearby properties. One site access driveway from Manor Boulevard is proposed, with adequate line-of-site for vehicles entering and exiting the site. The project would not increase traffic hazards or result in inadequate emergency access. The project would provide adequate emergency access, which ACFD’s review of the project site plan will confirm during the City’s approval process. The project site would be required to meet the standards set forth by the ACFD. Compliance with existing regulations would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
18 Tribal Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in a Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or □ □ □ □

b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. □ □ □ □ □

On July 1, 2015, California Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) was enacted. The law expands CEQA by defining a new resource category, tribal cultural resources. AB 52 establishes that “a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment” (PRC Section 21084.2). It further states that the lead agency shall establish measures to avoid impacts that would alter the significant characteristics of a tribal cultural resource, when feasible (PRC Section 21084.3).

PRC Section 21074 (a)(1)(A) and (B) defines tribal cultural resources as “sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe” and is:

1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying these criteria, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.
AB 52 also establishes a formal consultation process for California tribes regarding those resources. The consultation process must be completed before a CEQA document can be certified. Under AB 52, lead agencies are required to “begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project.” Native American tribes to be included in the process are those that have requested notice of projects proposed within the jurisdiction of the lead agency.

a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?

b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1?

No tribes have requested consultation from the City of San Leandro pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. Although no tribal cultural resources are expected to be present on the site, there is the possibility of encountering undisturbed subsurface tribal cultural resources. Grading the project site could potentially result in significant impacts on unanticipated tribal cultural resources. Mitigation Measure TCR-1 would reduce impacts on unidentified tribal cultural resources to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

**TCR-1 Unanticipated Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources**

In the event that cultural resources of Native American origin are identified during construction, all earth-disturbing work within 50 feet of the find must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find and an appropriate Native American representative, based on the nature of the find, is consulted. If the City, in consultation with local Native Americans, determines the resource is a tribal cultural resource and thus significant under CEQA, a mitigation plan shall be prepared and implemented in accordance with state guidelines and in consultation with Native American groups. The plan would include avoidance of the resource or, if avoidance of the resource is infeasible, the plan would outline the appropriate treatment of the resource in coordination with the archeologist, if applicable, and the appropriate Native American tribal representative.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure TCR-1 would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**
### 19 Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is served by the EBMUD for water supply, Oro Loma Sanitary District (OLSD) for wastewater treatment, the City of San Leandro for stormwater, PG&E for gas and electricity, AT&T and Comcast for telecommunications services, and Waste Management for solid waste.
a. Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

**Water**

EBMUD would provide potable water to the project, as it does to other commercial, institutional, and residential customers in the project area. A total of 90 percent of EBMUD’s water supply is sourced from the Mokelumne River Watershed, and the remaining 10 percent comes from protected watershed lands and reservoirs in the East Bay Hills (City of San Leandro 2016a). EBMUD’s water supply system was designed and constructed to deliver 325 million gallons per day (MGD), which has a surplus capacity of 95 MGD in the highest water demand year. The proposed project would increase demand for water above existing conditions on the project site. The project’s estimated water generation would be approximately 4.14 million gallons per year (Appendix AQ), or approximately 11,350 gallons per day,\(^2\) which is approximately 0.006 percent of EBMUD’s water supply during a normal year and approximately 0.012 percent of EBMUD’s water supply system surplus capacity. Therefore, EBMUD’s water supply system has sufficient capacity to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. This would be a less than significant impact.

**Wastewater**

The OLSD would provide wastewater treatment services for wastewater generated on the project site. OLSD encompasses 13 square miles, serving approximately 135,000 customers, including residential, commercial, and light industrial users. The OLSD’s wastewater treatment plant has an average dry weather flow of 12.2 MGD, with a design flow of 20 MGD (OLSD 2020). The project’s estimated wastewater generation would be approximately 3.45 million gallons per year (assuming water use is approximately 120 percent of wastewater generation), or approximately 9,458 gallons per day. This would represent approximately 0.12 percent of the OLSD’s wastewater treatment plant remaining capacity. Therefore, the proposed project would not require the construction of new municipal wastewater treatment facilities or impact the treatment capacity of existing municipal wastewater treatment providers. Impacts to wastewater treatment facilities would be less than significant.

**Stormwater**

The project would be designed and engineered with drainage features appropriate to accommodate the needs of the proposed project. As discussed in Section 10, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, the project would include the construction of bioretention areas throughout the project site, sized to provide adequate stormwater treatment on site. These features ensure compliance with Provision C.3, and the project would be regulated under the Municipal Regional Stormwater Discharge Permit. The proposed project would not require the construction of new off-site stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications**

A significant impact to electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities may occur if a project’s demand for these services exceeds the capacity of local providers. PG&E provides gas and

\(^2\) Note that this estimate does not subtract existing water usage, which provides a conservative estimate as the increase in water demand will be lower than estimated here.
electric utilities to the project site, and AT&T and Comcast provide telecommunications services at
the discretion of the project residents. Telecommunications are generally available in the project
area, and facility upgrades would not likely be necessary.

As described in Section 6, Energy, the project would require approximately 665 MMBtu/yr of
electricity and approximately 886 MMBtu/yr of natural gas. PG&E maintains power lines along
Manor Boulevard as well as along the western project site boundary. The substation that powers
lines in the vicinity of the project site has a capacity of 29.7 megawatts (MW) and a peak load of
12.3 MW, with a remaining capacity of 17.4 MW (PG&E 2020). The project would require
approximately 0.02 MW, approximately 0.1 percent of the remaining capacity of the PG&E
substation that serves the project site. For 2017, the total system of natural gas that PG&E provided
was 2,222 million cubic feet per day, or 2,304,214 MMBtu per year (California Gas and Electric
Utilities 2018). Therefore, natural gas demand generated by the project would represent less than
0.1 percent of PG&E’s natural gas demand. Accordingly, the project would be accommodated
adequately by existing electricity, natural gas, and telecommunication facilities and would not
require improvements to existing facilities, or the provision of new facilities, that would cause
significant environmental effects. This impact would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

b. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably
foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

As described above, EBMUD would provide water service to the project. EBMUD’s 2015 Urban
Water Management Plan addresses the district’s water system and includes descriptions of water
supply sources, water use, comparisons of supply and demand during dry years. Per the Urban
Water Management Plan, normal year, single dry year, and multiple dry year supply and demand
comparisons are shown in Table 11.
Table 11  EBMUD Supply and Demand in Million Gallons Per Day for Normal, Single Dry, and Multiple Dry Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dry Years</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Dry Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Dry Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Dry Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Parentheses denote a negative number
Source: EBMUD 2016

Table 11 shows that EBMUD’s projected water supplies are sufficient to meet projected demands during normal and multiple dry year conditions. During a severe drought condition, under the third dry year scenario, the district will not have adequate supplies and would need to impose mandatory water use restrictions (EBMUD 2016). Therefore, there would be adequate water supply to serve the project in average, single dry, and multiple dry years. This impact would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

c. Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

As described in response to question (a), above, the project’s estimated wastewater generation would be approximately 3.45 million gallons per year (assuming water use is approximately 120 percent of wastewater generation), or approximately 9,458 gallons per day. This would represent approximately 0.12 percent of the OLSD’s wastewater treatment plant remaining capacity. Therefore, the proposed project would be served by wastewater facilities that have adequate capacity to serve the project in addition to OLSD’s existing wastewater treatment commitments. Impacts would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
d. **Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?**

e. **Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

Waste Management provides solid waste and recycling disposal services in the project vicinity and has provided a will-serve letter (dated October 21, 2019; Appendix WM) for the provision of trash, recycling, and organics services to the proposed project. In 2018, 98 percent of the city’s solid waste went to seven landfills: Altamont Landfill, Newby Island Sanitary Landfill, North County Landfill and Recycling Center, Potrero Hills Landfill, Recology Hay Road, Redwood Landfill, and Vasco Road Sanitary Landfill (CalRecycle 2020a). Table 12 shows the permitted capacity and closure dates for these landfills.

**Table 12 Estimated Landfill Capabilities and Closure Dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landfill Facility</th>
<th>Permitted Capacity (cubic yards)</th>
<th>Remaining Capacity (cubic yards)</th>
<th>Maximum Permitted Throughput (tons per day)</th>
<th>Anticipated Closure Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altamont Landfill</td>
<td>124,400,000</td>
<td>65,400,000</td>
<td>11,150</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newby Island Sanitary Landfill</td>
<td>57,500,000</td>
<td>21,200,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Landfill and Recycling Center</td>
<td>41,200,000</td>
<td>35,400,000</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potrero Hills Landfill</td>
<td>83,100,000</td>
<td>13,872,000</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td>2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recology Hay Road</td>
<td>37,000,000</td>
<td>30,433,000</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Landfill</td>
<td>26,077,000</td>
<td>26,000,000</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasco Road Sanitary Landfill</td>
<td>32,970,000</td>
<td>7,379,000</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalRecycle 2020b

Waste Management would collect solid waste from the project site. The project residents would generate typical household solid waste and recyclables. In addition, construction would generate construction and demolition debris. At least 50 percent of construction waste would be recycled, in compliance with SLMC (refer to Chapter 3-7, Construction and Demolition Debris Waste Reduction and Recycling Requirements, of the SLMC).

Assuming 2.89 residents would be generated per dwelling unit (DOF 2019), the proposed project would add an estimated 113 residents. Using an estimated solid waste generation rate provided by CalRecycle for residential land uses, the proposed project would result in an increase of approximately 477 pounds of solid waste per day, or 87 tons per year (using a rate of 12.23 pounds per household per day) (CalRecycle 2020c). This represents approximately 0.00087 percent of the combined permitted daily throughput of the seven landfills (listed above) serving the City. This does not represent a substantial increase in waste at any of the seven landfills serving the project area or and the project would not be served by a landfill without sufficient capacity. The project would comply with state and local statues and regulations related to solid waste regarding increased
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recycling efforts per Assembly Bill 341 and the City’s 2035 General Plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
### 20 Wildfire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>野火</th>
<th>潜在显著影响</th>
<th>低于显著影响的缓解措施</th>
<th>低于显著影响</th>
<th>无影响</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? & □ & □ & □ & ■
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? & □ & □ & □ & ■
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? & □ & □ & □ & ■
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? & □ & □ & □ & ■

a. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
b. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?
c. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?
d. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in the San Leandro are located east of I-580 in the East Bay Hills. The project site is located within an urbanized area of the San Leandro and is surrounded by existing urban development. The project site is not located within a state responsibility area or near a very high fire hazard severity zone, with the nearest very high fire hazard severity zone located east of the City approximately 2 miles from the project site (CAL FIRE 2007, CAL FIRE 2008). There would be no impact to wildfire hazards.

NO IMPACT
a. Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

b. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

As discussed in Section 4, Biological Resources, the project would not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife species population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal with compliance with Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2.

As discussed in Section 5, Cultural Resources, the project could result in potentially significant impacts to undiscovered archaeological resources.

As discussed in Section 7, Geology and Soils, the
project could result in potentially significant impacts to undiscovered paleontological resources. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1, GEO-1, and GEO-2 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

b. *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?* ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Cumulative projects include buildout of the City of San Leandro 2035 General Plan and approved projects within the City of San Leandro. This includes several approved residential, mixed-use, and office/retail developments near the San Leandro Bay Area Rapid Transit Station, manufacturing and industrial developments in the Mulford Gardens and Laqua Manor industrial areas, and two high-growth projects near the Monarch Bay Golf Club and the Bayfair Shopping Center (City of San Leandro 2020). None of these approved projects are located within 1 mile of the project site.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3), cumulative impacts with some of the resource areas have been addressed in the individual resource sections above: Air Quality, Greenhouse Gases, Water Supply, and Solid Waste. As discussed in these sections, impacts (including cumulative impacts) would be less than significant. Some of the other resource areas were determined to have no impact in comparison to existing conditions and therefore would not contribute to cumulative impacts, such as Mineral Resources and Agricultural Resources. As such, cumulative impacts in these issue areas would also be less than significant (not cumulatively considerable). The project would be expected to decrease traffic compared to existing conditions. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the project’s impacts would not be cumulatively considerable with implementation of the required mitigation measures.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

c. *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

Effects to human beings are generally associated with air quality, noise, traffic safety, geology/soils and hazards/hazardous materials. As discussed in this Initial Study, the project would result in less than significant environmental impacts with respect to these issue areas with mitigation incorporated. Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would reduce potential impacts related to construction noise to a less than significant level. Therefore, the project would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**
Bibliography


City of San Leandro
903 Manor Boulevard Residential Project


List of Preparers

Rincon Consultants, Inc. prepared this IS-MND under contract to the City of San Leandro. Persons involved in data gathering analysis, project management, and quality control are listed below.

**RINCON CONSULTANTS, INC.**

Abe Leider, AICP CEP, Principal-in-Charge
Darcy Kremin, AICP, Project Manager
Aileen Mahoney, Lead Analyst
Amanda Ross, MCRP, Environmental Planner
Deborah Howell-Ardila, Technical Editor
Debra Jane Seltzer, Lead Document Formatting and Production Specialist
Dario Campos, Document Formatting and Production Specialist
This page intentionally left blank.