Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan

Final Program EIR

SCH# 2011042076

Pinedale Court Neighborhood Center

City of Hayward
Development Services Department
777 B Street, Hayward, CA 94541

September 2013

LAMPHIER-GREGORY
URBAN PLANNING, ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS & PROJECT MANAGEMENT | www.lamphier-gregory.com

CONTENTS

Page

Chapter 24: Introduction to the Final EIR.....24-1
Purpose of the Final EIR 24-1
EIR Review Process 24-1
EIR Organization.....24-2

Chapter 25: Revisions to the Specific Plan & Draft EIR 25-1
Specific Plan Revisions 25-1
EIR Revisions.....25-6

Chapter 26: Response to Comments 26-1
List of Comments on the Draft EIR.....26-1
Response to Comments 26-4

Chapter 27: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.....27-1
Introduction 27-1
MMRP 27-3

Appendices

Appendices A through E can be found in the Draft EIR

This page intentionally left blank

24

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE FINAL EIR

This document, combined with the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) published in April 2013, constitutes the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) prepared for the proposed Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (the "Project") in the City of Hayward, California. This EIR has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as amended (commencing with Section 21000 of the California Public Resources Code), and the CEQA Guidelines. The Lead Agency for the Project is the City of Hayward. Lamphier-Gregory, Inc. and their subconsultants Kittelson & Associates, Inc., H.T. Harvey and Associates, Illingworth & Rodkin, William Self Associates, ENGEO, and BKF Engineers prepared the EIR for the Lead Agency.

EIR REVIEW PROCESS

Draft EIR

A Draft EIR was made available for public review in April 2013 and distributed to local and state responsible and trustee agencies. The general public was advised of the availability of the Draft EIR through public notice in the newspaper and by mail for those in the vicinity of the project area. During the public review period for the Draft EIR (starting Monday, April 12, 2013 and ending Friday, May 28, 2013), the City received three (3) sets of written comments from public agencies.

Publicly noticed meetings to receive comments on the Draft EIR were conducted on May 16, 2013 before the Hayward City Council and May 23, 2013 before the Hayward Planning Commission. No written comments on the Draft EIR were received at either of those meetings. Though verbal comments were received from members of the public, City Council members and Planning Commissioners, they did not pertain to the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

Final EIR

This Final EIR was issued on July 18, 2013. It contains all comments received by the City on the Draft EIR and also includes responses to these comments, together with necessary changes or revisions to the text of the Draft EIR document. Changes to the text of the Draft EIR are included in this Final EIR at Chapter 25, shown in underline for new text or strikeout for deleted text.

This Final EIR will be presented to the Hayward Planning Commission at a public hearing on September 19, 2013. The Planning Commission will provide a recommendation as to the Final EIR's technical adequacy and provision of full disclosure to the City Council. The tentative hearing date for the City Council's consideration of the Final EIR is October 22, 2013.

Assuming that the City Council acts to certify this EIR as complete and adequate under the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this document together with the Draft EIR will

constitute the EIR for this Project. The City Council may require additional changes or modifications to this Final EIR prior to certification.

Certification of the EIR does not constitute approval of the Project. The EIR, if certified, will be used as an informational document by the Planning Commission and/or City Council when making future decisions whether to grant specific project approvals.

REPORT ORGANIZATION

This Final EIR consists of the following chapters, commencing after Chapter 23 of the Draft EIR:

- **Chapter 24: Introduction to the Final EIR**. This chapter outlines the purpose, organization and scope of the Final EIR document and important information regarding the public review and approval process.

- **Chapter 25: Revisions to the Specific Plan & Draft EIR**. This chapter includes corrections, clarifications or additions to text contained in the Specific Plan and Draft EIR based on comments received during the public review period.

- **Chapter 26: Comments on the Draft EIR and Responses**. This chapter provides reproductions of letters received from public agencies and the public on the Draft EIR. The comments are numbered in the margins. The responses to comments are also provided in this chapter immediately following each comment letter, and are keyed to the numbered comments.

- **Chapter 27: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.** A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of State law (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6) and CEQA Guidelines. A MMRP, which identifies timing of implementation and monitoring responsibility for each mitigation measure, is required to be adopted when mitigation measures are required to avoid or reduce significant environmental effects of a proposed project.

NO NEW SIGNIFICANT INFORMATION

If significant new information is added to a Draft EIR after notice of public review has been given, but before certification of the Final EIR, the lead agency must issue a new notice and re-circulate the Draft EIR for further comments and consultation.[1] Although Chapter 25 (Revisions to Specific Plan and Draft EIR) contains corrections and clarifications to the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan and information presented in the Draft EIR, none of these corrections or clarifications constitute "significant new information" as defined under Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. More specifically:

- No new significant environmental impacts have been identified as resulting from the Project or from a new mitigation measure.

- No substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified environmental impact has been identified as resulting from the Project or from a new mitigation measure, and no additional mitigation measures are necessary to reduce such impacts to a level of insignificance.

[1] *Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California*, 6 Cal 4th 112, (1993)

- There is no feasible alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed in the Draft EIR that would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the Project that the Project's proponents decline to adopt.

- The Draft EIR was not so fundamentally or basically inadequate or conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

Information presented in the Draft EIR and this document support the City's determination that recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required.

USE OF THE FINAL EIR

Pursuant to CEQA, this is a public information document for use by governmental agencies and the general public. The information contained in this Final EIR is subject to review and consideration by the City of Hayward, prior to its decision to approve, reject or modify the proposed Project. The City of Hayward City Council must ultimately certify that it has reviewed and considered the information in the EIR and that the EIR has been completed in conformity with the requirements of CEQA before making any decision of the proposed Project.

This page intentionally left blank

25

REVISIONS TO SPECIFIC PLAN & DRAFT EIR

SPECIFIC PLAN REVISIONS

The following are text changes, additions or modification made to the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan (minor clarifications or revisions are not identified below). None of these changes constitute significant new information within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines §15088.5 nor do they affect the conclusions of the Draft Program EIR. Deletions are noted by ~~strikethrough~~; additions are <u>underlined</u>. Where entire paragraphs have been substantially changed, the location of the previous text is noted and the new text is listed in whole.

Global Changes

- Since publication of the Draft EIR, the Specific Plan has been reformatted in order to increase its legibility and provide a more user-friendly reading experience. Examples of reformatting tasks completed include, but are not limited to, the following: new headers/footers, consistent pagination, correction of typographical errors and incorrect number of figures and tables, consistent font size/type, reordering of the acknowledgements and corrections due to staff and elected/appointed official changes, figures have been reoriented and resized, orphan text has relocated to keep bullet lists and paragraphs intact, and dates have been added where necessary. None of these changes materially or substantively affect the Project analyzed in the Draft EIR.

Changes to Chapter 1: Introduction

Page 1-2, 1.2 (Planning Area)

- The first paragraph under this heading has been revised to include current population estimates from the Association of Bay Area Governments. This revision does not alter the Project's estimated population and employment quantities.

Page 1-6, 1.4.1 (Synoptic Survey)

- All of the text under this subheading has been revised to read as follows, "The consultant team prepared a synoptic survey of the Specific Plan area. The synoptic survey is a tool used by urban designers and planners to measure the physical elements of a community, such as the perimeter length of blocks, lot widths, building types, frontage types and street widths. The expression "synoptic survey" is taken from scientific analysis of the natural world, where cross-section diagrams illustrate the elements of natural environments – from the canopy above down to the soil below. By applying these techniques to the urban environment, a deeper understanding of the physical components of the community may be gained. In this particular case, the synoptic survey also included a careful review of the existing zoning districts, overlays and other standards, regulated land uses and permits, and the decision-making process for the planning area."

Page 1-7, 1.4.4 (Environmental Review)

- All of the text under this subheading has been revised to read as follows, "Adoption and implementation of the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan requires changes to General Plan designations and zoning districts within the plan area. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, a program level Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared to assess the potential environmental effects of those changes. All potentially significant impacts identified in the EIR may be reduced to less than significant levels through the application of mitigation measures provided therein. It is anticipated that additional environmental review will occur as individual development approvals are requested in the future. It is further envisioned the EIR will be used as the basis for any further environmental analyses and documentation concerning those future land entitlement requests."

Page 1-8, 1.5.2 (Findings of Consistency with the General Plan)

- All of the text under this subheading has been relocated to Chapter 2 (Vision and Goals) under subheading 2.1 (Relationship to General Plan), as noted below.

Page 1-10, 1.5.2.7 (Public Utilities and Services)

- All of the following text in the second paragraph has been deleted, "~~Under State law, general plans are not immutable and may be amended up to four times every year (and those amendments may be comprehensive in nature). The existing City of Hayward General Plan was adopted in 2002. In the subsequent 8 years, the General Plan has already been amended several times. To be consistent with the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specif c Plan, the General Plan Land Use Map is being updated.~~"

Changes to Chapter 2: Vision and Goals

Page 2-1, 2.1 (Introduction)

- The text under this heading has been revised to read, "Chapter 2 of the Hayward General Plan ("Land Use Element") describes how the City's Planning Area is composed of certain neighborhoods (see General Plan Figure 2-2), including the Mission/Foothills and North Hayward neighborhoods, and further designates, among other things, certain significant Focus Areas (see General Plan Figure 2-3) for the implementation of Smart Growth principles. The Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan and its Form-Based Code component implement such principles for portions of the Mission Boulevard Corridor. Additionally, the Specific Plan is also consistent and will further the following General Plan goals, as described below."

  Each of the "findings" previously located at subheading 1.5.2.1 through 1.5.2.7 have been relocated to this section under subheadings 2.1.1 through 2.1.7.

Page 2-2, 2.2 (For the Community)

- The text under this heading has been relocated to subheading 2.1.1 (For the Community) and supplemented with the following introductory sentence, "At the community scale, the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan and Form-Based Code seek to ensure that:" The "that" preceding each bullet-point under the prior heading of 2.2 has been deleted.

Page 2-3, 2.3 (For the Transect)

- The text under this heading has been relocated to subheading 2.1.2 (For the Transect) and supplemented with the following introductory sentence, "At the neighborhood scale, the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan and Form-Based Code seek to ensure that:" The "that" preceding each bullet-point under the prior heading of 2-3 has been deleted.

Page 2-4, 2.4 (For the Block and Building)

- The text under this heading has been relocated to subheading 2.1.3 (For the Block and Building) and supplemented with the following introductory sentence, "At the block scale, the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan and Form-Based Code seek to ensure that:" The "that" preceding each bullet-point under the prior heading of 2-4 has been deleted.

Changes to Chapter 3: Regulating Plan

Page 3-1, 3.1 (Introduction)

- The paragraph under this heading has been revised to read, "The Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan establishes a Regulating Plan to delineate those areas subject to regulation by the Plan and its Form-Based Code component (see Chapter 4). The Regulating Plan, shown in Figure 3.1, is also the zoning map that identifies the different Transect Zones within the Mission Boulevard Corridor. The Regulating Plan also shows Thoroughfare Types and Special Requirements for all areas subject to the Specific Plan."

Page 3-1, 3.2 (Special Requirements)

- The text under this heading has been revised to read, "The Regulating Plan designates the following standards and special requirements:

    1. Height Overlay Areas: These designations indicate areas where the height of buildings are modified from the underlying Transect Zone.

    2. Commercial Overlay Areas: These designations indicate areas where residential is not allowed on the first floor of development.

    3. Mandatory Shopfront Frontage: These designations require that a building shall provide a commercial shopfront at sidewalk level along the entire length of its private frontage. The shopfront shall be no less than 70% glazed in clear glass and shaded by an awning overlapping the sidewalk as generally illustrated in Table 5.

    4. Recommended Shopfront Frontage: These designations indicate that a building should provide a commercial shopfront at sidewalk level along the entire length of its private frontage. Where provided, the shopfront shall be no less than 70% glazed in clear glass and shaded by an awning overlapping the sidewalk as generally illustrated in Table 5.

    5. Terminated Vista: These locations indicate that the building should be provided with architectural articulation of a type and character that responds visually to the location, as approved by the review authority. A building located at a Terminated Vista designated on the Regulating Plan should be designed in response to the axis through the use of color, material, massing and height

such that visual orientation along the axis is improved and a prominently visible destination is established.

The Regulating Plan also establishes the following Transect Zones within the Mission Boulevard Corridor:

T3 Sub-Urban

T4-1 General Urban 1

T4-2 General Urban 2

T5 Urban Center

Each of these Transect Zones has a distinct character as outlined in Table 1 (Transect Zone Description) in Chapter 4.

Page 3-1, 3.3 (Transect Zones)

- The paragraph under this heading has been revised to read, "All areas shown within the Regulating Plan boundaries shall be subject to the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan and Form-Based Code. The Transect Zones are hereby established and shall be shown on the Regulating Plan for the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan and Form-Based Code area."

Page 3-1, 3.4 (Civic Space Zone)

- The paragraph under this heading has been revised to read, "The Regulating Plan also establishes the Civic Space (CS) Zone. The purpose of the CS Zone is to provide designated areas for public open space, civic buildings and civic uses."

Page 3-1, 3.5 (Thoroughfare Plans)

- The paragraph under this heading has been revised to read, "In addition to the Regulating Plan, the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan also establishes a Thoroughfare Plan and a New Thoroughfare Plan are shown in Figures 3-2 and 3-3. The Form-Based Code (see Chapter 4) provides details on proposed upgrades to existing thoroughfares and proposed standards for new thoroughfares within the Specific Plan area."

Page 3-2, Figure 3-1 (Regulating Plan)

- The Commercial Overlay area has been removed from the western portion of the parcel located north of Dollar Street at Torrano Avenue.

- The Height Overlay has been extended north of A Street to include areas designated Civic Space Zone.

Changes to Chapter 4: Form-Based Code

Page 4-1, 4.1 (Introduction to the Form-Based Code)

- The text under this heading has been revised as follows, "The preceding chapters of this Specific plan provide the vision and policies for new development and redevelopment within the Mission

Boulevard Corridor. Under this vision, the scale and general character of new development and redevelopment are intended to be based on the traditional elements of Hayward's historic development as well as the preference of current residents and their elected representatives.

Chapter 4 introduces a Form-Based Code that is intended to ensure that the vision and goals of the Specific Plan are implemented. This Form-Based Code will be adopted as Chapter 10, Article 25 of the City of Hayward Municipal Code and may be used as a stand alone document. It replaces the underlying zoning districts and portions of the Zoning Ordinance applicable to the Mission Bouelvard Corridor Specific Plan area.

The Form-Based Code is designed to be used both as a set of rules for property owners and their designers – to allow them to understand from the outset the parameters that the community has set for development in the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan area – and also as a framework and systematic checklist for the City's use as it plans its investments in capital projects and evaluates the design of proposed building projects. This will improve the quality of design proposals that the City receives and the value of the City's cumulative investment in the public realm.

The Form-Based Code essentially provides a system or "kit" of parts and instructions for ensuring that the design of private development and the design of the public realm (i.e., streets, sidewalks, open space, etc.) are rigorously coordinated and focused on the common goal of creating a safe and lively pedestrian experience. The long-term result will be neighborhoods based directly on the preferences of the community as expressed through a public design charrette, workshops and meetings. The Form-Based Code will ensure that the scale and character of the parts are complementary and connected to one another."

Page SC7, Section 10-25.135(b) (Minimum Requirements)

- This section has been deleted.

Page SC11 through SC95

- Each standard qualifying for a warrant or exception has been identified by "[W]" or "[E]," as appropriate and as previously listed at Section 10-25.410 (Variances: Warrants and Exceptions).

Page SC12, Section 10-25.220(c)

- Language added indicating planning application fees will be waived for non-residential projects entailing dedication of land for Civic Spaces.

Page SC34, Section 10-25.275(h)(ii)

- Language added indicating planning application fees will be waived for non-residential projects entailing dedication of land for Civic Spaces.

Page SC49, Table 2 (SL-40-20-BR)

- Table and graphic modified to include different dimensions and also indicate area required for dedication.

Page SC50, Table 2 (SL-48-28-BR)

- Table and graphic modified to include different dimensions and also indicate area required for dedication.

Changes to Chapter 5: Infrastructure Plan

Page 5-15 and 5-16

- The last paragraph on Page 15-15 which carries over to Page 15-16 is revised as follows, "Additional collectors west of Mission Boulevard will help to connect the new smaller sized parcels together and minimize the need to access Mission Boulevard for circulation among the parcels. The planning area south of Jackson Street and west of Mission Boulevard will include a new parallel local internal street network from Harder Road to Jackson Street that will provide almost continuous access and circulation for autos, bikes and pedestrians. This is accomplished by connecting the existing streets with an extension from Dollar Street to O'Neill Avenue in the south sector and Fletcher Lane to Groom Street in the north sector, thus providing almost continuous access for the entire planning area. This new access combined with compatible mixed land uses would help to reduce traffic and reliance on Mission Boulevard and potentially minimize impacts to signalized and unsignalized cross street intersections. The plan includes new slip lanes parallel to Mission Boulevard in three locations that will provide additional access and improved circulation to land uses fronting Mission Boulevard with the benefit of reduced travel speeds, improved safety, and additional commercial parking situated off the main street. The eastern planning will include new connections to Carlos Bee Boulevard that will join two disconnected areas to the east of Mission Boulevard. The new thoroughfares connecting to Carlos Bee Boulevard will require more detailed traffic analysis ~~during the EIR~~ <u>in the future with related development applications</u> to determine whether these new intersections will need signal or stop control and whether traffic should exist with full access, or limited by right-in and right-out control."

EIR REVISIONS

The following are minor text changes, additions or modification made to the Draft EIR for the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan. An explanation of the changes made in response to comments can be found in Chapter 26 (Response to Comments). Deletions are noted by ~~strikethrough~~; additions are <u>underlined</u>.

Changes to Chapter 19: Transportation

Page 19-2, Mission Boulevard

- At the fourth paragraph, the following text is inserted after the first sentence, "<u>Per an agreement between Caltrans and the City of Hayward, the city will accept relinquishment of State Route 185 from A Street north to the city limit and of State Route 238 from Industrial Boulevard south to the city limit.</u>"

Changes to Chapter 22: Alternatives

Page 22-78, Table 22-1 (EIR Alternatives)

- At the first row (i.e., Cross-section for Mission Blvd (North of A Street), under the column labeled "Proposed Project," the text is revised as follows, "Install four (4) foot wide landscape median, reduce parking lane lanes from eight (8) feet to seven (7) feet, reduce sidewalks from <u>eleven (11) to</u>

ten (10) feet ~~to nine (9) feet~~, ~~maintain~~ reduce existing interior travel lanes from eleven (11) feet to ten (10) feet. (See Figure~~s 3-11 to~~ 3-14 of EIR)."

- At the second row (i.e., Building heights and Zoning designation North of A Street), under the column labeled "Proposed Project," the text is revised as follows, "T5 Zone on properties fronting A Street; remainder with T4-1 Zone and Height Overlay (2 to 3 stories)."

- At the seventh row (i.e., Commercial Overlay between Berry Ave. and Harder Rd.), under the column labeled "Alternative 'B'," the text is revised as follows, "Commercial Overlay only at intersection of Carlos Bee and Mission Blvds."

26

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

List of Comments on the Draft EIR

Public Agencies Commenting In Writing

The following is a list of written correspondence received by the City of Hayward from various public agencies, providing comments on the Draft EIR for the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan EIR:

- Comment #1: Governor's Office of Planning and Research – Letter from Scott Morgan, Director, dated May 29, 2013.
- Comment #2: California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) – Letter from Erik Alm, District Branch Chief, Local Government – Intergovernmental Review, dated May 28, 2013.
- Comment #3: Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) – Letter from Beth Walukas, Deputy Director of Planning, dated May 6, 2013.

Commenters at Public Hearings

Publicly noticed meetings to receive comments on the Draft EIR were conducted on May 16, 2013 before the Hayward City Council and May 23, 2013 before the Hayward Planning Commission. No written comments on the Draft EIR were received at either of those meetings. Though verbal comments were received from members of the public, City Council members and Planning Commissioners, they did not pertain to the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE *of* PLANNING AND RESEARCH

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR

KEN ALEX
DIRECTOR

May 29, 2013

RECEIVED
MAY 31 2013
Development Services Department

David Rizk
City of Hayward
777 B Street
Hayward, CA 94541

Subject: Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan
SCH#: 2011042076

Dear David Rizk:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on May 28, 2013, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

> "A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

1-1

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

1400 10th Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044
(916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH#	**2011042076**
Project Title	Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan
Lead Agency	Hayward, City of

Type	**EIR** Draft EIR
Description	This project consists of a Specific Plan which includes a Form-Based Code and Economic Stra covering properties along the northern portion of the Mission Boulevard Corridor from Harder R the northern City limit with the exception of the Downtown. The project area comprises approxi 600 parcels on 240 acres and has a total length of approximately two (2) miles. Implementatio Specific Plan will include concurrent general plan amendments and rezones.

Lead Agency Contact

Name	David Rizk		
Agency	City of Hayward		
Phone	510 583 4004	***Fax***	
email			
Address	777 B Street		
City	Hayward	***State*** CA	***Zip*** 94541

Project Location

County	Alameda			
City	Hayward			
Region				
Lat / Long				
Cross Streets	Mission Blvd. (North & South of Downtown Hayward)			
Parcel No.				
Township		***Range***	***Section***	***Base***

Proximity to:

Highways	Hwy 238, 580, 880
Airports	Hayward Executive
Railways	BART
Waterways	San Lorenzo Creek
Schools	Multiple
Land Use	Multiple

Project Issues	Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Miner Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; S Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumul Effects
Reviewing Agencies	Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 3; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Com Department of Water Resources; Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 4; Department of Housing and Community Development; Air Resources Boar Transportation Projects; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 2; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Native American Heritage Commission; State Lands Commission

Date Received	04/12/2013	***Start of Review***	04/12/2013	***End of Review***	05/28/2013

Responses to Comment #1

Governor's Office of Planning and Research; May 29, 2013

Response 1-1: This letter acknowledges receipt of the Draft Program EIR and states that the City of Hayward complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents. This letter does not speak to the adequacy of the Draft EIR. No further response is required.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AGENCY EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
111 GRAND AVENUE
P. O. BOX 23660
OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660
PHONE (510) 286-6053
FAX (510) 286-5559
TTY 711

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

RECEIVED
MAY 31 2013
Development Services Department

May 28, 2013

ALAVAR011
SCH#2011042076

Mr. David Rizk
City of Hayward
777 B Street
Hayward, CA 94541

Dear Mr. Rizk:

Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan – Draft Environmental Impact Report

Thank you for continuing to include the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan. The following comments are based on the Draft Environmental Impact Report .

Improvements to State Facilities
The proposed project will significantly increase residential, commercial and office square footage and will negatively impact the adjacent state facilities that are already operating at poor levels of service. To ensure the safety of the traveling public, please include a statement of how the City of Hayward (City) will mitigate these impacts and finance improvements on State facilities generated from the proposed plan. Although facility expansion is limited within the City's boundaries, Caltrans currently has a number of unfunded projects that would improve highway and safety operations. We look forward to coordinating with the City to develop and fund these improvement projects. 2-1

State Roadway Relinquishment
Per Caltrans and the City's relinquishment agreement, the City will accept relinquishment of State Route (SR-) 185 from "A" Street north to the City limit and of SR-238 from Industrial Boulevard south to the City limit. Please revise page 19-2 accordingly. 2-2

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please call Yatman Kwan, AICP of my staff at (510) 622-1670.

Sincerely,

ERIK ALM, AICP
District Branch Chief
Local Development - Intergovernmental Review

c: State Clearinghouse

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

Responses to Comment #2

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans); Erik Alm, District Branch Chief; May 28, 2013

Response 2-1: This comment states that the project will significantly increase residential, commercial, and office square footage and will negatively impact the adjacent state facilities that are already operating at poor levels of service. The comment requests a statement of how the City of Hayward will mitigate the alleged impact and finance improvements of State facilities.

This comment does not identify any particular state facility that is presently or projected in a future year to operate at an unacceptable level of service. The comment also does not identify any particular aspect of the Project (e.g., roadway, intersection, planned new thoroughfare) that is alleged to adversely affect a state facility. California Public Resources Code §21104(c) requires that comments from a responsible agency such as the California Department of Transportation shall be supported by specific documentation.

Table 3-1 of the Draft EIR described the build-out assumptions for the Project and which indicates an increase in both residential dwelling units and commercial floor area when compared to existing conditions. Chapter 19 (Transportation) of the Draft EIR analyzes the potential impacts of the Project on roadways, intersections, public transit systems, and bicycle and pedestrian systems. That analysis includes consideration of the following state facilities: Interstate 880 (I-880), Interstate 580 (I-580), State Route 92, and State Route 185. As noted in the response below, portions of State Route 185 and State Route 238 will be relinquished to the City of Hayward. At the time of completing this EIR, ownership of the portion of Mission Boulevard north of A Street had not yet been transferred to the City of Hayward.

The Draft EIR analyzed two (2) intersections (Mission/A Street and Mission/Sunset) within State Route 185 and found potentially significant impacts that could be mitigated to a less than significant level (See Page 19-40 to 19-41, Page 19-48 to 19-50). The Draft EIR also analyzed the Project's potential effects on the regional transportation system, inclusive of the state facilities mentioned above, in accordance with the local Congestion Management Program (See Pages 19-52 to 19-62) and found the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

Response 2-2: This comment asks that the Draft EIR include mention of an agreement between the California Department of Transportation and City of Hayward relative to the relinquishment of certain state facilities within the City of Hayward. As mentioned in Chapter 25 (Revisions to the Specific Plan and Draft EIR), the requested edit has been made.

ALAMEDA County Transportation Commission
1333 Broadway, Suites 220 & 300 ▪ Oakland, CA 94612 ▪ PH: (510) 208-7400
www.AlamedaCTC.org

May 6, 2013

David Rizk, Director
Development Services Department
City of Hayward
777 B Street
Hayward, CA 94541

SUBJECT: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan

Dear Mr. Rizk:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan. The Project's northern segment extends from the northern City boundary (just north of Rose Street) south to A Street. The southern segment of the Project area extends from Jackson Street south to Harder Road. Between these two segments, the Specific Plan excludes lands associated with downtown Hayward. The Mission Boulevard Specific Plan intends to provide opportunities for new development in the Mission Boulevard Corridor that respects the existing character of the area and its surroundings, and includes vibrant commercial uses, pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods that are safe, desirable, and at sufficient densities to support public transportation, and a built form that will encourage such uses, and complements the natural and historic amenities existing in the Specific Plan area. The Project, at full build out, would result in an increase of 3,452 p.m. peak hour trips over the existing land uses in the Project Area.

The Alameda CTC respectfully submits the following comments:

- The Infrastructure Plan (Hall Alminana, Inc., April 23, 2013) notes on page 5-15 that the Regulating Plan includes "a new street system of thoroughfares to complement Mission Boulevard and also to provide alternative routing and access." The new thoroughfares are essential to the Plan's vision as they will create new, smaller parcels that are more conducive to mixed-use, transit-oriented development and provide improved connectivity for all modes. The Plan further notes on page 5-16 that "the new thoroughfares connecting to Carlos Bee Boulevard will require more detailed traffic analysis during the EIR to determine whether these new intersections will need signal or stop control and whether traffic should exit with full access, or limited by right-in and right-out control." This analysis was not included as part of the DEIR. The DEIR should include analysis of this and all other new thoroughfares, as needed. The analysis of new connections to Carlos Bee Boulevard should take into account that this facility is part of the Countywide Bike Network, and should ensure that the control and access at any new intersections enable safe, comfortable travel by cyclists on this facility. 3-1

May 6, 2013
Page 2

- The Mission Boulevard Corridor Parking and Transportation Demand Management Strategy which forms a component of the Specific Plan identifies a number of promising recommendations for supporting and advancing the Plan's overall goals. Of these, only the Recommendation to eliminate parking minimums is present in the Form-Based Code. Consideration should be given to whether it is possible to implement other recommendations as part of the zoning amendments being made through the Form-Based Code, rather than through separate, discretionary actions. The recommendation to unbundle parking, in particular, could enable projects built as part of the Specific Plan to truly take advantage of the reduced parking provision requirements in the Form-Based Code, without increasing costs to developers. 3-2

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this Draft EIR. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (510) 208-7400 or Matthew Bomberg of my staff at (510) 208-7444 if you require additional information.

Sincerely,

Beth Walukas
Deputy Director of Planning

Cc: Matthew Bomberg, Assistant Transportation Planner

File: CMP – Environmental Review Opinions – Responses - 2013

Responses to Comment #3

Alameda County Transportation Commission; Beth Walukas, Deputy Director of Planning; May 6, 2013

Response 3-1: This comment requests that the Draft EIR be revised to include detailed analysis of the proposed intersections of new thoroughfares with existing thoroughfares. It also makes mention of the inclusion of Carlos Bee Avenue on the Countywide Bike Network and states that bicyclist safety and comfort should be ensured.

The Specific Plan has been revised, as indicated in Chapter 25, to omit reference to the intent to provide detailed study of the intersection of new thoroughfares with Carlos Bee Avenue. It was not the City's intent to provide a detailed review of each proposed new intersection since detailed designs for such intersections have not been prepared. The City of Hayward intended for the Draft EIR to provide a programmatic analysis of proposed new thoroughfares only.

As stated on Page 19-66 of the Draft EIR, the analysis of detailed designs for the intersection of new thoroughfares with all existing thoroughfares would occur through the City's already-established Precise Plan Lines for Streets process codified at Chapter 10, Article 4 of the Municipal Code. Such a review will include thorough study of a detailed design including factors relating to traffic control devices, pedestrian and bicyclist safety, and turn movements.

Response 3-2: This comment encourages the City of Hayward to enact additional parking and transportation demand management measures included in the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan. The City of Hayward appreciates the suggestion and is presently weighing options on how to best pursue transportation demand management both within and outside of the Project area.

This page intentionally left blank

27

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) is based on the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan ("Project") in the City of Hayward.

This MMRP is in compliance with CEQA Guidelines §15097, which requires that the Lead Agency "adopt a program for monitoring or reporting on the revisions which it has required in the project and the measures it has imposed to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects." The MMRP lists mitigation measures recommended in the EIR and identifies mitigation monitoring requirements.

The following Table presents the mitigation measures identified in the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan EIR necessary to mitigate potentially significant impacts. Each mitigation measure is numbered according to the section of the EIR from which it is derived. For example, Mitigation Measure Traf-1 is the first mitigation measure identified in the Traffic and Circulation chapter of the EIR.

- The first column indicates the environmental impact as identified in the EIR,
- The second column identifies the mitigation measure (MM) applicable to that impact,
- The third column identifies the monitoring schedule or timing,
- The fourth column names the party responsible for monitoring the required action, and
- The fifth column, "Monitoring Procedure," outlines the steps for monitoring the action identified in the mitigation measure or condition of approval.

This page intentionally left blank

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
Chapter 6: Air Quality				
(Air Quality) Impact Air-2: Siting of Sensitive Receptors Near Highway Emissions and Related Risks. Development anticipated under the Project would bring additional sensitive uses (which could include residences, schools, day care centers, playgrounds, and medical facilities) to sites exposed to increased health risks from vehicle emissions from Mission Boulevard (State Highway 238). However, the application of a BAAQMD recommended "Highway Overlay Zone" would ensure the Project would result in a Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	**(Air Quality) Mitigation Measure Air-2a**: Highway Overlay Zone. The Project shall include an overlay zone extending five-hundred (500) feet from Mission Boulevard and W. Jackson Street. Future development projects within that overlay zone shall adhere to the indoor and exterior air quality measures below. <u>Indoor Air Quality</u>: In accordance with the recommendations of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), measures shall be incorporated into the project design in order to reduce the potential health risk due to exposure to diesel particulate matter to achieve an acceptable interior air quality level for sensitive receptors. The measures shall include one of the following methods: (a) Development project applicants shall implement all of the following features that have been found to reduce the air quality risk to sensitive receptors and shall be included in the project construction plans. These features shall be submitted to the Development Services Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of a demolition, grading, or building permit and shall be maintained on an ongoing basis during operation of the project. For sensitive uses (residences, schools, day care centers, playgrounds, and medical facilities) sited within an overlay zone, the applicant shall install, operate and maintain in good working order a central heating and ventilation (HV) system or other air intake system in the building, or in each individual unit, that meets or exceeds an efficiency standard of MERV 13. The HV system shall include the following features: Installation of a high efficiency filter and/or carbon filter to filter particulates and other chemical matter from entering the building. Either HEPA filters or ASHRAE 85% supply filters shall be used. Project applicants shall maintain, repair and/or replace HV system on an ongoing and as needed	On-going, throughout life of Project	Hayward Planning Division for overlay zone; individual project developers for indoor/exterior air quality measures	Apply overlay zone to qualifying projects; Review and approve plans including required measures; inspection during construction to ensure implementation

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
	basis or shall prepare an operation and maintenance manual for the HV system and the filter. The manual shall include the operating instructions and the maintenance and replacement schedule. This manual shall be included in the CC&Rs for residential projects and/or distributed to the building maintenance staff. In addition, the applicant shall prepare a separate homeowners manual. The manual shall contain the operating instructions and the maintenance and replacement schedule for the HV system and the filters. (b) Alternative to (a) above, a project applicant proposing siting of sensitive uses (residences, schools, day care centers, playgrounds, and medical facilities) within an overlay zone shall retain a qualified air quality consultant to prepare a health risk assessment (HRA) in accordance with CARB and the Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment requirements to determine the exposure of project residents/occupants/users to air polluters prior to issuance of a demolition, grading, or building permit. The HRA shall be submitted to the Development Services Department for review and approval. The applicant shall implement the approved HRA recommendations, if any. If the HRA concludes that the air quality risks from nearby sources are at or below acceptable levels, then measures outlined under item (a) are not required. <u>Exterior Air Quality</u>: (c) To the maximum extent practicable, individual and common exterior open space proposed as a part of developments in the Project area, including playgrounds, patios, and decks, shall either be shielded from the source of air pollution by buildings or otherwise buffered to further reduce air pollution for project occupants. (d) Alternative to (c) above, an HRA could be prepared and implemented to take into account the risk specifics of the site, as more fully described in item (b) above.			

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
	(Air Quality) Mitigation Measure Air-2b: Toxic Air Contaminants – Stationary Sources. The location and potential air contaminants associated with stationary sources present at the time of this EIR's preparation may change over time. Similarly, new stationary sources may be established. Therefore, this mitigation measure provides a dynamic buffer zone to ensure toxic air contaminants from all existing and future stationary sources do not result in unacceptable health risks. The provisions below shall apply to all future development under the Project occurring within five-hundred (500) feet of any stationary source, existing at the time of EIR preparation or subsequently established, and which exceeds the applicable BAAQMD individual source or cumulative threshold: (a) All new development proposals shall be evaluated to determine whether they are within five-hundred (500) feet of a stationary source exceeding the thresholds cited above. (b) Development proposals located within the five-hundred (500) foot radius of a stationary source exceeding threshold shall adhere to the indoor and exterior air quality measures of Mitigation Measure Air-2, including the option to complete a HRA.			
Chapter 7: Biological Resources				
(Biological Resources) Impact Bio-3: (Impacts to Pallid Bats). During future construction projects that implement the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan that include tree removal and/or building demolition, it is possible that pallid bat roosts could be adversely impacted. However, the use of preconstruction surveys to determine the presence or absence of Pallid Bats, in conjunction with avoidance and creation of alternate habitat in the event of discovery, would ensure the Project would result in a Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	**(Biological Resources) Mitigation Measure Bio-3a**: (Pre-demolition Surveys and Buffer Zones). A pre-demolition survey for roosting bats will be conducted prior to any removal of buildings or trees ≥12 inches in diameter at 4.5 ft. above grade. The survey will be conducted by a qualified bat biologist (i.e., a biologist holding a CDFG collection permit and a Memorandum of Understanding with CDFG allowing the biologist to handle and collect bats). No activities that would result in disturbance to active roosts shall proceed prior to the completed surveys. If no active roosts are found, then no further action would be warranted. If a pallid bat roost is present, Mitigation Measures Bio-3b shall be implemented. **(Biological Resources) Mitigation Measure Bio-3b**:	On-going, throughout life of Project	Individual project developers	Receive and review survey; apply Mitigation Measure Bio-3b through Bio-3d if pallid bats found.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
	(Avoidance). If an active pallid bat maternity roost is found, the project shall be redesigned to avoid the loss of the building or tree occupied by the roost, if feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, Mitigation Measures 3c and 3d shall be implemented. If the roost is a non-maternity roost, then avoidance is not necessary, but Mitigation Measure 3c shall be implemented to avoid the injury or mortality of individual pallid bats. **(Biological Resources) Mitigation Measure Bio-3c**: (Exclude Pallid Bats Prior to Demolition of Roosts). If an active pallid bat roost will be impacted, demolition of that tree or structure will commence before maternity colonies form (i.e., prior to March 1) or after young are volant (flying) (i.e., after July 31). A disturbance-free buffer zone, the extent of which shall be determined by a qualified bat biologist based on site-specific conditions, will be observed during the maternity roost season (March 1–July 31) Bats may be evicted during the period August 1-October 31, or November 1-February 28 only during prolonged periods of warm conditions. Bats shall not be evicted on rainy nights or nights when temperatures are predicted to be less than 50 degrees F. The individuals shall be safely evicted under the direction of a qualified bat biologist by opening the roosting area to allow air flow through the cavity. Demolition should then follow no sooner than the following day (i.e., there should be no less than one night between initial disturbance for air flow and the demolition). This action will allow bats to leave during dark hours, thus increasing their chance of finding new roosts with a minimum of potential predation during daylight. Trees with roosts that need to be removed will first be disturbed at dusk, just prior to removal that same evening, to allow bats to escape during the darker hours. **(Biological Resources) Mitigation Measure Bio-3d**: (Provide Alternative Pallid Bat Roost). If a tree or structure containing a pallid bat maternity roost is to be removed by the proposed Project, a qualified biologist shall design and determine an appropriate location for an alternative roost structure. The qualified biologist			

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
	will determine the appropriate location for the alternative roost structure based on the location of the original roost and the habitat conditions in the vicinity. The roost structure will be built to specifications as determined by the qualified biologist, or it may be purchased from an appropriate vendor. The structure will be placed as close to the impacted roost site as feasible. The project applicant will monitor the roost for up to three years (or until occupancy is determined, whichever occurs first) to determine use by bats. If by Year 3 pallid bats are not using the structure, a qualified bat biologist, in consultation with the CDFG, will identify alternative roost designs or locations for placement of the roost.			
(Biological Resources) Impact Bio-5: (Impacts to Special-status Plants). The agricultural/ruderal grassland, wetland, and riparian habitats within the Project area may provide habitat for plants considered special-status by the USFWS, CDFG, or CNPS. Future development pursuant to the Specific Plan could adversely impact special-status plants and their associated habitats. However, with implementation of preconstruction surveys to determine absence or presence and, if discovered the avoidance, preservation or provision of compensatory mitigation, would ensure the Project would result in a Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	**(Biological Resources) Mitigation Measure Bio-5a**: (Conduct Special-status Plant Surveys in Locations Where Project Activities Are Proposed to Occur in Natural Areas). Prior to approving construction in any of the areas mapped as agricultural/ruderal grassland, wetland, or riparian habitat in the Project Area, the project proponent shall be required to hire a qualified biologist to conduct focused surveys during the published blooming period for the Santa Cruz tarplant, Johnny nip, fragrant fritillary, and Diablo helianthella. The locations and specific habitat requirements of each of these species are outlined in the Biological Resources Report prepared for the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan EIR. **(Biological Resources) Mitigation Measure Bio-5b**: (Determine CEQA Significance for Potential Impacts). After protocol-level floristic surveys are completed, a species-specific determination of potential significance will be conducted for each plant species by a qualified plant ecologist, using the results of the Project Area survey and existing databases. Due to the regional rarity of the one species (Santa Cruz tarplant) that is listed under the federal and California Endangered Species Act, if this species is found to be present, any adverse effects on this species will be considered potentially significant. If activities will result in the loss of any Santa Cruz tarplants found within the proposed work area, the impact will be deemed	On-going, throughout life of Project	Individual project developers	Receive and review survey; apply Mitigation Measure Bio-5b through Bio-5d if special-status plant species identified

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
	significant and unmitigable. Implementation of the avoidance component of Mitigation Measure 5c shall be implemented for such impacts. As described earlier, the only remaining documented occurrences of this species are from Santa Cruz and Monterey counties, although the plant was known at one time on coastal terraces of the Bay Area. The discovery of this federally threatened and state endangered plant in the Project Area would represent a substantial finding requiring protection. If any other CNPS-listed plant species are found within or directly adjacent to the proposed work area, the impact will be deemed less than significant and no further mitigation will be required if activities will result in either: (1) the loss of less than 5 percent of the known individuals documented as occurring within 50 mi of the impact location; or (2) if the total number of individuals is unknown, the loss of less than 5 percent of the known populations. Such an impact would be considered less than significant because regional populations will remain abundant following Project implementation and the Project will not substantially reduce the number or range of these species. If such activities will result in loss of more than 5 percent of the known populations or individuals of these species documented as occurring within 50 mi of the impact location, this impact is determined to be significant. It is likely that if found, impacts to small populations of List 4 species such as Johnny nip would be considered less than significant. These plant species are widely distributed, with many known, extant populations occurring in many counties. In other cases, the species are considered to be more rare but the amount of suitable habitat present on-site is limited, meaning that any potentially present populations are likely to be small in size and, therefore, impacts to these would likely also be less than significant. However, impacts to populations of more restricted, rare, or declining species are likely to be considered significant unless mitigated. Finally, for those species that have a potential to occur on-site as a large population due to the abundance of potentially suitable habitat, impacts to a large population			

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
	of so-called "watch-list" (i.e., CNPS List 3 and 4) species may be considered significant unless mitigated. For any special-status plant for which it is determined that Project activities may result in a significant impact, the following mitigation measure will be implemented. **(Biological Resources) Mitigation Measure Bio-5c**: (Avoid and Preserve Special-status Plants). To the extent feasible, construction activities will avoid impacts to known special-status plant populations on site. All Santa Cruz tarplants and populations of CNPS-listed plants (for which a determination of significance has been determined under Mitigation Measure 5b) that are to be avoided shall be protected by a permanent buffer zone established prior to site grading. The buffer for any special-status plants on site shall be established at 50 ft. from the perimeter of the population or the individual plants unless otherwise agreed upon by a qualified botanist retained by the City. With implementation of this component of this mitigation measure, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. **(Biological Resources) Mitigation Measure Bio-5d**: (Compensatory Mitigation). If avoidance of the CNPS-listed plants (for which a determination of significance has been determined) is not feasible, mitigation shall be provided via the preservation, enhancement, and management of occupied habitat for the affected species. Habitat that supports the species that are impacted shall be preserved and managed in perpetuity. The mitigation habitat shall be of equal or greater habitat quality compared to the impacted areas, as determined by a qualified botanist, in terms of soil features, extent of disturbance, vegetation structure, and dominant species composition, and will contain at least as many individuals of the impacted species as are impacted by Project activities. The permanent protection and management of mitigation lands shall be ensured through an appropriate mechanism, such as a conservation easement or fee title purchase. A Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) will be developed and implemented for the mitigation lands. That plan will include, at a minimum, the following			

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
	information: • A summary of habitat impacts and the proposed mitigation • A description of the location and boundaries of the mitigation site and description of existing site conditions • A description of measures to be undertaken to enhance (e.g., through focused management) the mitigation site for the focal special-status species • A description of measures to transplant individual plants or seeds from the impact area to the mitigation site, if appropriate (which will be determined by a qualified botanist) • Proposed management activities to maintain high-quality habitat conditions for the focal species • A description of habitat and species monitoring measures on the mitigation site, including specific, objective final and performance criteria, monitoring methods, data analysis, reporting requirements, monitoring schedule, etc. • Contingency measures for mitigation elements that do not meet performance criteria Alternatively, mitigation could be provided by contributing funds to an entity, such as the East Bay Regional Parks District, that would be used specifically to enhance and manage habitat supporting the species for which mitigation is needed. Such enhancement and management would be performed in accordance with the HMMP contents listed above.			
(Biological Resources) Impact Bio-6: (Indirect Impacts to Water Quality and Sensitive Habitats). Construction activities pursuant to the Specific Plan could result in indirect effects on water quality and sensitive aquatic and wetland habitats in and near the Project area. (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)	**(Biological Resources) Bio-6a:** (Incorporate Best Management Practices for Water Quality During Construction). The Project will incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) for water quality. These BMPs will include numerous practices that will be outlined in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), but will include measures such as: 1. No equipment will be operated in live flow in any of the channels or ditches on or adjacent to the	On-going, throughout life of Project	Individual project developers	Receive and review SWPPP, inspect during construction to ensure implementaton

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
	Project Area. 2. No debris, soil, silt, sand, bark, slash, sawdust, cement, concrete, washings, petroleum products or other organic or earthen material shall be allowed to enter into or be placed where it may be washed by rainfall or runoff into aquatic or wetland habitat. 3. Standard erosion control and slope stabilization measures will be required for work performed in any area where erosion could lead to sedimentation of a waterbody. For example, silt fencing will be installed just outside the limits of grading and construction in any areas where such activities will occur upslope from, and within 50 ft. of, any wetland, or aquatic habitat. This silt fencing will be inspected and maintained regularly throughout the duration of construction. 4. Machinery will be refueled at least 50 ft. from any aquatic habitat, and a spill prevention and response plan will be developed. All workers will be informed of the importance of preventing spills and of the appropriate measures to take should a spill occur. **(Biological Resources) Mitigation Measure Bio-6b**: (Minimize Soil Disturbance Adjacent to Wetland Habitat). To the extent feasible, soil stockpiling, equipment staging, construction access roads, and other intensively soil-disturbing activities will not occur immediately adjacent to any wetlands that are to be avoided by the project. The limits of the construction area will be clearly demarcated with Environmentally Sensitive Area fencing to avoid inadvertent disturbance outside the fence during construction activities. (Biological Resources) Mitigation Measure Bio-6c: (Ensure Adequate Stormwater Run-off Capacity). Increases in stormwater run-off due to increased hardscape will be mitigated through the construction and maintenance of features designed to handle the expected increases in flows and provide adequate energy dissipation. All such features, including outfalls, will be regularly maintained to ensure continued function and			

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
	prevent failure following construction.			
(Biological Resources) Impact Bio-7: (Impacts to Sensitive Plant Communities and Habitats). Approximately 1 acre of riparian and 0.2 acres of aquatic and wetland habitats have been identified in the Project area and may be affected by construction activities pursuant to the Specific Plan. (Less Than Significant with Mitigation)	**(Biological Resources) Mitigation Measure Bio-7a**: (Delineate Riparian, Aquatic, and Wetland Boundaries). Prior to any ground disturbing activities that could potentially have direct impacts on riparian, aquatic, or wetland habitats, a focused delineation will be performed to determine the precise limits of these habitats within the project Area. **(Biological Resources) Mitigation Measure Bio-7b**: (Impact Avoidance/Minimization). Future project elements shall be designed to avoid and minimize impacts to these sensitive habitats to the extent practicable while still accomplishing project objectives. **(Biological Resources) Mitigation Measure Bio-7c**: (Restoration of Temporarily Impacted Wetland/Aquatic Habitats). Riparian, aquatic, or wetland habitats that are temporarily impacted during construction of specific development projects shall be restored to pre-existing contours and levels of soil compaction following build-out. The means by which such temporarily impacted areas will be restored shall be detailed in the mitigation plan described in Mitigation Measure 7d below. **(Biological Resources) Bio-7d**: (Compensation for Permanently Impacted Riparian, Wetland and Aquatic Habitats). Unavoidable permanent fill of riparian, wetland, and aquatic habitats shall be mitigated at a minimum ratio of 1:1 (mitigation area: impact area) by creation or restoration of similar habitat. Mitigation may be achieved through a combination of on-site restoration or creation of riparian, wetland, or aquatic habitats (including removal of on-site fill or structures that results in a gain of wetland or aquatic habitats); off-site restoration/creation; funding of off-site restoration/creation projects implemented by others; and/or mitigation credits purchased at mitigation banks within the San Francisco Bay Region. For funding of off-site improvements or purchase of mitigation bank credits, the Project Proponent shall provide written evidence to the City that either: (1)	On-going, throughout life of Project	Individual project developers	Receive and review wetland/riparian area survey; apply Mitigation Measure Bio-7b through Bio-7d if wetland and/or riparian areas identified

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
	compensation has been established through the purchase of a sufficient number of mitigation credits in a mitigation bank to satisfy the mitigation acreage requirements of the Project activity; or (2) funds sufficient for the restoration of the mitigation acreage requirements of the Project activity have been paid to an entity implementing a project that would create or restore habitats of the type being impacted by the project. For areas to be restored as mitigation for temporary or permanent impacts, the project applicant shall prepare and implement a mitigation plan. The project applicant shall retain a qualified restoration ecologist or wetland biologist to develop the mitigation plan, which shall contain the following components (or as otherwise modified by regulatory agency permitting conditions): • Summary of habitat impacts and proposed mitigation ratios, along with a description of any other mitigation strategies used to achieve the overall mitigation ratios, such as funding of off-site improvements and/or purchase of mitigation bank credits • Goal of the restoration to achieve no net loss of habitat functions and values • Location of mitigation site(s) and description of existing site conditions • Mitigation design: • Existing and proposed site hydrology • Grading plan if appropriate, including bank stabilization or other site stabilization features • Soil amendments and other site preparation elements as appropriate • Planting plan • Irrigation and maintenance plan • Remedial measures / adaptive management, etc. • Monitoring plan (including final and performance criteria, monitoring methods, data analysis,			

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
	reporting requirements, monitoring schedule, etc.) • Contingency plan for mitigation elements that do not meet performance or final success criteria.			
Chapter 8: Cultural Resources				
(Cultural Resources) Impact Culture-2: Disturbance of Unidentified Archaeological Resources. During earth-moving activities relating to future construction projects which implement the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan, construction at private property or within the public right-of-way may encounter yet unidentified prehistoric and historic archaeological resources. However, adherence to the Hayward Historic Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 10, Article 11) including, in particular, the adoption and use of an archaeological sensitivity map for the Project area, would ensure Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation would result.	**Culture-2a: Adoption of Archaeological Resource Sensitivity Map**. The City of Hayward shall adopt the archaeological sensitivity map found within the September 2012 "Archaeological Resources Assessment Report for the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan EIR, Alameda County, California" prepared by William Self Associates. **Culture-2b: Utilization of Archaeological Resource Sensitivity Map**. Projects within the Project area shall comply with the Historic Preservation Ordinance for the City of Hayward as set forth in Chapter 10 Article 11 of the Hayward Municipal Code and use the archaeological sensitivity maps provided as Appendix A: Figures 8, 9, and 10 to the September 2012 "Archaeological Resources Assessment Report for the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan EIR, Alameda County, California" prepared by William Self Associates.	On-going, throughout life of Project	City of Hayward for adoption of the sensitivity map; Individual project developers for compliance with Municipal Code	Adopt the sensitivity map in accordance with the Historic Preservation Ordinance; apply the provisions of Chapter 10, Article 11 to individual, qualifying development projects.
(Cultural Resources) Impact Culture-3: Disturbance of Unique Paleontological Resource or Geologic Feature. During earth-moving activities relating to future construction projects which implement the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan, construction at private property or within the public right-of-way may encounter undiscovered paleontological resources or unique geologic feature; in particular, those which involve deep excavations. The Project would, however, result in a Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation when unanticipated discoveries are addressed through appropriate documentation and	**Culture-3: Construction shall halt in the Event of Unanticipated Discovery of Paleontological Resources**. In the event of unanticipated discoveries paleontological resources, the project sponsor shall promptly notify the City and retain a qualified paleontologist who shall document the discovery as needed, evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the find under the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of a brea (a seep of natural petroleum that preserved and fossilized remains of trapped animals) or of fossils during construction, excavations within fifty (50) feet of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist (per Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (SVP 2010). The paleontologist shall notify the City, including all other appropriate agencies, to determine procedures that	On-going, throughout life of Project	Individual project developers	Halt construction in the event of unanticipated discovery of resources; compliance with CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 in the event of discovery.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
evaluation under CEQA §15064.5.	would be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the City determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of the project on the qualities that make the resource important, and such plan shall be implemented. The plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval.			
(Cultural Resources) Impact Culture-4: Disturbance of Unidentified Human Remains. During earth-moving activities relating to future construction projects which implement the Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan, construction at private property or within the public right-of-way may encounter undiscovered human remains. However, adherence to California Health and Safety Code §7050.5(b), would ensure Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation would result.	**Culture-4: Adherence to California Health and Safety Code §7050.5(b).** If human remains, or possible human remains, are encountered during future project-related construction activities, Section 7050.5(b) of the California Health and Safety code must be implemented. Section 7050.5(b) states: "In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined, in accordance with Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 27460) of Part 3 of Division 2 of Title 3 of the Government Code, that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27492 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of death, and the recommendations concerning treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. The County Coroner, upon recognizing the remains as being of Native American origin, is responsible to contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. The Commission has various powers and duties, including the appointment of a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to the project. The MLD, or in lieu of the MLD, the NAHC, has the responsibility to provide guidance as to the ultimate disposition of any Native American remains."	On-going, throughout life of Project	Individual project developers	Halt construction in the event of unanticipated discovery of remains; compliance with Health & Safety code §750.5(b) in the event of discovery.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
Chapter 11: Hazards				
(Hazards & Hazardous Materials) Impact Haz-2: (Upset or Accident Hazards). With increased population and construction activity anticipated in the Project area under the Project, the number of residents and workers who could potentially be exposed to hazardous materials which may already be present at some sites would increase. However, requiring pre-development site assessments would ensure the Project results in a Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.	**(Hazards & Hazardous Materials) Mitigation Measure Haz-2**: (Require Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessments for Development Projects). Prior to development/re-development of properties located within the Project area, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall be performed to assess any potential risks of hazardous material release to the property or the environment due to any previous land uses. This Phase I environmental site assessment will determine the likelihood of the presence of hazards and/or hazardous materials and determine whether construction activities on the building site will lead to a release of hazardous material.	On-going, throughout life of Project	Individual project developers	Preparation of Phase I and adherence to recommendations.
Chapter 12: Hydrology & Water Quality				
(Hydrology & Water Quality) Impact Hyd-1: (Short-term, Construction-Related Water Quality Impacts). Future construction activities in the Project area could lead to exceedance of water quality objectives or criteria. However, adherence to local and state water quality control requirements would ensure no significant impact results. (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)	**(Hydrology) Mitigation Measure Hyd-1**: Compliance with City Water Quality Requirements and State NPDES Construction General Permit. All construction activities, including installation and realignment of utilities, would be subject to existing regulatory requirements, including the SWRCB statewide NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit) (Order No. 2009 0009-DWQ, NPDES No. CAR000002). The NPDES Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP must list BMPs that the discharger will use to protect stormwater runoff, including the placement and timing of those BMPs. Additionally, the SWPPP must contain a visual monitoring program; and a chemical monitoring program for "non-visible" pollutants to be implemented if there is a failure of BMPs.	On-going, throughout life of Project	Individual project developers for SWPPP preparation; City of Hayward Building Division for inpsections	Compliance with SWPPP in accordance with NPDES permit; inspection during construction to ensure compliance.
(Hydrology & Water Quality) Impact Hyd-2: (Long-term, Post-Construction Water Quality Impacts). Operational impacts associated with increased development under the Project could adversely affect water quality and lead to a violation of an applicable standard.	**(Hydrology) Mitigation Measure Hyd-2**: Compliance with NPDES Permit Requirements, City Ordinances and ACCWP Guidelines. All development must comply with the California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit (MS4 Permit), City of Hayward Storm Water Management and Urban Runoff	On-going, throughout life of Project	Individual project developers for SWPPP preparation; City of Hayward Building Division for inpsections	Compliance with SWPPP in accordance with NPDES permit; inspection during construction to ensure compliance.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
However, adherence to local and state water quality control requirements would ensure no significant impact results. (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)	Control Ordinance, and Alameda County Clean Water Program(ACCWP) Guidelines.			
(Hydrology & Water Quality) Impact Hyd-4: (Stormwater System Capacity). Future development within the Project area may create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems but would not provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. However, through the submittal of site-specific drainage plans and, where necessary, modifications to the existing stormwater facilities or construction of new facilities would ensure no significant impact would result under this criterion. (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)	**(Hydrology) Mitigation Measure Hyd-4**: (Site-specific Drainage Plans). Site-specific drainage plans shall be prepared for all future construction within the Project area prior to approval of a grading permit, or a building permit in the event a grading permit is not required. Each report shall include a summary of existing (pre-project) drainage flows from the project site, anticipated increases in the amount and rate of stormwater flows from the site and an analysis of the ability of downstream facilities to accommodate peak flow increases. The analysis shall also include a summary of new or improved drainage facilities needed to accommodate stormwater increases. Each drainage plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City Public Works Director prior to approval of a grading or building permit.	On-going, throughout life of Project	Individual project developers for drainage plan preparation; City of Hayward Public Works Department for plan review/inspection	Submittal of drainage plan; implementation of plan; inspection during construction to ensure conformance
(Hydrology & Water Quality) Impact Hyd-5: (100-Year Flood Hazard). Construction of buildings or other improvements adjacent to the channelized portion of Ward Creek (south of Orchard Avenue; north of Torrance Avenue) would be placed in proximity to but not within a mapped 100-year flood hazard area. However, site-specific studies would ensure flood hazards are identified and addressed to prevent damage to persons and property. (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)	**(Hydrology) Mitigation Measure Hyd-5: (100-Year Flood Hazard)**. Development proposals adjacent to the channelized portion of Ward Creek (south of Orchard Avenue; north of Torrano Avenue) shall include a hydrology and hydraulic study, prepared by a California-Registered Civil Engineer, and which addresses whether the subject site would be subject to a flood hazard and whether flood waters would not be increased on any surrounding sites. If that study confirms the proposed development would be subject to a flood hazard, all proposed development shall be removed from the flood hazard area through measures including, but not limited to, increasing the topographic elevation of the site or similar steps to minimize flood hazards. The study shall be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Director, shall comply with Municipal Code Chapter 9, Article 4, and shall include, at minimum, a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) to remove the site from the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map 100-year flood hazard area.	On-going, throughout life of Project	Individual project developers in area of applicability	Submittal of study; removal of development from flood hazard

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
Chapter 15: Noise				
(Noise) Impact Noise-1: (Noise Exposure or Levels in Excess of Local Standards) Development under the Project could expose future land uses to noise levels exceeding those considered acceptable for such uses. Residential land uses can be expected to be exposed to noise level in excess of 60 dBA throughout the Project area. However, even greater noise levels can be expected at locations immediately adjacent to Mission Boulevard, Jackson Street and railroad tracks. (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)	**(Noise) Mitigation Measure Noise-1a**: For subsequent residential projects proposed in the Project area, an acoustic analysis shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical specialist. to demonstrate that interior noise levels can be maintained below 45 dBA Ldn. (Qualifications shall include the following: Bachelor of Science or higher degree from a qualified program in engineering, physics, or architecture offered by an accredited university or college, and five years of experience in noise control engineering). This can typically be accomplished with the incorporation of an adequate forced air mechanical ventilation system in the residential units to allow residents the option of controlling noise by keeping the windows closed. **(Noise) Mitigation Measure Noise-1b**: For subsequent commercial, industrial and institutional projects proposed in areas where exterior day-night average noise levels are, or are projected to be 60 to 70 dBA Ldn, the need for noise attenuation measures shall be determined by a qualified acoustical specialist on a project by project basis at the time development is proposed. Standard office construction methods typically provide about 25 to 30 decibels of noise reduction in interior spaces. **Noise (Mitigation Measure) Noise-1c**: Noise levels exceed, or are projected to exceed 70 dBA Ldn, within 200 feet of the railroad tracks, within 150 feet of the centerline of Mission Boulevard, and within 175 feet of the centerline of Jackson Street. At these locations with increased noise levels, an acoustic analysis shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical specialist to demonstrate how interior noise levels can be maintained below 45 dBA Ldn and the adopted single event residential limits set forth in the Noise Element. Potential strategies are expected to be more robust than measures required by Mitigation Measure Noise 1-a and may include, but are not limited to, the inclusion of windows and doors with high Sound Transmission Class (STC) ratings, and the incorporation of forced-air mechanical ventilation systems necessary to meet 45	On-going, throughout life of Project	Individual project developers	Preparation of acoustic analysis; adherence to measures necessary to achieve acceptable noise exposure levels.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
	dBA Ldn and the Lmax noise limits. Noise barriers may be necessary to shield outdoor activity areas at multi-family residential uses facilitated by the Plan.			
(Noise) Impact Noise-2a: (Ground Vibration from Rail Operations) Future development under the Project could expose persons to excessive vibration from rail operations. (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)	**(Noise) Mitigation Measure Noise-2a**: New development that is within one-hundred (100) feet of the centerline of existing railroad and BART tracks or other sources of ground-borne vibration shall have a vibration analysis prepared by a qualified vibration specialist that specifies the vibration control measures including, but not limited to, setbacks and structural design features to reduce vibration levels at or below the guidelines of the Federal Transit Administration criteria, consistent with the receiving land use categories of Category 1, Category 2 or Category 3 as shown in Table 15-7 (Groundborne Vibration Impact Criteria). (Qualifications shall include: Bachelor of Science or higher degree from a qualified program in engineering or physics, offered by an accredited university or college, and five years or experience in vibration control engineering).	On-going, throughout life of Project	Individual project developers	Preparation of acoustic analysis; adherence to measures necessary to achieve acceptable groundborne vibration exposure levels.
(Noise) Impact Noise-2b: (Ground Vibration from Construction Vibration) Future development under the Project could expose persons to excessive vibration from construction activities. (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)	**(Noise) Mitigation Measure Noise-2b**: New development shall minimize vibration impacts to adjacent uses during demolition and construction. For sensitive historic structures, a vibration limit of 0.08 in/sec PPV (peak particle velocity) will be used to minimize the potential for cosmetic damage to the building. A vibration limit of 0.30 in/sec PPV will be used to minimize the potential for cosmetic damage at buildings of normal conventional construction. For activities involving the use of a pile driver, a Vibration Control Plan shall be prepared and approved by the Development Services Director or Designee. The Vibration Control Plan shall be prepared by a qualified professional, identify the proximity and sensitivity of nearby structures, and include measures sufficient to reduce vibration below levels before the aforementioned limits.	On-going, throughout life of Project	Individual project developers	Preparation of acoustic analysis; adherence to measures necessary to achieve acceptable groundborne vibration exposure levels.
(Noise) Impact Noise-4: (Substantial Permanent Noise Increase – Mixed-Use Development) New mixed-use development projects may include noise	**(Noise) Mitigation Measure Noise-4**: Mixed-use developments shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to identify and avoid the generation of potentially significant noise levels on on existing and potential	On-going, throughout life of Project	Individual mixed-use project developers	Preparation of acoustic analysis; adherence to measures necessary to achieve acceptable noise

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
generating activities that result in excessive noise at nearby noise sensitive land uses. (Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation)	future sensitive land uses. Where avoidance is not feasible, noise impacts shall be mitigated by measures including, but not limited to, operation limitations on noise generation activities (e.g., time of day, volume), relocation of noise generating source(s), and/or use of noise attenuation measures such as acoustical enclosures and sound barriers.			exposure levels.
(Noise) Impact Noise-5: (Substantial Temporary or Periodic Noise Increase) Future Project-related construction activities may involve construction activities that exceed noise levels established by the Noise Ordinance. (Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation)	**(Noise) Mitigation Measure Noise-5**: In order to maintain compliance with Hayward Noise Ordinance §4-1.03.4, development that includes demolition and/or construction activity exceeding 86 dBA outside of the property plane shall be carried out in accordance with a Construction Noise Logistics Plan approved by the Development Services Director or Designee pursuant to a Conditional Noise Permit authorized in accordance with Hayward Noise Ordinance §4-1.04. A Construction Noise Logistics Plan shall specify the hours of construction, noise and vibration minimization measures, posting or notification of the method of construction and schedules, and designation of a noise disturbance coordinator who would respond to neighborhood complaints. Additionally, a Construction Noise Logistics Plan shall include measures required to be in place prior to the start of construction, and implemented during construction to reduce noise impacts on neighboring residents and other uses. A typical construction noise logistics plan would include, but not be limited to, the following measures to reduce construction noise levels as low as practical: • Utilize 'quiet' models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists; • Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with mufflers, which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment; • Locate all stationary noise-generating equipment, such as air compressors and portable power generators, as far away as possible from adjacent land uses; • Locate staging areas and construction material areas			

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
	as far away as possible from adjacent land uses; • Prohibit all unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines; • If impact pile driving is proposed, multiple-pile drivers shall be considered to expedite construction. Although noise levels generated by multiple pile drivers would be higher than the noise generated by a single pile driver, the total duration of pile driving activities would be reduced. • If impact pile driving is proposed, temporary noise control blanket barriers shall shroud pile drivers or be erected in a manner to shield the adjacent land uses. Such noise control blanket barriers can be rented and quickly erected. • If impact pile driving is proposed, foundation pile holes shall be pre-drilled to minimize the number of impacts required to seat the pile Pre-drilling foundation pile holes is a standard construction noise control technique. Pre-drilling reduces the number of blows required to seat the pile. Notify all adjacent land uses of the construction schedule in writing; • Designate a "disturbance coordinator" who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and will require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem be implemented. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site and include it in the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule.			

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
Chapter 4.11: Traffic				
Existing plus Project				
(Transportation) Impact Trans-1: (Existing 2012 (Baseline) – Mission Boulevard and A Street Intersection) Under the Existing 2012 (Baseline) Plus Project condition, traffic generated by the Project would increase the delay at Mission Boulevard and A Street intersection, which already operates at unacceptable (i.e., LOS F) level of service, by more than four (4) seconds, (from 61.0 to 76.7 seconds of delay) during the PM peak-hour As noted, previously in the 238 Corridor Improvement Project DEIR (page 3.11-28), this intersection was identified to operate at LOS F under existing conditions during the AM and PM peak hours.	**(Transportation) Mitigation Measure Trans-1**: (Restripe on the eastbound approach on A Street at Mission Boulevard and A Street) Convert the eastbound outer left-turn lane into a left-right turn shared lane.	As determined through a project-specific traffic study or through monitoring by Public Works Department over time	Individual project developers.	Confirm future development projects do not result in this impact through project-specific traffic study, as determined by Public Works Department
2035 Intersection Impacts				
(Transportation) Impact Trans-2: (Cumulative 2035 Plus Project - Mission Boulevard and Sunset Boulevard) Under the Cumulative 2035 Plus Project condition, traffic generated by the Project would have a cumulatively considerable impact on the delay at the intersection Mission Boulevard and Sunset Boulevard intersection through an increase of 12.1 seconds of average delay during the PM peak-hour.	**(Transportation) Mitigation Measure Trans-2**: (Cumulative 2035 Plus Project - Mission Boulevard and Sunset Boulevard) Convert the existing left-through-right shared lane into a through-right shared lane on both eastbound and westbound approaches; add a separate left-turn lane on both eastbound and westbound approaches.	As determined through a project-specific traffic study or through monitoring by Public Works Department over time	Individual project developers.	Confirm future development projects do not result in this impact through project-specific traffic study, as determined by Public Works Department
(Transportation) Impact Trans-3: (Cumulative 2035 Plus Project - Mission Boulevard and A Street) Under the Cumulative 2035 Plus Project condition, the Project would increase the delay of the Mission Boulevard and A Street intersection to increase by an average of	**(Transportation) Mitigation Measure Trans-3:** (Cumulative 2035 Plus Project - Restripe on the eastbound approach on A Street at Mission Boulevard and A Street) Convert the eastbound outer left-turn lane into a left-right turn shared lane.	As determined through a project-specific traffic study or through monitoring by Public Works Department over time	Individual project developers.	Confirm future development projects do not result in this impact through project-specific traffic study, as determined by Public Works Department

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigation Monitoring:		
		Schedule	Responsibility	Procedure
9.3 seconds during the AM peak-hour and 20.6 seconds during the PM peak-hour.				

This page intentionally left blank