

5. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

The following discussion is intended to inform the public and decision makers of feasible alternatives to the proposed Specific Plan that would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the proposed Specific Plan. The CEQA Guidelines set forth the intent and extent of alternatives analysis to be provided in an EIR. Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states that:

An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.

All of the potential environmental impacts associated with adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan were found to be either *less than significant without mitigation* or *less than significant with mitigation*, with the exception of some impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, noise, transportation and circulation, and utilities and service systems, which were found to be *significant and unavoidable*. The alternatives were selected because of their potential to further reduce and avoid these impacts.

The alternatives to be analyzed in comparison to the proposed Specific Plan include:

- No Project Alternative (General Plan 2040)
- General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative
- Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative
- Specific Plan with Lower Intensity (30% Less) Alternative

The first alternative discussed is the CEQA-required “No Project” Alternative and assumes the project would not be approved and the project site would continue to develop as designated under the 2040 General Plan. The second alternative, the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative, assumes no changes to current General Plan land use designations, however includes the circulation changes as proposed in the Specific Plan. This alternative would not increase population and employee estimates above what would naturally occur under General Plan buildout. The third alternative, Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative, assumes that all the land use changes proposed within the Specific Plan could be implemented, yet would not make any circulation changes as proposed in the Specific Plan. This alternative would result in the same increase in population and employees as the proposed Specific Plan. The fourth alternative, the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity (30% Less)

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Alternative, assumes a 30 percent reduction in the non-residential development proposed in the Specific Plan, and all other aspects of the proposed Specific Plan would be implemented. As such, the population and employment increase anticipated in this alternative would be less than that of the proposed Specific Plan, and of the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative.

Table 5-1 shows the development intensity for each of the alternatives.

TABLE 5-1 NET DEVELOPMENT COMPARISONS OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED SPECIFIC PLAN

Land Use Category	Proposed Specific Plan	No Project Alternative ^e	General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative ^e	Specific Plan Without Circulation Changes Alternative	Specific Plan with Lower Intensity (30% Less) Alternative
Non-Residential Square Feet ^a	1,900,000	393,782	393,782	1,900,000	1,330,000
Residential Units ^b	3,427	3,110	3,110	3,427	3,427
Population ^c	7,539	6,842	6,842	7,539	7,539
Employees ^d	6,333	774	774 ^h	6,333	4,433

Notes:

a. Non-residential includes health, education, and recreation including entertainment, accommodation, food services and other service (except public administration), other land use (i.e., industrial, warehouse, construction, information, and public administration), financial and professional services (i.e., office) and retail land uses.

b. Represents multifamily residential.

c. Population rates assume 3.5 persons per household for single-family residential and 2.2 persons per household for multifamily residential.

d. Employee rates assume 300 square feet (sf) per job for all non-residential land uses.

e. Based on the 2002 and 2014 General Plan estimates.

Source: City of Hayward, 2018.

The following analysis compares the potentially significant environmental impacts of the alternatives to the proposed Specific Plan with those of the project-related impacts for each of the environmental topics in Chapter 4.1 through Chapter 4.14 of this Draft EIR. The impacts of each alternative are classified as greater, less, or similar to (or comparable to) the level of impacts associated with the proposed Specific Plan.

Table 5-2 summarizes the relative impacts of each of the alternatives when compared to the proposed Specific Plan, and the sections that follow describe the relative impacts in detail.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

TABLE 5-2 COMPARISON OF IMPACTS FROM PROJECT ALTERNATIVES AND THE PROPOSED SPECIFIC PLAN

Topic	Proposed Project ^a	No Project Alternative	General Plan Buildout with Circulation Changes Alternative	Specific Plan Buildout Without Circulation Changes Alternative	Specific Plan with Lower Intensity (30% Less) Alternative
Aesthetics	LTS	=	=	=	=
Air Quality	SU ^b	>	>	>	=
Biological Resources	LTS	=	=	=	=
Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources	LTS	=	=	=	=
Geology and Soils	LTS	=	=	=	=
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	SU ^b	>	>	>	=
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	LTS	=	=	=	=
Hydrology and Water Quality	LTS	>	>	=	=
Land Use and Planning	LTS	=	=	=	=
Noise	SU ^b	<	<	=	<
Population and Housing	LTS	=	=	=	=
Public Services and Recreation	LTS	<	<	=	<
Transportation and Circulation	SU ^b	>	=	>	=
Utilities and Service Systems	LTS	<	<	=	<

Notes:

LTS	Less Than Significant	<	Less impact in comparison to the proposed project
LTS/M	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	=	Similar impacts in comparison to the proposed project
SU	Significant and Unavoidable	>	Greater impact in comparison to the proposed project

a. The impacts listed in this column represent the highest significance determination for each respective threshold.

b. Indicates an impact at the program-level and does not directly preclude a finding of less than significant at the project-level.

5.1 NO PROJECT

5.1.1 DESCRIPTION

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1), the No Project Alternative is required as part of the “reasonable range of alternatives” to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed Specific Plan with the impacts of taking no action or not approving the proposed Specific Plan. Downtown Hayward is comprised of approximately 320 acres of urban, developed land, located in northern Hayward. Under this alternative, the proposed Specific Plan would not be adopted, and the Specific Plan Area would be developed consistent with the current City of Hayward General Plan and Zoning regulations.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

As shown in Table 5-1 above, under the No Project Alternative, potential future development that would occur with full General Plan buildout, would add 393,782 square feet of non-residential development and 3,110 residential units, which would increase the population by 6,842 residents and 774 employees in Downtown Hayward.

The federal and State Regulations, General Plan policies, and Municipal Code development standards that apply to the proposed Specific Plan, would also apply to this Alternative, and all mitigation measures listed in Chapters 4.1 through 4.14 would also apply to their respective impacts under this Alternative.

The differences between the proposed Specific Plan and the No Project Alternative would be incremental and even if no action was taken, regional growth, and the associated environmental effects linked to this growth, would continue to occur under the provisions of the current General Plan.

5.1.2 IMPACT DISCUSSION

The following analysis compares the potentially significant environmental impacts of the No Project Alternative with those of the project-related impacts for each of the environmental topics analyzed in detail in Chapter 4.1 through Chapter 4.14 of this Draft EIR. The impacts of each alternative are classified as greater, less, or essentially similar to (or comparable to) the level of impacts associated with the proposed Specific Plan.

5.1.2.1 AESTHETICS

Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, describes that the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant aesthetics impacts. The Specific Plan Area where potential future development is expected to occur is concentrated on parcels in the form of infill/intensification on sites either already developed and/or underutilized, and/or in close proximity to existing development, where future development would have a lesser impact on scenic vistas. Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed increases in maximum height, would not occur, which would somewhat lessen the impacts to far-field views of the scenic vistas from various vantage points surrounding the Specific Plan Area. Future development under the No Project Alternative would not further block or obstruct public views of scenic vistas from within the city or surrounding areas. Similar views would continue to be visible between projects and over lower density areas. Considering this and the fact that the Specific Plan Area and surrounding roadways are not considered destination public viewing points nor are they visible from scenic vistas, overall impacts to scenic vistas under the No Project Alternative would be *similar* to impacts under the proposed Specific Plan.

Development under the No Project Alternative would also be subject to General Plan goals and policies related to design, the *Hayward Design Guidelines*, the Hayward Municipal Code, and the *Hayward Landscape Beautification Plan*, as well as the City's architectural control process (i.e., Site Plan Review). Although future development under the No Project Alternative would change the existing visual character on individual sites similar to that of the proposed Specific Plan, compliance with the existing regulations would ensure that the bulk, mass, height, and architectural character of future development in the Specific Plan Area would be compatible with surrounding uses and would not substantially degrade the

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

visual quality of the site or its surroundings. However, unlike the proposed Specific Plan, which includes extended design standards as part of the proposed Zoning Code Update and Specific Plan, development under this alternative would not provide the same level of design consideration related to the visual character or quality of a project site and its surroundings. Therefore, associated impacts under the No Project Alternative would be *greater* to those under the proposed Specific Plan.

Similar to the proposed Specific Plan, the No Project Alternative would result in new lighting sources that could result in sources of glare. However, the future development under the No Project Alternative would be required to comply with best management practices and General Plan policies, as well as Municipal Code provisions that ensure new land uses do not generate excessive light levels and reduce light and glare spillover from future development to surrounding land uses. Given that the No Project Alternative allows for lower intensity development than the proposed Specific Plan, impacts related to light or glare would generally be *less* than those under the proposed Specific Plan.

Overall, the development in the Specific Plan Area under this alternative would be less and would be guided by the current policies and regulations that guide development in Hayward, and impacts related to aesthetics would be *similar* to those of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.1.2.2 AIR QUALITY

As described in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with the 2017 Clean Air Plan, would pose no operational community risks or hazards, and would not generate any substantial odors. However, at a program level, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to construction and operation of future development, as well as the cumulative contribution to the non-attainment designations of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin.

The No Project Alternative would allow less redevelopment in the Specific Plan Area. Under the No Project Alternative, the reduced development would reduce impacts associated with the construction and operation of these land uses. However, reducing development near the Hayward Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Station could lessen the net benefit gained from siting these land uses near public transit and result in a higher percentage of transit users that may rely on automobiles (as opposed to walking or biking) to and from the Specific Plan Area. Therefore, as a result of reducing development, the No Project Alternative would not necessarily reduce trips, which are the major source of criteria air pollutants from the proposed Specific Plan. As shown in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Circulation, of this Draft EIR, under the No Project conditions, the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita would be greater than that of the proposed Specific Plan (27.1 VMT per capita compared to 23.3 VMT per capita). Therefore, while the No Project Alternative would result in less overall development than the proposed Specific Plan, air quality impacts from the operation of these uses would be considered *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

Same as the proposed Specific Plan, the No Project Alternative is not the type of project that would result in significant impacts from odor and impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Overall, because the No Project Alternative would result in less infill development that would create a higher VMT per capita, air quality impacts under the No Project Alternative would be *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.1.2.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

As discussed in Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts to biological resources in the Specific Plan Area. Although future development as proposed under the Specific Plan could have potential to affect animal and plant species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, proposed open space, and adherence to all federal, State, and local regulations relating to biological resources would fully mitigate any potential impacts. While development would be less intensive under the No Project Alternative, the same area, thus the same species, would be impacted; therefore, impacts to special-status species would be *similar* under both scenarios.

As described in Chapter 4.3, riparian corridors in the Specific Plan Area are along the San Lorenzo Creek. Neither the General Plan nor the proposed Specific Plan proposed new development to this area or other wetland areas in Downtown that would have a substantial adverse effect on the riparian corridor and surrounding sensitive communities. Therefore, impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

Future development potential in the Specific Plan Area would occur in urbanized areas where sensitive wildlife resources and important wildlife movement corridors are no longer present because of existing development. Therefore, impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

In summary, impacts to biological resources from potential future development as allowed in the General Plan under the No Project Alternative would be *similar* to that of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.1.2.4 CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES

As described in Chapter 4.4, Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would have less-than-significant impacts to known cultural, including historic buildings, and tribal cultural resources that may exist in the Specific Plan Area. The General Plan includes several goals and policies that address preservation and protection of cultural and tribal resources, of which any potential future development would be required to comply. Under the No Project Alternative these potential impacts would be *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

Chapter 4.4 finds that applicable regulations, procedures, and policies would ensure that any human remains discovered during construction allowed by the proposed Specific Plan would be handled appropriately. These regulations, procedures, and policies would be maintained under the No Project Alternative, and therefore this alternative would result in *similar* impacts to human remains when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

In summary, development allowed by the General Plan under the No Project Alternative would be in the same Specific Plan Area and would be required to comply with all applicable regulations, thus the potential to impact cultural and tribal resources would be *similar* under both scenarios.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

5.1.2.5 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

As described in Chapter 4.5, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would have a less-than-significant impacts related to geology and soils in the Specific Plan Area.

Future development under both the No Project Alternative and proposed Specific Plan would occur in the same area and would be subject to the same federal, State, and local regulations which address and prevent hazards associated with geology, soils, and seismicity. Although the No Project Alternative would result in less overall development, compliance with existing regulations related to geologic and seismic safety would apply similarly to both future development under the No Project Alternative and the proposed Specific Plan; therefore, would result in *similar* impacts when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.1.2.6 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

As described in Chapter 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict or obstruct the attainment of any plans adopted for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions. However, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impacts when applying program-level thresholds for the forecast year-2040. With respect to GHG emissions from construction, new buildings constructed would be subject to the triennial updates to California's Building and Energy Efficiency Standards, which would presumably improve over time. With respect to operational impacts, nonresidential buildings (including multifamily that is four stories or higher) will use about 30 percent less energy due mainly to lighting upgrades. New buildings would be more energy efficient, but there would be an overall increase in energy usage due to the magnitude of new building space that would be constructed. While the 2017 Scoping Plan outlines strategies to be on a trajectory to achieve the 2050 target identified under Executive Order S-03-05, it is estimated that the State cannot meet the 2050 goal without major advances in technology. The identification of these program-level impacts does not preclude the finding of less-than-significant impacts for subsequent projects that comply with BAAQMD screening criteria or meet applicable thresholds of significance. Furthermore, under both scenarios when applying plan-level thresholds for forecast year-2040, even though new more energy efficient buildings would be constructed, and major advances in technology are required under both scenarios, because the No Project Alternative would result in less redevelopment when compared to the proposed Specific Plan GHG emissions from buildings would be *less*.

However, reducing development near the Hayward Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Station could lessen the net benefit gained from siting more intense infill near public transit and result in a higher percentage of transit users that may rely on automobiles (as opposed to walking or biking) to and from the Specific Plan Area. Therefore, as a result of reducing development, the No Project Alternative would not necessarily reduce trips, which are the major source of criteria GHG emissions from the proposed Specific Plan. As shown in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Circulation, of this Draft EIR, under the No Project conditions, the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita would be greater than that of the proposed Specific Plan (27.1 VMT per capita compared to 23.3 VMT per capita). Therefore, while the No Project Alternative would result in less overall development than the proposed Specific Plan, GHG emissions impacts from operation would be considered *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Under the No Project Alternative, future development in the Specific Plan Area would continue to occur under the City's existing General Plan and would introduce infill development in a Priority Development Area near transit. Accordingly, impacts related to consistency with the 2017 Scoping Plan, *Plan Bay Area*, and the City's Climate Action Plan as integrated into the General Plan, would be *similar* under both scenarios.

Overall, because the No Project Alternative would result in less infill development that would create a higher VMT per capita, impacts from GHG emissions under the No Project Alternative would be *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.1.2.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

As discussed in Chapter 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of this Draft EIR, there are no sites within the Specific Plan Area that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites. All potential future development allowed under the proposed Specific Plan would be required to comply with all federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to hazards and hazardous materials, as well as the City of Hayward Hillside Design and Urban/Wildfire Interface Guidelines to protect urban development from fire hazards. Accordingly, as discussed the proposed Specific Plan would have a less-than-significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Because future development under the No Project Alternative would be in the same Specific Plan Area and subject to the same regulatory setting, the No Project Alternative would result in *similar* impacts when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.1.2.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Chapter 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, finds that the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant hydrological impacts. Compliance with existing State and local regulations and procedures would ensure that pre- and post-construction impacts to water quality would be less than significant. These regulations and procedures would be maintained under the No Project Alternative.

Although the No Project Alternative would result in less development overall, future development would occur within previously urbanized areas and would connect to existing drainage systems already in place and be subject to the same existing federal, State, and local regulations relating to hydrology and water quality, similar to the proposed Specific Plan. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that pre- and post-construction impacts to water quality be minimized as future development occurs. However, current regulations are limited to sites of a certain size and the proposed Specific Plan includes measures to ensure all future projects would limit the rate and total volume of off-site discharges to the existing levels, which would improve stormwater runoff water quality. Furthermore, the proposed Specific Plan envisions the use stormwater treatment measures within the public realm, which would improve conditions that currently have no existing stormwater treatment facilities within the public right-of-way (ROW). Accordingly, impacts under the No Project Alternative would not see these benefits and would be considered to be *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The Specific Plan Area has a 100-year flood zone near San Lorenzo Creek and a 500-year flood zone along Sulfur Creek. Any potential future development that may occur within these flood zones would be required to stay in compliance with existing local regulations, and compliance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMAs) flood regulations, which would minimize potential flood impacts, under both scenarios. Thus, impacts related to flooding would be *similar*.

Overall, future development under the No Project Alternative and the proposed Specific Plan would be in the same highly urbanized environment and would be subject to existing regulations that limit impacts from runoff. However, under the No Project Alternative the higher standards for water treatment would not be implemented and impacts would be considered to be *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.1.2.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

As described in Chapter 4.9, Land Use and Planning, of this Draft EIR, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts related to land use and planning.

While the proposed Specific Plan would aim to improve connectivity and would not create physical barriers within existing communities, the No Project Alternative also supports the integration of infill development and does not propose physical features that could divide a community. Accordingly, impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

Under the No Project Alternative, development would continue to occur throughout the Specific Plan Area under the existing General Plan and Zoning Code and would not conflict with these already approved standards. However, because the General Plan Policy LU-2.7 requires the City to develop, maintain, and implement a Specific Plan to establish a vision for Downtown Hayward and to guide and regulate future development and infrastructure improvements, the No Project Alternative would not implement this policy. Nonetheless, development under both scenarios would not conflict with any applicable land use plan adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and impacts would be *similar*.

5.1.2.10 NOISE

As described in Chapter 4.10, Noise, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts from construction and operation of future development due to the close proximity of sensitive receptors when evaluated at the plan level.

Future development allowed under the proposed Specific Plan would be subject to the standards of the Hayward Municipal Code and General Plan, including those relating to the interface between residential and non-residential land uses. As specific uses are proposed for particular sites, project-level design, permitting, and/or environmental review would serve to ensure that individual uses would comply with the noise regulations. Future development under the No Project Alternative would also be subject to these applicable standards. Impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios in this regard.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The No Project Alternative would result in less development, which subsequently would result in less construction and less vehicular trip generation. As discussed in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Circulation, 48,635 daily trips on a typical weekday would occur at buildout under the No Project conditions. Under buildout conditions of the proposed Specific Plan, trips in the Specific Plan Area would increase by about 46,500 daily trips to a total of approximately 95,126 trips on a typical weekday. Accordingly, noise generated from trips from the No Project Alternative would be less when compared to the proposed Specific Plan. For this reason, Overall noise related impacts from future development under the No Project Alternative would be *less* than those of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.1.2.11 POPULATION AND HOUSING

As described in Chapter 4.11, Population and Housing, of this Draft EIR, growth under the proposed Specific Plan is in line with ABAG 2013 regional projections for housing, population, and employment. Therefore, the proposed Specific Plan would have less-than-significant impacts related to population and housing.

The No Project Alternative would result in less population and housing; thus, the regional projections would not be exceeded under this scenario. Furthermore, a policy framework is in place under the existing General Plan to ensure adequate planning occurs to accommodate this Alternative. Therefore, impacts under the No Project Alternative would be *similar* to those under the proposed Specific Plan.

The No Project Alternative would allow a net increase of residential and non-residential uses in the Specific Plan Area. Since implementation of the No Project Alternative would result in a net increase in housing, like the proposed project it would not require replacement housing outside the Specific Plan Area. Therefore, impacts under the No Project Alternative would be *similar* to those of the proposed Specific Plan.

In summary, while the No Project Alternative would result in a different buildout potential, impacts related to population and housing would be *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.1.2.12 PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION

As described in Chapter 4.12, Public Services and Recreation, of this Draft EIR, impacts to fire protection services, police services, parks, schools, and libraries, under the proposed Specific Plan, were found to be less than significant. The No Project Alternative would result in fewer residents and employees to the Specific Plan Area, and therefore, would result in less demand on the public service providers that serve the Downtown and the City of Hayward. Potential future development under the No Project Alternative would be required to pay developer impact fees and provide their fair-share of parks to help meet the City's target for parkland acres to residents. Overall, impacts under the No Project Alternative would be *less* than those of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.1.2.13 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

As discussed in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Circulation, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would exceed acceptable level-of-service standards at intersections and roadway segment capacity at

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

some roadway segments in the Specific Plan Area even with implementation of mitigation measures TRANS-1. Implementation of the proposed project would also cause or contribute to impacts on 14 AC Transit bus lines in the area. Impacts related to hazards from design features, emergency access, and conflicting with adopted plans or decrease performance standards, were found to be less than significant.

Under the No Project Alternative, development density in the Specific Plan Area would be lower than under the proposed Specific Plan, and circulation changes under the Specific Plan (including lane/capacity reductions on roads and conversions from one-way roads to two-way roads) would not occur. This Alternative would result in higher Vehicle Miles Traveled per capita than the proposed Specific Plan since the proposed land use and circulation changes would not be implemented.

Impacts to vehicle operations at intersections within the Specific Plan Area and on Congestion Management Program segments would be lower compared to the proposed Specific Plan since reductions in roadway vehicular capacity would not be implemented under the No Project Alternative. Impacts to AC Transit bus operations (specifically, effects of vehicle traffic on mixed flow transit operations) would be *less* under the No Project Alternative compared to the proposed Specific Plan due to fewer intersection and roadway segment operational impacts. In addition, vehicle traffic would be less compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Impacts to bicycles and pedestrians would be *greater* than the proposed Specific Plan since the improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities would not be implemented as part of the No Project Alternative

Overall, vehicular traffic impacts on the project site under the No Project Alternative would be *less* than that of the proposed Specific Plan. However, the proposed Specific Plan includes goals, policies, and design guidelines, and circulation changes that will improve the mobility of the site, and encourage biking, walking, and taking public transit. These circulation changes, as proposed in the Specific Plan, meet goals and policies identified in the Hayward General Plan. Under the No Project Alternative, these circulation changes would not occur, therefore the circulation impact is considered to be *greater* than the proposed Specific Plan.

5.1.2.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

As described in Chapter 4.13, Utilities and Service Systems, of this Draft EIR, impacts to sanitary wastewater, solid waste, stormwater infrastructure, and energy conservation, under the proposed Specific Plan, were found to be less than significant. However, impacts to water supply during multiple dry years would not be sufficient water supplies available to serve the proposed future development from existing entitlements and resources. Supplemental water supply sources for the 2040 buildout year of the proposed Specific Plan would be identified and developed by San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). Because SFPUC is the water service provider to the City and the entity that has the ability to mitigate this impact, and because the City does not have jurisdiction over the development of new water supplies, the City cannot guarantee that additional water supplies will be developed, so the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Because the No Project Alternative would result in less non-residential and residential development, and thus, overall less water demand, wastewater and solid waste generation and energy use, impacts under the No Project Alternative would be *less* than those of the proposed Specific Plan.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

5.1.3 RELATIONSHIP TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed Specific Plan would not be implemented and therefore, this alternative does not meet any of the project objectives.

5.2 GENERAL PLAN WITH CIRCULATION CHANGES

5.2.1 DESCRIPTION

Under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative, the buildout of the Specific Plan Area would occur as currently described in the 2040 General Plan and the circulation changes of the proposed Specific Plan would be approved. However, land use and zoning changes of the proposed Specific Plan would not be implemented.

As shown in Table 5-1 above, under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative, potential future development that would add 393,782 square feet of non-residential development and 3,110 residential units, which would increase the population by 6,842 residents and 774 employees in Downtown Hayward.

The following is a summary of the proposed circulation changes. See Section 3.4.4 Mobility Plan, of Chapter 3, Project Description, of this Draft EIR, for a complete description of the proposed circulation changes.

- **Street Modifications:** The following one-way streets would be converted to two-way streets:
 - A Street (between Mission Boulevard and Foothill Boulevard);
 - B Street (between Watkins Street and Foothill Boulevard);
 - C Street (between Mission Boulevard and Second Street);
 - 1st Street (between C Street and D Street);
 - Mission Boulevard (between A Street and Foothill Boulevard); and
 - Foothill Boulevard (between A Street and the new Foothill Boulevard roundabout).
- **Road Diets:** Motor vehicle travel lanes on a roadway would be reduced to reallocate the space for other uses, such as transit lanes, bikeways, or wider sidewalks on the following streets:
 - A Street (between Grand Street and 3rd Street);
 - B Street (between Grand Street and Watkins Street);
 - 2nd Street (between Russell Way and E Street);
 - Mission Boulevard (between A Street and Foothill Boulevard);
 - Main Street (between Warren Street/ McKeever Avenue and Foothill Boulevard); and
 - Foothill Boulevard (between Hazel Avenue and Watkins Street).
- **Roadway and Transit improvements.** To better facilitate pedestrians, bicyclists, and users of public transit the following changes are proposed:
 - Reduced travel lanes and travel lane widths
 - Expanded pedestrian zones

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

- Shorter crossing distances at intersections
- Landscaped streets
- Additional bikeways
- Implement recommendations in the City's *Shuttle Feasibility Study*
- Improve access to the Hayward BART Station
- Implement Street Designs based on the 2016 *Alameda County Central County Complete Streets Design Guidelines*

In addition to the proposed improvements, future development under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be exempt from the City's currently adopted level of service standards.

The differences between the proposed Specific Plan and the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be incremental and even if no action was taken, regional growth, and the associated environmental effects linked to this growth, would continue to occur under the provisions of the current General Plan.

5.2.2 IMPACT DISCUSSION

The following analysis compares the potentially significant environmental impacts of the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative with those of the project-related impacts for each of the environmental topics analyzed in detail in Chapter 4.1 through Chapter 4.14 of this Draft EIR. The impacts of each alternative are classified as greater, less, or essentially similar to (or comparable to) the level of impacts associated with the proposed Specific Plan.

5.2.2.1 AESTHETICS

Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, describes that the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant aesthetics impacts. The Specific Plan Area where potential future development is expected to occur is concentrated on parcels in the form of infill/intensification on sites either already developed and/or underutilized, and/or in close proximity to existing development, where future development would have a lesser impact on scenic vistas. Under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative, the proposed increases in maximum height, would not occur, which would somewhat lessen the impacts to far-field views of the scenic vistas from various vantage points surrounding the Specific Plan Area. Future development under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would not further block or obstruct public views of scenic vistas from within the city or surrounding areas. Similar views would continue to be visible between projects and over lower density areas. Considering this and the fact that the Specific Plan Area and surrounding roadways are not considered destination public viewing points nor are they visible from scenic vistas, overall impacts to scenic vistas under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be *similar* to impacts under the proposed Specific Plan.

Development under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would also be subject to General Plan goals and policies related to design, the Hayward Municipal Code, and the *Hayward Landscape Beautification Plan*, as well as the City's architectural control process (i.e., Site Plan Review). Although future development under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would change the existing visual character on individual sites similar to that of the proposed Specific Plan, compliance

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

with the existing regulations would ensure that the bulk, mass, height, and architectural character of future development in the Specific Plan Area would be compatible with surrounding uses and would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings. However, unlike the proposed Specific Plan, which includes extended design standards as part of the proposed Zoning Code Update and Specific Plan, development under this alternative would not provide the same level of design consideration related to the visual character or quality of a project site and its surroundings. Therefore, associated impacts under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be *greater* to those under the proposed Specific Plan.

Similar to the proposed Specific Plan, the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would result in new lighting sources that could result in sources of glare. However, the future development under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be required to comply with best management practices and General Plan policies, as well as Municipal Code provisions that ensure new land uses do not generate excessive light levels and reduce light and glare spillover from future development to surrounding land uses. Given that the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative allows for lower intensity development than the proposed Specific Plan, impacts related to light or glare would generally be *less* than those under the proposed Specific Plan.

Overall, the development in the Specific Plan Area under this alternative would be less and would be guided by the current policies and regulations that guide development in Hayward, and impacts related to aesthetics would be *similar* to those of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.2.2.2 AIR QUALITY

As described in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with the 2017 Clean Air Plan, would pose no operational community risks or hazards, and would not generate any substantial odors. However, at a program level, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to construction and operation of future development, as well as the cumulative contribution to the non-attainment designations of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin.

The General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would introduce roadway changes that would improve multimodal transportation options (e.g., walking, biking, and riding transit) in the Specific Plan Area; however, like the No Project Alternative, it would allow less redevelopment in the Specific Plan Area. Under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative, the reduced development would reduce impacts associated with the construction and operation of these land uses. However, reducing development near the Hayward BART Station could lessen the net benefit gained from siting these land uses near public transit and result in a higher percentage of transit users that may rely on automobiles (as opposed to walking or biking) to and from the Specific Plan Area. Therefore, as a result of reducing development, the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would not necessarily reduce trips, which are the major source of criteria air pollutants from the proposed Specific Plan. As shown in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Circulation, of this Draft EIR, under the General Plan with Circulation Changes conditions, the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita would be greater than that of the proposed Specific Plan (27.1 VMT per capita compared to 23.3 VMT per capita). Therefore, while the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would result in less overall development than the proposed Specific

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Plan, air quality impacts would from the operation of these uses would be considered *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

Same as the proposed Specific Plan, the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative is not the type of project that would result in significant impacts from odor and impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

Overall, because the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would result in less infill development that would create a higher VMT per capita, air quality impacts under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.2.2.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

As discussed in Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts to biological resources in the Specific Plan Area. Although future development as proposed under the Specific Plan could have potential to affect animal and plant species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, proposed open space, and adherence to all federal, State, and local regulations relating to biological resources would fully mitigate any potential impacts. While development would be less intensive under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative, the same area, thus the same species, would be impacted; therefore, impacts to special-status species would be *similar* under both scenarios.

As described in Chapter 4.3, riparian corridors in the Specific Plan Area are along the San Lorenzo Creek. Neither the General Plan nor the proposed Specific Plan proposed new development to this area or other wetland areas in Downtown that would have a substantial adverse effect on the riparian corridor and surrounding sensitive communities. Therefore, impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

Future development potential in the Specific Plan Area would occur in urbanized areas where sensitive wildlife resources and important wildlife movement corridors are no longer present because of existing development. Therefore, impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

In summary, impacts to biological resources from potential future development as allowed in the General Plan under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be *similar* to that of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.2.2.4 CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES

As described in Chapter 4.4, Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would have less-than-significant impacts to known cultural, including historic buildings, and tribal cultural resources that may exist in the Specific Plan Area. The General Plan includes several goals and policies that address preservation and protection of cultural and tribal resources, of which any potential future development would be required to comply. Under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative these potential impacts would be *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Chapter 4.4 finds that applicable regulations, procedures, and policies would ensure that any human remains discovered during construction allowed by the proposed Specific Plan would be handled appropriately. These regulations, procedures, and policies would be maintained under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative, and therefore this Alternative would result in *similar* impacts to human remains when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

In summary, development under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be in the same Specific Plan Area and would be required to comply with all applicable regulations, thus the potential to impact cultural and tribal cultural resources would be *similar* under both scenarios.

5.2.2.5 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

As described in Chapter 4.5, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would have a less-than-significant impacts related to geology and soils in the Specific Plan Area.

Future development under both the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative and proposed Specific Plan would occur in the same area and would be subject to the same federal, State, and local regulations which address and prevent hazards associated with geology, soils, and seismicity. Although the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would result in less overall development, compliance with existing regulations related to geologic and seismic safety would apply similarly to both future development under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative and the proposed Specific Plan; therefore, would result in *similar* impacts when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.2.2.6 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

As described in Chapter 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict or obstruct the attainment of any plans adopted for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions. However, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impacts when applying program-level thresholds for the forecast year-2040. With respect to GHG emissions from construction, new buildings constructed would be subject to the triennial updates to California's Building and Energy Efficiency Standards, which would presumably improve over time. With respect to operational impacts, nonresidential buildings (including multifamily that is four stories or higher) will use about 30 percent less energy due mainly to lighting upgrades. New buildings would be more energy efficient, but there would be an overall increase in energy usage due to the magnitude of new building space that would be constructed. While the 2017 Scoping Plan outlines strategies to be on a trajectory to achieve the 2050 target identified under Executive Order S-03-05, it is estimated that the State cannot meet the 2050 goal without major advances in technology. The identification of these program-level impacts does not preclude the finding of less-than-significant impacts for subsequent projects that comply with BAAQMD screening criteria or meet applicable thresholds of significance. Furthermore, under both scenarios when applying plan-level thresholds for forecast year-2040, even though new more energy efficient buildings would be constructed, and major advances in technology are required under both scenarios, because the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would result in less redevelopment when compared to the proposed Specific Plan GHG emissions from buildings would be *less*.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

However, reducing development near the Hayward Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Station could lessen the net benefit gained from siting more intense infill near public transit and result in a higher percentage of transit users that may rely on automobiles (as opposed to walking or biking) to and from the Specific Plan Area. Therefore, as a result of reducing development, the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would not necessarily reduce trips, which are the major source of criteria GHG emissions from the proposed Specific Plan. As shown in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Circulation, of this Draft EIR, under the No Project conditions, the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita would be greater than that of the proposed Specific Plan (27.1 VMT per capita compared to 23.3 VMT per capita). Therefore, while the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would result in less overall development than the proposed Specific Plan, GHG emissions impacts from operation would be considered *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

Under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative, future development in the Specific Plan Area would continue to occur under the City's existing General Plan and would introduce infill development in a Priority Development Area near transit. Accordingly, impacts related to consistency with the 2017 Scoping Plan, *Plan Bay Area*, and the City's Climate Action Plan as integrated into the General Plan, would be *similar* under both scenarios.

Overall, because the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would result in less infill development that would create a higher VMT per capita, impacts from GHG emissions under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.2.2.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

As discussed in Chapter 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of this Draft EIR, there are no sites within the Specific Plan Area that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites. All potential future development allowed under the proposed Specific Plan would be required to comply with all federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to hazards and hazardous materials, as well as the City of Hayward Hillside Design and Urban/Wildfire Interface Guidelines to protect urban development from fire hazards. Accordingly, as discussed the proposed Specific Plan would have a less-than-significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Because future development under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be in the same Specific Plan Area and subject to the same regulatory setting, the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would result in *similar* impacts when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.2.2.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Chapter 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, finds that the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant hydrological impacts. Compliance with existing State and local regulations and procedures would ensure that pre- and post-construction impacts to water quality would be less than significant. These regulations and procedures would be maintained under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Although the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would result in less development overall, future development would occur within previously urbanized areas and would connect to existing drainage systems already in place and be subject to the same existing federal, State, and local regulations relating to hydrology and water quality, similar to the proposed Specific Plan. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that pre- and post-construction impacts to water quality be minimized as future development occurs. However, current regulations are limited to sites of a certain size and the proposed Specific Plan includes measures to ensure all future projects would limit the rate and total volume of off-site discharges to the existing levels, which would improve stormwater runoff water quality. Furthermore, the proposed Specific Plan envisions the use stormwater treatment measures within the public realm, which would improve conditions that currently have no existing stormwater treatment facilities within the public right-of-way (ROW). Accordingly, impacts under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would not see these benefits and would be considered to be *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

The Specific Plan Area has a 100-year flood zone near San Lorenzo Creek and a 500-year flood zone along Sulfur Creek. Any potential future development that may occur within these flood zones would be required to stay in compliance with existing local regulations, and compliance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMAs) flood regulations, which would minimize potential flood impacts, under both scenarios. Thus, impacts related to flooding would be *similar*.

Overall, future development under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative and the proposed Specific Plan would be in the same highly urbanized environment and would be subject to existing regulations that limit impacts from water runoff and flooding. However, under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative the higher standards for water treatment would not be implemented and impacts would be considered to be *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.2.2.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

As described in Chapter 4.9, Land Use and Planning, of this Draft EIR, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts related to land use and planning.

While the proposed Specific Plan would aim to improve connectivity and would not create physical barriers within existing communities, the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative also supports the integration of infill development and does not propose physical features that could divide a community. Accordingly, impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

Under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative, development would continue to occur throughout the Specific Plan Area under the existing General Plan and Zoning Code and would not conflict with these already approved standards. However, because the General Plan Policy LU-2.7 requires the City to develop, maintain, and implement a Specific Plan to establish a vision for Downtown Hayward and to guide and regulate future development and infrastructure improvements, the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would not implement this policy. Nonetheless, development under both scenarios would not conflict with any applicable land use plan adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and impacts would be *similar*.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

5.2.2.10 NOISE

As described in Chapter 4.10, Noise, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts from construction and operation of future development due to the close proximity of sensitive receptors when evaluated at the plan level.

Future development allowed under the proposed Specific Plan would be subject to the standards of the Hayward Municipal Code and General Plan, including those relating to the interface between residential and non-residential land uses. As specific uses are proposed for particular sites, project-level design, permitting, and/or environmental review would serve to ensure that individual uses would comply with the noise regulations. Future development under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would also be subject to these applicable standards. Impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios in this regard.

The General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would result in less development, which subsequently would result in less construction and less vehicular trip generation. Accordingly, noise generated from the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be less when compared to the proposed Specific Plan. For this reason, overall noise related impacts from future development under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be *less* than that of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.2.2.11 POPULATION AND HOUSING

As described in Chapter 4.11, Population and Housing, of this Draft EIR, growth under the proposed Specific Plan is in line with ABAG 2013 regional projections for housing, population, and employment. Therefore, the proposed Specific Plan would have less-than-significant impacts related to population and housing.

The General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would result in less population and housing; thus, the regional projections would not be exceeded under this scenario. Furthermore, a policy framework is in place under the existing General Plan to ensure adequate planning occurs to accommodate this Alternative. Therefore, impacts under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be *similar* to those under the proposed Specific Plan.

The General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would allow a net increase of residential and non-residential uses in the Specific Plan Area. Since implementation of the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would result in a net increase in housing, like the proposed project it would not require replacement housing outside the Specific Plan Area. Therefore, impacts under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be *similar* to those of the proposed Specific Plan.

In summary, while the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would result in a different buildout potential, impacts related to population and housing would be *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

5.2.2.12 PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION

As described in Chapter 4.12, Public Services and Recreation, of this Draft EIR, impacts to fire protection services, police services, parks, schools, and libraries, under the proposed Specific Plan, were found to be less than significant. The General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would result in fewer residents and employees to the Specific Plan Area, and therefore, would result in less demand on the public service providers that serve the Downtown and the City of Hayward. Potential future development under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be required to pay developer impact fees and provide their fair-share of parks to help meet the City's target for parkland acres to residents. Overall, impacts under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be *less* than those of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.2.2.13 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

As discussed in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Circulation, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would exceed acceptable level-of-service standards at intersections and roadway segment capacity at some roadway segments in the Specific Plan Area even with implementation of mitigation measures TRANS-1. Implementation of the proposed project would also cause or contribute to impacts on 14 AC Transit bus lines in the area. Impacts related to hazards from design features, emergency access, and conflicting with adopted plans or decrease performance standards, were found to be less than significant.

Under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative, circulation changes proposed under the Specific Plan (including lane/capacity reductions on roads and conversions from one-way roads to two-way roads and other multimodal improvements) would occur, but land use densities would remain consistent with General Plan Buildout and would be less than under the proposed Specific Plan (see Table 5-1). The General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would result in greater VMT per capita than the proposed Specific Plan since the allowable development (infill development and a mix of uses) would not be implemented to the same intensity as the proposed Specific Plan.

Impacts to vehicle operations at Specific Plan Area intersections and on Congestion Management Program segments would be *less* compared to the proposed Specific Plan. While reductions in roadway vehicular capacity would be implemented under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative, vehicle traffic would be lower compared to the proposed Specific Plan due to less intense land use development. Impacts to AC Transit bus operations (specifically, effects of vehicle traffic on mixed flow transit operations) would be *less* under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative compared to the proposed Specific Plan due to fewer intersection and roadway segment operational impacts. Impacts to bicycles and pedestrian and on vehicle traffic on roadways would be *similar* to the proposed Specific Plan since the proposed improvements would be implemented the same as the proposed Specific Plan.

Overall, vehicular traffic impacts on the project site under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be the same as the proposed Specific Plan. These circulation changes, as proposed in the Specific Plan, meet goals and policies identified in the Hayward General Plan. Under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative, these circulation changes would still occur, therefore the circulation impact would be *similar* to the proposed Specific Plan.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

5.2.2.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

As described in Chapter 4.13, Utilities and Service Systems, of this Draft EIR, impacts to sanitary wastewater, solid waste, stormwater infrastructure, and energy conservation, under the proposed Specific Plan, were found to be less than significant. However, impacts to water supply during multiple dry years would not be sufficient water supplies available to serve the proposed future development from existing entitlements and resources. Supplemental water supply sources for the 2040 buildout year of the proposed Specific Plan would be identified and developed by San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). Because SFPUC is the water service provider to the City and the entity that has the ability to mitigate this impact, and because the City does not have jurisdiction over the development of new water supplies, the City cannot guarantee that additional water supplies will be developed, so the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Because the General Plan with Circulation Changes would result in less non-residential and residential development, and thus, overall less water demand, wastewater and solid waste generation and energy use, impacts under the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be *less* than those of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.2.3 RELATIONSHIP TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would not allow for implementation of any of the land use or zoning changes proposed under the proposed Specific Plan and would therefore not comply with any of the land use or zoning related objectives. However, the circulation changes as proposed in the Specific Plan would occur, therefore, the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative meets the following project objectives:

- Propose multimodal enhancements to the circulation network to make Downtown Hayward a more active, safe, and attractive environment to promote walking, biking, and transit as viable alternatives to driving. Improvements include dedicated bicycle lanes with landscaped buffers, shorter blocks, more pedestrian crossings, and returning to a two-way street network.
- Establish a circulation network to serve the needs of Hayward residents and visitors and signal that Downtown is a destination in the San Francisco Bay Area, rather than using the Downtown as a pass-through arterial.
- Replace the roadway pattern in the Specific Plan Area that were made when Foothill Boulevard and Mission Boulevard were engineered into a highway bypass, locally known as “the Loop” to accommodate regional traffic by-passing SR 238 between I-580 and I-880, with two-way streets to simplify navigation, allow for on-street parking and wider sidewalks, slow vehicle speeds and accommodate pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchairs, and create a more attractive, accessible, and inviting Downtown.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

5.3 SPECIFIC PLAN WITHOUT CIRCULATION CHANGES

5.3.1 DESCRIPTION

Under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative, the buildout of the Specific Plan Area would occur as currently proposed in the Specific Plan and the land use and zoning changes of the proposed Specific Plan would be implemented. However, circulation changes of the proposed Specific Plan would not be implemented.

As shown in Table 5-1, the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would allow for the implementation, at maximum, of up to 1.9 million square feet of non-residential space, and 3,427 residential units that would increase the project site's population by 7,539 residents and 6,333 employees.

The differences between the proposed Specific Plan and the General Plan with Circulation Changes Alternative would be incremental and even if no action was taken, regional growth, and the associated environmental effects linked to this growth, would continue to occur under the provisions of the current General Plan.

5.3.2 IMPACT DISCUSSION

The following analysis compares the potentially significant environmental impacts of the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative with those of the project-related impacts for each of the environmental topics analyzed in detail in Chapter 4.1 through Chapter 4.14 of this Draft EIR. The impacts of each alternative are classified as greater, less, or essentially similar to (or comparable to) the level of impacts associated with the proposed Specific Plan.

5.3.2.1 AESTHETICS

Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, describes that the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant aesthetics impacts. The Specific Plan Area where potential future development is expected to occur is concentrated on parcels in the form of infill/intensification on sites either already developed and/or underutilized, and/or in close proximity to existing development, where future development would have a lesser impact on scenic vistas. Under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative, the proposed increases in maximum height would occur, which would result in *similar* impacts to far-field views of the scenic vistas from various vantage points surrounding the Specific Plan Area. Future development under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would not further block or obstruct public views of scenic vistas from within the city or surrounding areas when compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Similar views would continue to be visible between projects and over lower density areas. Considering this and the fact that the Specific Plan Area and surrounding roadways are not considered destination public viewing points nor are they visible from scenic vistas, overall impacts to scenic vistas under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be *similar* to impacts under the proposed Specific Plan.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Development under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be subject to General Plan goals and policies related to design, the *Hayward Landscape Beautification Plan*, and the City's architectural control process (i.e., Site Plan Review), as well as the proposed Development Code and the goals, policies, and programs of the Specific Plan. Future development under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would change the existing visual character on individual sites similar to that of the proposed Specific Plan, compliance with the existing and proposed regulations would ensure that the bulk, mass, height, and architectural character of future development in the Specific Plan Area would be compatible with surrounding uses and would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings. Therefore, associated impacts under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be *similar* to those under the proposed Specific Plan.

Similar to the proposed Specific Plan, the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would result in new lighting sources that could result in sources of glare. Future development under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be required to comply with best management practices and General Plan policies, as well as Municipal Code provisions that ensure new land uses do not generate excessive light levels and reduce light and glare spillover from future development to surrounding land uses. Given that the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative allows for the same level of intensity development of the proposed Specific Plan, impacts related to light or glare would generally be *similar* to those under the proposed Specific Plan.

Overall, the development in the Specific Plan Area under this alternative would be similar and would be guided by the current and proposed regulations that guide development in Hayward, and impacts related to aesthetics would be *similar* to those of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.3.2.2 AIR QUALITY

As described in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with the 2017 Clean Air Plan, would pose no operational community risks or hazards, and would not generate any substantial odors. However, at a program level, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to construction and operation of future development, as well as the cumulative contribution to the non-attainment designations of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin.

The Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would not introduce roadway changes that would improve multimodal transportation options (e.g., walking, biking, and riding transit) in the Specific Plan Area and would result in the same amount of buildout in the Specific Plan Area as the proposed Specific Plan (see Table 5-1). Under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative, because the development potential is the same, the impacts associated with the construction and operation of these land uses would be the same. Keeping the development near the Hayward BART Station would see some of the net benefit gained from siting these land uses near public transit and result in a higher percentage of transit users that may rely on automobiles (as opposed to walking or biking) to and from the Specific Plan Area. However, this Alternative would overall result in higher VMT per capita when compared to the proposed Specific Plan because the reduced vehicle capacity on Specific Plan Area roads (which would encourage other travel modes) would not be implemented. Automobile trips are the major source of criteria air pollutants from the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, while the Specific Plan without

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Circulation Changes Alternative would result the same overall buildout as the proposed Specific Plan, air quality impacts would from the operation of these uses would be considered *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

Same as the proposed Specific Plan, the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative is not the type of project that would result in significant impacts from odor and impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

Overall, because the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would result in the same infill development, but would create a higher VMT per capita, air quality impacts under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.3.2.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

As discussed in Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts to biological resources in the Specific Plan Area. Although future development as proposed under the Specific Plan could have potential to affect animal and plant species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, proposed open space, and adherence to all federal, State, and local regulations relating to biological resources would fully mitigate any potential impacts. Development would be equally intensive under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative, the same area, thus the same species, would be impacted; therefore, impacts to special-status species would be *similar* under both scenarios. The same would be true for impacts related to the riparian corridors in the Specific Plan Area along the San Lorenzo Creek or other wetland areas in Downtown that would have a substantial adverse effect on the riparian corridor and surrounding sensitive communities. Therefore, impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

Future development potential in the Specific Plan Area would occur in urbanized areas where sensitive wildlife resources and important wildlife movement corridors are no longer present because of existing development. Therefore, impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

In summary, impacts to biological resources from potential future development as allowed in the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be *similar* to that of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.3.2.4 CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES

As described in Chapter 4.4, Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would have less-than-significant impacts to known cultural, including historic buildings, and tribal cultural resources that may exist in the Specific Plan Area. The General Plan includes several goals and policies that address preservation and protection of cultural and tribal resources, of which any potential future development would be required to comply. Under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative these potential impacts would be *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

Chapter 4.4 finds that applicable regulations, procedures, and policies would ensure that any human remains discovered during construction allowed by the proposed Specific Plan would be handled appropriately. These regulations, procedures, and policies would be maintained under the Specific Plan

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

without Circulation Changes Alternative, and therefore this Alternative would result in *similar* impacts to human remains when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

In summary, development under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be in the same Specific Plan Area and would be required to comply with all applicable regulations, thus, the potential to impact cultural and tribal cultural resources would be *similar* under both scenarios.

5.3.2.5 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

As described in Chapter 4.5, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would have a less-than-significant impacts related to geology and soils in the Specific Plan Area.

Future development under both the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative and proposed Specific Plan would occur in the same area and would be subject to the same federal, State, and local regulations which address and prevent hazards associated with geology, soils, and seismicity. Compliance with existing regulations related to geologic and seismic safety would apply similarly to both future development under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative and the proposed Specific Plan; therefore, would result in *similar* impacts when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.3.2.6 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

As described in Chapter 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict or obstruct the attainment of any plans adopted for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions. However, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impacts when applying program-level thresholds for the forecast year-2040. With respect to GHG emissions from construction, new buildings constructed would be subject to the triennial updates to California's Building and Energy Efficiency Standards, which would presumably improve over time. With respect to operational impacts, nonresidential buildings (including multifamily that is four stories or higher) will use about 30 percent less energy due mainly to lighting upgrades. New buildings would be more energy efficient, but there would be an overall increase in energy usage due to the magnitude of new building space that would be constructed. While the 2017 Scoping Plan outlines strategies to be on a trajectory to achieve the 2050 target identified under Executive Order S-03-05, it is estimated that the State cannot meet the 2050 goal without major advances in technology. The identification of these program-level impacts does not preclude the finding of less-than-significant impacts for subsequent projects that comply with BAAQMD screening criteria or meet applicable thresholds of significance. Furthermore, under both scenarios when applying plan-level thresholds for forecast year-2040, even though new more energy efficient buildings would be constructed, and major advances in technology are required under both scenarios, because the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would result in the same amount of redevelopment when compared to the proposed Specific Plan GHG emissions from buildings would be *similar*.

Maintaining the same level of development near the BART Station could see the same net benefits gained from siting more intense infill near public transit and result in a higher percentage of transit users that may rely on automobiles (as opposed to walking or biking) to and from the Specific Plan Area. However, the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would not introduce roadway changes that

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

would improve multimodal transportation options (e.g., walking, biking, and riding transit) in the Specific Plan Area. However, this Alternative would overall result in higher VMT per capita when compared to the proposed Specific Plan because the reduced vehicle capacity on Specific Plan Area roads (which would encourage other travel modes) would not be implemented. Automobile use is a major source of GHG emissions from the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, while the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would result in the same overall development as the proposed Specific Plan, GHG emissions impacts from operation would be considered *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

Under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative, future development in the Specific Plan Area would occur under the proposed Specific Plan and Development Code and would introduce infill development in a Priority Development Area near transit. Accordingly, impacts related to consistency with the 2017 Scoping Plan, *Plan Bay Area*, and the City's Climate Action Plan as integrated into the General Plan, would be *similar* under both scenarios.

Overall, because the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would result in the same infill development but would create a higher VMT per capita, impacts from GHG emissions under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be *greater* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.3.2.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

As discussed in Chapter 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of this Draft EIR, there are no sites within the Specific Plan Area that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites. All potential future development allowed under the proposed Specific Plan would be required to comply with all federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to hazards and hazardous materials, as well as the City of Hayward Hillside Design and Urban/Wildfire Interface Guidelines to protect urban development from fire hazards. Accordingly, as discussed the proposed Specific Plan would have a less-than-significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Because future development under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be in the same Specific Plan Area and subject to the same regulatory setting, the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would result in *similar* impacts when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.3.2.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Chapter 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, finds that the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant hydrological impacts. Compliance with existing State and local regulations and procedures would ensure that pre- and post-construction impacts to water quality would be less than significant. These regulations and procedures would be maintained under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative.

Future development under both scenarios would occur within previously urbanized areas and would connect to existing drainage systems already in place and be subject to the same existing federal, State, and local regulations relating to hydrology and water quality, similar to the proposed Specific Plan.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that pre- and post-construction impacts to water quality be minimized as future development occurs. Development under both scenarios would see the benefits of the proposed measures to ensure all future projects would limit the rate and total volume of off-site discharges to the existing levels, which would improve stormwater runoff water quality. Furthermore, the proposed Specific Plan, and therefore, this Alternative, both envisions the use stormwater treatment measures within the public realm, which would improve conditions that currently have no existing stormwater treatment facilities within the public right-of-way (ROW). Accordingly, impacts under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

The Specific Plan Area has a 100-year flood zone near San Lorenzo Creek and a 500-year flood zone along Sulfur Creek. Any potential future development that may occur within these flood zones would be required to stay in compliance with existing local regulations, and compliance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMAs) flood regulations, which would minimize potential flood impacts, under both scenarios. Thus, impacts related to flooding would be *similar*.

Overall, future development under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative and the proposed Specific Plan would be in the same highly urbanized environment and would be subject to existing regulations that limit impacts from water runoff and flooding. Future development under each scenario would benefit from the higher standards for water treatment and impacts would be considered to be *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.3.2.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

As described in Chapter 4.9, Land Use and Planning, of this Draft EIR, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts related to land use and planning.

While the proposed Specific Plan would aim to improve connectivity and would not create physical barriers within existing communities, the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative also supports the integration of infill development and does not propose physical features that could divide a community. Accordingly, impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

Under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative, development would occur throughout the Specific Plan Area under the proposed Specific Plan and Development Code. Because the General Plan Policy LU-2.7 requires the City to develop, maintain, and implement a Specific Plan to establish a vision for Downtown Hayward and to guide and regulate future development and infrastructure improvements, the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would also implement this policy. Accordingly, development under both scenarios would not conflict with any applicable land use plan adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and impacts would be *similar*.

5.3.2.10 NOISE

As described in Chapter 4.10, Noise, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts from construction and operation of future development due to the close proximity of sensitive receptors when evaluated at the plan level.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Future development allowed under the proposed Specific Plan would be subject to the standards of the Hayward Municipal Code and General Plan, including those relating to the interface between residential and non-residential land uses. As specific uses are proposed for particular sites, project-level design, permitting, and/or environmental review would serve to ensure that individual uses would comply with the noise regulations. Future development under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would also be subject to these applicable standards. Impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios in this regard.

The Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would result in equal development, which would result in the same construction and vehicular trip generation. Accordingly, noise generated from trips from the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be the same when compared to the proposed Specific Plan. For this reason, overall noise related impacts from future development under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be *similar* to those of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.3.2.11 POPULATION AND HOUSING

As described in Chapter 4.11, Population and Housing, of this Draft EIR, growth under the proposed Specific Plan is in line with ABAG 2013 regional projections for housing, population, and employment. Therefore, the proposed Specific Plan would have less-than-significant impacts related to population and housing.

The Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would result in the same population and housing; thus, the regional projections would also not be exceeded under this scenario. Furthermore, a policy framework is in place under the proposed Specific Plan and subsequently this Alternative, to ensure adequate planning occurs to accommodate future development. Therefore, impacts under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be *similar* to those under the proposed Specific Plan.

The Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would allow a net increase of residential and non-residential uses in the Specific Plan Area. Since implementation of the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would result in a net increase in housing, like the proposed Specific Plan it would not require replacement housing outside the Specific Plan Area. Therefore, impacts under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be *similar* to those of the proposed Specific Plan.

In summary, while the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would result in a different buildout potential, impacts related to population and housing would be *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.3.2.12 PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION

As described in Chapter 4.12, Public Services and Recreation, of this Draft EIR, impacts to fire protection services, police services, parks, schools, and libraries, under the proposed Specific Plan, were found to be less than significant. The Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would result in the same number of new residents and employees to the Specific Plan Area (see Table 5-1), and therefore, would

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

result in the same level of demand on the public service providers that serve the Downtown and the City of Hayward. Potential future development under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be required to pay developer impact fees and provide their fair-share of parks to help meet the City's target for parkland acres to residents. Overall, impacts under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes would be *similar* than those of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.3.2.13 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

As discussed in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Circulation, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would exceed acceptable level-of-service standards at intersections and roadway segment capacity at some roadway segments in the Specific Plan Area even with implementation of mitigation measures TRANS-1. Implementation of the proposed project would also cause or contribute to impacts on 14 AC Transit bus lines in the area. Impacts related to hazards from design features, emergency access, and conflicting with adopted plans or decrease performance standards, were found to be less than significant.

Under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative, density increases and infill development under the Specific Plan would be implemented, but circulation changes (including lane/capacity reductions on roads and conversions from one-way roads to two-way roads and other multimodal improvements) would not occur. Similar to the proposed Specific Plan, the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would result in reduced VMT per capita due to the increased infill development and mix of uses in the Specific Plan Area. The Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would also result in the benefits of lower VMT per capita. However, this Alternative would result in higher VMT per capita than the proposed Specific Plan since the reduced vehicle capacity on Specific Plan Area roads (which would encourage other travel modes) would not be implemented.

Impacts to vehicle operations at Specific Plan Area intersections and on Congestion Management Program segments would be less compared to the proposed Specific Plan since reductions in roadway vehicular capacity would not be implemented under the Alternative. Impacts to AC Transit bus operations (specifically, effects of vehicle traffic on mixed flow transit operations) would be *less* under this Alternative compared to the proposed Specific Plan due to fewer intersection and roadway segment operational impacts. Impacts to bicycles and pedestrian would be *greater* than the proposed Specific Plan since an increase in vehicle traffic in the area (due to increased development) would not be accompanied by the Specific Plan's improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Overall, vehicular traffic impacts on the project site under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be *less* than that of the proposed Specific Plan. However, the proposed Specific Plan includes goals, policies, and design guidelines, and circulation changes that will improve the mobility of the site, and encourage biking, walking, and taking public transit. These circulation changes, as proposed in the Specific Plan, meet goals and policies identified in the Hayward General Plan. Under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative, these circulation changes would not occur, therefore the circulation impact is considered to be *greater* than the proposed Specific Plan.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

5.3.2.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

As described in Chapter 4.13, Utilities and Service Systems, of this Draft EIR, impacts to sanitary wastewater, solid waste, stormwater infrastructure, and energy conservation, under the proposed Specific Plan, were found to be less than significant. However, impacts to water supply during multiple dry years would not be sufficient water supplies available to serve the proposed future development from existing entitlements and resources. Supplemental water supply sources for the 2040 buildout year of the proposed Specific Plan would be identified and developed by San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). Because SFPUC is the water service provider to the City and the entity that has the ability to mitigate this impact, and because the City does not have jurisdiction over the development of new water supplies, the City cannot guarantee that additional water supplies will be developed, so the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Because the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would result in the same non-residential and residential development, and thus, overall equal water demand, wastewater and solid waste generation and energy use, impacts under the Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would be *similar* to those of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.3.3 RELATIONSHIP TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative would comply with the project objectives aimed at creating a more vibrant downtown, and would not comply with project objectives that regard improvements to the circulation network. The Specific Plan without Circulation Changes Alternative meets the following project objectives:

- Create a Specific Plan that provides for improvements to the public and private realms that enhance the perception of Downtown as a regional destination with a diverse mix of shopping, entertainment, and employment opportunities.
- Provide direction on the physical character, building design, and intensity of Downtown's commercial and residential areas that supports new businesses and promotes transit ridership.
- Provide a strategy for revitalizing Downtown Hayward through strategic infill projects and improvements that capitalize on vacant and underutilized land and the significant assets in the Specific Plan Area.
- Contribute to active, healthy lifestyles by preserving existing parks and open spaces and prioritizing opportunities for new public and private open spaces to provide residents and visitors opportunities for active and passive recreation.
- Improve the appearance of the public realm through requirements to provide street furniture, pedestrian scale lighting, facade renovations, wayfinding signage, and street trees in Downtown.
- Establish three main reinvigorated centers of activity, Mixed-Use Gateway, Station Plaza at BART, and the Southern Downtown Gateway, and target infill projects in the Downtown Core and Downtown Neighborhoods to connect these areas, enhancing the existing historic character and promoting active ground-floor uses.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

- Allow for new mixed-use projects to fill in vacancies and complement park and public spaces, and planned enhancements to existing spaces, such as the library plaza.
- Allow for increased residential and employment populations Downtown to contribute to patronage of businesses throughout the week and weekends and generate greater overall foot traffic and vitality.
- Preserve existing residential neighborhoods to the north and southeast of the Specific Plan Area through improved connections to the commercial core.
- Create a new marketing and branding campaign to highlight the opportunity and potential of living, shopping, and doing business in Downtown to achieve the City's goal as a destination in the Bay Area.
- Create zoning, building, and frontage standards for new development that responds to changing market forces and demographic shifts, support multimodal transportation, and align with the long-term vision for the Specific Plan Area.
- Facilitate the redevelopment of the underutilized portions of the Specific Plan Area with office, retail, residentially-focused mixed-use development, with a flexible mix of uses in the areas immediately surrounding the BART station.

5.4 SPECIFIC PLAN WITH LOWER INTENSITY (30% LESS)

5.4.1 DESCRIPTION

Under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative the proposed Specific Plan would be implemented the same as the proposed project, but the non-residential development potential would be reduced by 30 percent. As shown in Table 5-1, the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would allow for a maximum of up to 1,330,000 square feet of non-residential space, and 3,427 multifamily residential units, which would add 7,539 residents and 4,433 employees to the Downtown.

The differences between the proposed Specific Plan and the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be incremental and even if no action was taken, regional growth, and the associated environmental effects linked to this growth, would continue to occur under the provisions of the current General Plan.

5.4.2 IMPACT DISCUSSION

The following analysis compares the potentially significant environmental impacts of the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative with those of the project-related impacts for each of the environmental topics analyzed in detail in Chapter 4.1 through Chapter 4.14 of this Draft EIR. The impacts of each alternative are classified as greater, less, or essentially similar to (or comparable to) the level of impacts associated with the proposed Specific Plan.

5.4.2.1 AESTHETICS

Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, describes that the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant aesthetics impacts. The Specific Plan Area where potential future development is expected to occur is

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

concentrated on parcels in the form of infill/intensification on sites either already developed and/or underutilized, and/or in close proximity to existing development, where future development would have a lesser impact on scenic vistas. Under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative, the proposed increases in maximum height would occur, albeit with the potential for fewer tall buildings, which would result in *similar* impacts to far-field views of the scenic vistas from various vantage points surrounding the Specific Plan Area. Future development under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would not further block or obstruct public views of scenic vistas from within the city or surrounding areas when compared to the proposed Specific Plan. Similar views would continue to be visible between projects and over lower density areas. Considering this and the fact that the Specific Plan Area and surrounding roadways are not considered destination public viewing points nor are they visible from scenic vistas, overall impacts to scenic vistas under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be *similar* to impacts under the proposed Specific Plan.

Development under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be subject to General Plan goals and policies related to design, the *Hayward Landscape Beautification Plan*, and the City's architectural control process (i.e., Site Plan Review), as well the proposed Development Code and the goals, policies, and programs of the Specific Plan. Future development under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would change the existing visual character on individual sites similar to that of the proposed Specific Plan, compliance with the existing and proposed regulations would ensure that the bulk, mass, height, and architectural character of future development in the Specific Plan Area would be compatible with surrounding uses and would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings. Therefore, associated impacts under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be *similar* to those under the proposed Specific Plan.

Similar to the proposed Specific Plan, the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would result in new lighting sources that could result in sources of glare. Future development under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be required to comply with best management practices and General Plan policies, as well as Municipal Code provisions that ensure new land uses do not generate excessive light levels and reduce light and glare spillover from future development to surrounding land uses. Given that the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative allows for less development than the proposed Specific Plan, impacts related to light or glare would generally be *less* than those under the proposed Specific Plan.

Overall, while the development in the Specific Plan Area under this alternative would be less intense, it would be guided by the current and proposed regulations that guide development in Hayward and the Specific Plan Area. Accordingly, impacts related to aesthetics would be *similar* to those of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.4.2.2 AIR QUALITY

As described in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with the 2017 Clean Air Plan, would pose no operational community risks or hazards, and would not generate any substantial odors. However, at a program level, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to construction and

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

operation of future development, as well as the cumulative contribution to the non-attainment designations of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin.

The Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would introduce roadway changes that would improve multimodal transportation options (e.g., walking, biking, and riding transit) in the Specific Plan Area and would result in slightly less buildout in the Specific Plan Area compared to the proposed Specific Plan (see Table 5-1). Under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative, because the development potential is the less, the impacts associated with the construction and operation of these land uses would be the *less*. Keeping the development near the Hayward BART Station would see some of the net benefit gained from siting these land uses near public transit and result in a higher percentage of transit users that may rely on automobiles (as opposed to walking or biking) to and from the Specific Plan Area. Additionally, this Alternative would overall result in higher VMT per capita when compared to the proposed Specific Plan because of the 30 percent reduction in non-residential development. While automobile trips are the major source of criteria air pollutants from the proposed Specific Plan, this Alternative would still have the benefits of more intensive infill combined with the roadway changes that facilitate multimodal transportation in the Specific Plan Area. Therefore, operational air quality impacts are considered *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

Same as the proposed Specific Plan, the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative is not the type of project that would result in significant impacts from odor and impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

Overall, because the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would result in intensive infill development and would include multimodal transportation infrastructure improvements, air quality impacts under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.4.2.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

As discussed in Chapter 4.3, Biological Resources, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts to biological resources in the Specific Plan Area. Although future development as proposed under the Specific Plan could have potential to affect animal and plant species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, proposed open space, and adherence to all federal, State, and local regulations relating to biological resources would fully mitigate any potential impacts. While development would be slightly less under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative, the same area, thus the same species, would be impacted; therefore, impacts to special-status species would be *similar* under both scenarios. The same would be true for impacts related to the riparian corridors in the Specific Plan Area along the San Lorenzo Creek or other wetland areas in Downtown that would have a substantial adverse effect on the riparian corridor and surrounding sensitive communities. Therefore, impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

Future development potential in the Specific Plan Area would occur in urbanized areas where sensitive wildlife resources and important wildlife movement corridors are no longer present because of existing development. Therefore, impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

In summary, impacts to biological resources from potential future development as allowed in the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be *similar* to that of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.4.2.4 CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES

As described in Chapter 4.4, Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would have less-than-significant impacts to known cultural, including historic buildings, and tribal cultural resources that may exist in the Specific Plan Area. The General Plan includes several goals and policies that address preservation and protection of cultural and tribal resources, of which any potential future development would be required to comply. Under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative these potential impacts would be *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

Chapter 4.4 finds that applicable regulations, procedures, and policies would ensure that any human remains discovered during construction allowed by the proposed Specific Plan would be handled appropriately. These regulations, procedures, and policies would be maintained under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative, and therefore this Alternative would result in *similar* impacts to human remains when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

In summary, development under the Lower Intensity Alternative would be in the same Specific Plan Area and would be required to comply with all applicable regulations, thus, the potential to impact cultural and tribal cultural resources would be *similar* under both scenarios.

5.4.2.5 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

As described in Chapter 4.5, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would have a less-than-significant impacts related to geology and soils in the Specific Plan Area.

Future development under both the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative and proposed Specific Plan would occur in the same area and would be subject to the same federal, State, and local regulations which address and prevent hazards associated with geology, soils, and seismicity. Compliance with existing regulations related to geologic and seismic safety would apply similarly to both future development under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative and the proposed Specific Plan; therefore, would result in *similar* impacts when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.4.2.6 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

As described in Chapter 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict or obstruct the attainment of any plans adopted for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions. However, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impacts when applying program-level thresholds for the forecast year-2040. With respect to GHG emissions from construction, new buildings constructed would be subject to the triennial updates to California's Building and Energy Efficiency Standards, which would presumably improve over time. With respect to operational impacts, nonresidential buildings (including multifamily that is four stories or higher) will use about 30 percent less energy due mainly to lighting upgrades. New buildings would be more energy efficient, but there would be an overall increase in energy usage due to the magnitude of

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

new building space that would be constructed. While the 2017 Scoping Plan outlines strategies to be on a trajectory to achieve the 2050 target identified under Executive Order S-03-05, it is estimated that the State cannot meet the 2050 goal without major advances in technology. The identification of these program-level impacts does not preclude the finding of less-than-significant impacts for subsequent projects that comply with BAAQMD screening criteria or meet applicable thresholds of significance. Furthermore, under both scenarios when applying plan-level thresholds for forecast year-2040, even though new more energy efficient buildings would be constructed, and major advances in technology are required under both scenarios, because the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would result in less redevelopment when compared to the proposed Specific Plan GHG emissions from buildings would be *less*.

Maintaining a similar level of infill development near the BART Station would see net benefits gained from siting more intense infill near public transit and result in a higher percentage of transit users that may rely on automobiles (as opposed to walking or biking) to and from the Specific Plan Area. Additionally, the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would introduce roadway changes that would improve multimodal transportation options (e.g., walking, biking, and riding transit) in the Specific Plan Area. Additionally, this Alternative would overall result in higher VMT per capita when compared to the proposed Specific Plan because of the 30 percent reduction in non-residential development. While automobile trips are the major source of criteria air pollutants from the proposed Specific Plan, this Alternative would still have the benefits of more intensive infill combined with the roadway changes that facilitate multimodal transportation in the Specific Plan Area. Therefore, operational GHG emissions impacts would be considered *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

Under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative, future development in the Specific Plan Area would occur under the proposed Specific Plan and Development Code and would introduce infill development in a Priority Development Area near transit. Accordingly, impacts related to consistency with the 2017 Scoping Plan, *Plan Bay Area*, and the City's Climate Action Plan as integrated into the General Plan, would be *similar* under both scenarios.

Overall, because the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would result in intensive infill development and would include multimodal transportation infrastructure improvements, GHG emissions impacts under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.4.2.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

As discussed in Chapter 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of this Draft EIR, there are no sites within the Specific Plan Area that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites. All potential future development allowed under the proposed Specific Plan would be required to comply with all federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to hazards and hazardous materials, as well as the City of Hayward Hillside Design and Urban/Wildfire Interface Guidelines to protect urban development from fire hazards. Accordingly, as discussed the proposed Specific Plan would have a less-than-significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Because future development under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be in the same Specific Plan Area and subject to the same regulatory setting, the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would result in *similar* impacts when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.4.2.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Chapter 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, finds that the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant hydrological impacts. Compliance with existing State and local regulations and procedures would ensure that pre- and post-construction impacts to water quality would be less than significant. These regulations and procedures would be maintained under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative.

Future development under both scenarios would occur within previously urbanized areas and would connect to existing drainage systems already in place and be subject to the same existing federal, State, and local regulations relating to hydrology and water quality, similar to the proposed Specific Plan. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that pre- and post-construction impacts to water quality be minimized as future development occurs. Development under both scenarios would see the benefits of the proposed measures to ensure all future projects would limit the rate and total volume of off-site discharges to the existing levels, which would improve stormwater runoff water quality. Furthermore, the proposed Specific Plan, and therefore, this Alternative, both envisions the use stormwater treatment measures within the public realm, which would improve conditions that currently have no existing stormwater treatment facilities within the public right-of-way (ROW). Accordingly, impacts under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

The Specific Plan Area has a 100-year flood zone near San Lorenzo Creek and a 500-year flood zone along Sulfur Creek. Any potential future development that may occur within these flood zones would be required to stay in compliance with existing local regulations, and compliance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMAs) flood regulations, which would minimize potential flood impacts, under both scenarios. Thus, impacts related to flooding would be *similar*.

Overall, future development under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative and the proposed Specific Plan would be in the same highly urbanized environment and would be subject to existing regulations that limit impacts from water runoff and flooding. Future development under each scenario would benefit from the higher standards for water treatment and impacts would be considered to be *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.4.2.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

As described in Chapter 4.9, Land Use and Planning, of this Draft EIR, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in less-than-significant impacts related to land use and planning.

While the proposed Specific Plan would aim to improve connectivity and would not create physical barriers within existing communities, the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative also supports the

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

integration of infill development and does not propose physical features that could divide a community. Accordingly, impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios.

Under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative, development would occur throughout the Specific Plan Area under the proposed Specific Plan and Development Code. Because the General Plan Policy LU-2.7 requires the City to develop, maintain, and implement a Specific Plan to establish a vision for Downtown Hayward and to guide and regulate future development and infrastructure improvements, the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would also implement this policy. Accordingly, development under both scenarios would not conflict with any applicable land use plan adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and impacts would be *similar*.

5.4.2.10 NOISE

As described in Chapter 4.10, Noise, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts from construction and operation of future development due to the close proximity of sensitive receptors when evaluated at the plan level.

Future development allowed under the proposed Specific Plan would be subject to the standards of the Hayward Municipal Code and General Plan, including those relating to the interface between residential and non-residential land uses. As specific uses are proposed for particular sites, project-level design, permitting, and/or environmental review would serve to ensure that individual uses would comply with the noise regulations. Future development under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would also be subject to these applicable standards. Impacts would be *similar* under both scenarios in this regard.

The Specific Plan Buildout with Lower Intensity Alternative would result in less development, which would result in less construction and vehicular trip generation. Accordingly, noise generated from trips from the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be *less* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan. For this reason, overall noise related impacts from future development under the Lower Intensity would be *less* to those of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.4.2.11 POPULATION AND HOUSING

As described in Chapter 4.11, Population and Housing, of this Draft EIR, growth under the proposed Specific Plan is in line with ABAG 2013 regional projections for housing, population, and employment. Therefore, the proposed Specific Plan would have less-than-significant impacts related to population and housing.

The Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would result in the less population and housing; thus, the regional projections would also not be exceeded under this scenario. Furthermore, a policy framework is in place under the proposed Specific Plan and subsequently this Alternative, to ensure adequate planning occurs to accommodate future development. Therefore, impacts under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be *similar* to those under the proposed Specific Plan.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would allow a net increase of residential and non-residential uses in the Specific Plan Area. Since implementation of the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would result in a net increase in housing, like the proposed Specific Plan it would not require replacement housing outside the Specific Plan Area. Therefore, impacts under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be *similar* to those of the proposed Specific Plan.

In summary, while the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would result in a different buildout potential, impacts related to population and housing would be *similar* when compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.4.2.12 PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION

As described in Chapter 4.12, Public Services and Recreation, of this Draft EIR, impacts to fire protection services, police services, parks, schools, and libraries, under the proposed Specific Plan, were found to be less than significant. The Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would result in fewer new residents and employees to the Specific Plan Area (see Table 5-1), and therefore, would result in the less demand on the public service providers that serve the Downtown and the City of Hayward. Potential future development under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be required to pay developer impact fees and provide their fair-share of parks to help meet the City's target for parkland acres to residents. Overall, impacts under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be *similar* than those of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.4.2.13 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

As discussed in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Circulation, of this Draft EIR, the proposed Specific Plan would exceed acceptable level-of-service standards at intersections and roadway segment capacity at some roadway segments in the Specific Plan Area even with implementation of mitigation measures TRANS-1. Implementation of the proposed project would also cause or contribute to impacts on 14 AC Transit bus lines in the area. Impacts related to hazards from design features, emergency access, and conflicting with adopted plans or decrease performance standards, were found to be less than significant.

Under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative, the development potential proposed under the Specific Plan would be reduced by 30 percent. Circulation changes proposed under the Specific Plan (including lane/capacity reductions on roads and conversions from one-way roads to two-way roads and other multimodal improvements) would be implemented. Similar to the proposed Specific Plan, the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would result in reduced VMT per capita due to the increased infill development and mix of uses in the Specific Plan area as well as the circulation changes; this Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would also result in the benefits of lower VMT per capita. However, this Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would result in higher VMT per capita than the proposed Specific Plan due to lower infill development density.

Impacts to vehicle operations at Specific Plan Area intersections and on Congestion Management Program segments would be less compared to the proposed Specific Plan. While reductions in roadway vehicular capacity would be implemented under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative, vehicle traffic would be less compared to the proposed Specific Plan due to lower development intensity. Impacts to AC

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Transit bus operations (specifically, effects of vehicle traffic on mixed flow transit operations) would be less under this Alternative compared to the proposed Specific Plan due to fewer intersection and roadway segment operational impacts. Impacts to bicycles and pedestrian would be less than the proposed Specific Plan since the Specific Plan's improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be implemented and vehicle traffic on Specific Plan Area roads would be less compared to the proposed Specific Plan.

Overall, vehicular traffic impacts on the project site under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be similar to that of the proposed Specific Plan. These circulation changes, as proposed in the Specific Plan, meet goals and policies identified in the Hayward General Plan. Under the General Plan Buildout with Circulation Changes Alternative, these circulation changes would still occur, therefore the circulation impact would be *similar* to the proposed Specific Plan.

5.4.2.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

As described in Chapter 4.13, Utilities and Service Systems, of this Draft EIR, impacts to water, sanitary wastewater, solid waste, stormwater infrastructure, and energy conservation, under the proposed Specific Plan, were found to be less than significant. Because the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would result in the less non-residential and residential development, and thus, overall less water demand, wastewater and solid waste generation and energy use, impacts under the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would be *less* when compared to those of the proposed Specific Plan.

5.4.3 RELATIONSHIP TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would generally meet all the project objectives because it would implement the proposed Specific Plan with slightly less non-residential development.

5.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

In addition to the discussion and comparison of impacts of the proposed Specific Plan and the alternatives, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an "environmentally superior" alternative be selected and the reasons for such a selection be disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the least environmental impact. Identification of the environmentally superior alternative is an informational procedure and the alternative selected may not be the alternative that best meets project objectives.

As shown in Table 5-2, the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would have similar impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, geology and soils, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, population and housing, public services and recreation, and transportation and circulation. The Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative would not create greater impacts than the proposed Specific Plan in these topic areas. Additionally, this Alternative would result in fewer impacts with respect to roadway noise and demand on public service providers and water supply. For these reasons, the Specific Plan with Lower Intensity Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This page intentionally left blank.