6. *Alternatives to the Project*

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The following discussion is intended to inform the public and decision makers of feasible alternatives to the Project that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project. Section 15126.6 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines states that:

> *An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation.*

A "No Project" Alternative is required as part of the "reasonable range of alternatives" that could feasibly attain most or all of the project's objectives. Each alternative is analyzed against the significance thresholds considered in Chapter 4, Environmental Evaluation. This chapter assesses whether the impacts of the alternatives would be greater than, less than, or similar to those of the Project.

6.2 OVERVIEW OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives to the Project are described below. Table 6-1 provides a summary of the development program for each Alternative.

- No Project Alternative. Consistent with Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, under the No Project Alternative, the Project site would remain in its existing condition. Although existing land use designations and zoning would allow for some future development under existing conditions, this alternative was developed under the assumption that the Project site would not be further developed. Therefore, under this alternative, improvements proposed by the Project, such as adding new housing units, new restaurants, commercial and retail uses, a new parking structure, and public amenities, including a community library, aquatic center, and enhanced shorelines would not occur. As discussed in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this Draft EIR, the Marina would be maintained for as long as financially feasible; however, for purposes of the environmental analysis, it is assumed that the harbor master's office, fuel pump/dock, and the 462 existing boat slips in the harbor basin would eventually be removed by the City. As such, under the No Project Alternative, the removal of the Marina would still occur as soon as it is no longer financially feasible for the City to maintain its operation.

TABLE 6-1 COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVE BUILDOUT PROJECTIONS

Alternative	Added Population[a]	Residential Units[b]	Hotel Units	Office (SF)	Conference Center (SF)	Restaurant (SF)[c]	Public Amenities (SF)[d]
Proposed Project	970	354	200	150,000	15,000	21,000	2,500
No Project Alternative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Relocated Hotel Alternative	970	354	200	150,000	15,000	21,000	2,500
Reduced Density/ Intensity Alternative[e]	728	265	150	112,500	11,250	15,750	1,875

a. Assumes an average household size of 2.74 persons per household. (354 residential units X 2.74 = 969.96 (approx. 970).
b. 354 proposed residential units includes 220 flats, 92 townhomes, and 42 single-family homes.
c. 21,000 square feet proposed restaurant space includes 3 restaurants including two at approximately 8,000 square feet and one at approximately 5,000 square feet.
d. The public amenities square footage only represents the approximately 2,500-square-foot community library/community meeting space and does not reflect square footage of other proposed public amenities as listed in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this Draft EIR.
e. The Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative would reduce the Project components by 25 percent.

- **Relocated Hotel Alternative.** Under the Relocated Hotel Alternative, the proposed hotel would be relocated from its proposed location on Mulford Point Drive. Potential locations that could accommodate the hotel include the parking lot along Pescador Point Drive, which is southeast of the current proposed location, the parking lot along Mulford Point Drive, which is directly adjacent to the northeast of the proposed location, and on the corner of Monarch Point Drive and Monarch Bay Drive. Under this alternative, all other components of the Project would remain the same.
- **Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative.** Under the Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative, Project components, including the office, retail, restaurant, convention center residential units, the community library and hotel rooms would be reduced by 25 percent over what is proposed under the Project. As such, Table 6-1 shows the buildout that would occur under this alternative.

6.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED INFEASIBLE

The following alternatives were considered infeasible and therefore were not further analyzed as alternatives in this chapter:

- **Off-Site Alternative.** Under the Off-Site Alternative, the Project would be constructed at an off-site location. Due to the nature of the Project, which consists of redeveloping a previously developed shoreline, which is currently underutilized, this alternative would not provide the same opportunity for new development.
- **Hotel Removal Alternative.** Under the Hotel Removal Alternative, the Project would not include construction of a new 200-room hotel. This alternative was considered given the number of hotels in the area of Oakland Airport, but as determined in the urban decay analysis (included in Appendix B), the inclusion of the hotel would not result in urban decay. As a result, removal of the hotel would not reduce a potentially significant impact. Additionally, this alternative does not meet the objectives of the Project.

6.4 OBJECTIVES ASSESSMENT

In general, the Project objectives include redevelopment and enhancement of a portion of the San Leandro Shoreline Area to build an economically viable and vibrant mixed-use development that provides amenities and services to the citizens and visitors to San Leandro. As listed in the Chapter 3, Project Description, the objectives of the Project are to:

- Build an economically viable and vibrant mixed-use development which provides needed amenities and services to the citizens of the City of San Leandro, including:
  - A banquet/conference facility for residents and others to hold large parties such as weddings, graduation parties, Quinceañeras and other events in San Leandro. The banquet/conference center is also needed to support tournaments at the Tony Lema Golf Course.
  - A limited-service hotel, providing limited food and beverage service to hotel guests and not the general public.
  - Multiple dining options.
  - Housing units responsive to market demands to increase City housing stock, for above-moderate income units[1].
  - Class A office space to attract innovative businesses and quality jobs for the citizens of San Leandro.
  - An enhanced library/community building.
- Ensure the project uses are synergistic and create a regional destination for dining, lodging, entertainment and recreation.
- Provide recreation opportunities such as bocce ball courts, a small boat launch and public gathering spaces, a 20-foot-wide public promenade including lookout stations, to increase and enhance the public's access to the Bay.
- Provide multiple areas for the public to enjoy scenic views and interact with the San Francisco Bay.
- Enhance connections between the San Leandro Shoreline and the San Francisco Bay Trail.
- Remove current blight, including the former Blue Dolphin site pillars and fencing and the fenced former Boatworks site.
- Ensure the redeveloped portion of San Leandro Shoreline complements existing amenities and provides needed connection between the amenities and current shoreline uses.
- Ensure that development is provided in an environmentally sensitive manner, and promotes the latest trends in energy efficiency.
- Recognize the economic uncertainty of acquiring future funding for needed on-going channel and harbor dredging, the City's existing debt burden related to past harbor improvements, and the City's desire to plan for a successful transition from the existing blighted use to an environmentally and

[1] Housing units would be to satisfy 2014-2022 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) housing target for above-moderate income units of 1,161 units.

financially sustainable alternative that maintains the public's access to the harbor and San Francisco Bay.

6.4.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Although the No Project Alternative would allow for some development to occur under existing land use and zoning designations, as stated above, due to market uncertainties and the speculative nature of future development, this alternative assumes no further development would occur; therefore, enhanced and new public amenities are unlikely to be provided under the No Project Alternative. Further, this alternative would not result in an economically viable and vibrant mixed-use development. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not meet the Project objectives.

6.4.2 RELOCATED HOTEL ALTERNATIVE

The Relocated Hotel Alternative would meet the Project objectives given that the overall development of proposed by the Project would still occur; however, the proposed hotel would be relocated. As mentioned above, potential locations that could accommodate the hotel include the parking lot along Pescador Point Drive which is southeast of the current proposed location, the parking lot along Mulford Point Drive which is directly adjacent to the northeast of the proposed location, and on the corner of Monarch Point Drive and Monarch Bay Drive. Overall, because of its similarities to the Project, this alternative would meet the Project objectives.

6.4.3 REDUCED DENSITY/INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

The Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative would meet most of the Project objectives given that the same type of development would occur as the Project, with the exception of a 25 percent reduction in the density and intensity of the amount of development. As such, this alternative would meet all the Project objectives with the exception of meeting the City's RHNA of providing 1,161 above-moderate income housing units by 2022.

6.5 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Each alternative is analyzed against the impact factors considered for the Project, according to whether it would have effects greater or less than the Project. The basis for the determinations is discussed in the next section of this chapter, where each of the topics is listed for each alternative.

6.5.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires that an EIR analyze a "no project" alternative. Under the No Project Alternative, the existing uses and buildings would remain unchanged, including continued operation of the marina. As mentioned above, the existing land use and zoning designations would allow for additional development under this alternative; however, due to market uncertainties and the speculative nature of future development, this alternative assumes no further development would occur.

Under this alternative, the existing uses of the Project site include a 131-room Marina Inn, Horatio's Restaurant, and El Torito Restaurant would remain. Additionally, the 462-slip public boat harbor with separate boat launch and support operations, and two private yacht clubs would remain unchanged under this alternative. As mentioned in Chapter 3, Project Description, the harbor's occupancy currently stands at less than 30 percent. Further, the approximately 1,950 parking spaces throughout the Shoreline Recreational Area would remain unchanged. Under the No Project Alternative, proposed improvements such as removing the Marina, adding new housing units, new restaurants, commercial and retail uses, a new parking structure, and public amenities, including a community building/library, aquatic center, and enhanced shorelines would not occur.

6.5.1.1 AESTHETICS

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing uses of the Project site would remain the same, including continued operation of the Marina. With no changes, the existing character of the area would remain similar to existing conditions; however, in the absence of secured funding for dredging and continued maintenance of the Marina, the overall character regarding the Marina could be affected as a result of fewer boats able to access the harbor and continued degradation of the Marina. As a result, near-view vistas could be affected as a result of the Marina not being able to be adequately maintained in the long-term. The existing building site layout and landscaping would remain unchanged. Overall, this alternative would result in similar impacts when compared to the Project.

6.5.1.2 AIR QUALITY

Under the No Project Alternative, the Project site would remain in its existing condition, including continued operation of the Marina. Under this alternative, there would be no enhancements and redevelopment as proposed by the Project, such as new residential units, new hotel, removal of the Marina, and pedestrian amenities would not be constructed. As such, this alternative would not place new sensitive receptors, such as residents and hotel guests, at the Project site. Although continued operation of the Marina would result in continuing air emissions from boat engines, there would be no new vehicle trips generated and no construction activity under this alternative that would otherwise occur under the Project. Overall, this alternative would result in impacts less than those of the Project.

6.5.1.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Under this alternative, the Project site would remain in its existing condition, including continued operation of the Marina. Under this alternative, there would be no enhancements and redevelopment as proposed by the Project and this alternative would not result in any construction activity and related impacts that would otherwise occur under the Project. Although this alternative would still pose the potential for environmental impacts associated with fuel spills and/or leaks in the Marina which could result impacts to marine habitat, continued compliance with existing regulations related to the handling of hazardous materials would ensure the continued safe handling of fuels as they relate to Marine activities, such as fueling of pleasure crafts. Overall, the No Project Alternative would result in impacts less than those of the Project regarding biological resources.

6.5.1.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The No Project Alternative would result in the Project site remaining in its existing condition with no future development assumed. As such, there would be no construction activity and, therefore, would not result in any ground disturbance within the Project site. As a result, the existing on-site monuments (a mosaic depicting the oyster beds associated with CHL #824; a plaque commemorating the dedication of the San Leandro channel as the Jack D. Maltester Channel; and a Lost Boats Memorial placed in memory of USS Argonaut and the USS Grampus) would not be disturbed. In addition, the potential for disturbing or uncovering any not yet discovered cultural resources on the Project site would be avoided. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in impacts less than those of the Project regarding cultural resources.

6.5.1.5 GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY

Under the No Project Alternative, no grading or excavation would occur on the Project site. However, as discussed in Chapter 4.5, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, large earthquakes could generate strong to violent ground shaking at the Project site which could result in damage to existing structures. Although this alternative would not result in any new development and, therefore, would likely result in fewer on-site employees and residents, the potential for ground shaking and exposure of existing structures and on-site employees and residents would result in this alternative having similar impacts as the Project.

6.5.1.6 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing Project site would remain unchanged and continue to operate under its current condition, including the Marina. Under this alternative, construction under the Project, including a new 200-room hotel, 354 residential units, removal of the marina, and public amenities would not be constructed and surface parking lots along the perimeter of the marina would remain unchanged. This alternative would not generate additional vehicle trips as under the Project, nor would new structures be constructed, which would increase greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions during the operational phase. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in impacts less than those of the Project.

6.5.1.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Under this alternative, the Project site would remain unchanged and continue to operate under its current condition. Given that there would be no ground-disturbing activity under the No Project Alternative because no new construction would occur, existing hazardous materials would remain in use resulting from day-to-day operations that currently exist. Existing activities include, but are not limited to, operation of the marina, restaurants, and surface parking lots. Under this alternative, the Marina would continue to operate, which could result in exposure of hazardous materials related to marina operations, including marine fuel and oil, whereas, under the Project the Marina would be removed and, therefore, reduce potential exposure of marine-related hazardous materials associated with marina operations. Overall, this alternative would result in similar impacts as the Project given the continued operation of the marina.

6.5.1.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

There would be no potential for water quality impacts, such as siltation, erosion and hazardous material spills, associated with construction activities under the No Project Alternative and the existing stormwater drainage system as described in Chapter 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, would continue to operate. However, under this alternative, the Marina would continue to operate under existing conditions, which could impact water quality from potential exposure of marine-related hazardous materials from day-to-day operations of a marina. In addition, the inherent water quality benefits of the Project complying with C.3 and NPDES requirements would not be implemented. As a result, continued operations and activities at the Project site would not have water runoff requirements implemented, and this alternative could also result in continued impacts to hydrology and water quality. As a result, the No Project Alternative would have greater impacts than the Project.

6.5.1.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

The No Project Alternative would not physically divide an existing community, because it would remain physically unchanged from its existing condition. Under this alternative, although existing land use and zoning designations would allow for some development to still occur on the Project site, it is assumed that no future development would occur under this alternative. Further, this alternative would not result in the construction of Class II bicycle lanes on Monarch Bay Drive between Neptune Drive and Fairway Drive as proposed by the Project. Overall, given that no future development is likely to occur under the No Project Alternative, this alternative would result in impacts less than those of the Project.

6.5.1.10 NOISE

The No Project Alternative would not result in any changes to existing conditions and temporary noise and vibration as a result of construction related activities under the Project would not occur. Therefore, this alternative would result in impacts less than those of the Project.

6.5.1.11 POPULATION AND HOUSING

This alternative would not increase population or housing units compared to the Project. As discussed in Chapter 4.11, Population and Housing, the San Leandro General Plan anticipated the substantial growth in housing and employment proposed as part of the Project. Additionally, the amount of direct and indirect growth anticipated would not exceed Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) projections and the anticipated growth was adequately planned for in the San Leandro General Plan. Overall, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts. Further, while the removal of the Marina under the Project would displace the approximate 10 units that consist of housing for approximately 10-16 people living on boats in the Marina, is nominal and was found to be less than significant. Under this alternative, no new housing would be constructed and the proposed 354 residential units would not be built. However, the existing 10 units consisting of housing on boats would not be displaced under this alternative. Overall, this alternative would result in impacts less than those of the Project as it would not result in the displacement of existing housing units or residents.

6.5.1.12 PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION

The No Project Alternative would not result in any changes to existing conditions of the Project site. Under this alternative, there would be no new construction or enhancement of the Project site that would result in an increase to the overall number of structures and/or permanent population and service population. As such, this alternative would not result in any impacts to existing police and emergency services, fire protection services, libraries, and/or schools serving the Project site. Although less-than-significant impacts with regard to public services and recreation were identified, the Project would result in 354 residential units, new structures, including a hotel, new public amenities, and approximately 970 new residents, which would result in additional calls for public services. Additionally, this alternative would not result in an overall reduction in total parkland or result in the reconfiguration of the Marina 9-hole Golf Course, whereas, the Project would result in the reconfiguration of portions of the Marina Golf Course to accommodate residential units at its northwestern and southern edge. Overall, as described in Chapter 4.12, Public Services and Recreation, the reduction and addition of public amenities would essentially result in a neutral impact on parkland in San Leandro. This alternative would result in impacts less than those of the Project.

6.5.1.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

As discussed in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, the Project would not result in significant impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities given that it would construction of Class II bicycle lanes on Monarch Bay Drive between Neptune Drive and Fairway Drive; therefore, would not conflict with the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and the Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan. Additionally, the Project would include pedestrian paths along Monarch Bay Drive south of Mulford Point Drive. Under the No Project Alternative, the Project site would remain unchanged and no future development would occur, including the installation of Class II bike lanes and pedestrian paths along Monarch Bay Drive. As such, there would continue to be limited pedestrian facilities and bicycle lanes along Monarch Bay Drive. However, under this alternative, there would not be new structures or public amenities constructed and therefore would not result in an increase in pedestrian and vehicular traffic that would occur under the Project. Further, vehicle traffic associated with the Project would cause several intersections to operate at unacceptable levels of service, as discussed in Chapter 4.13 of this Draft EIR. Overall, the No Project Alternative would result in impacts less than those of the Project, as it would not result in additional vehicle trips which would cause unacceptable levels of service at some of the intersections on or near the Project site.

6.5.1.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The No Project Alternative would result in lower demand for water and wastewater treatment. Under this alternative, the Project site would remain in its existing condition and no future development or public amenities would be constructed as proposed by the Project. The Project would include construction of a new 200-room hotel and approximately 354 residential units, which would increase demand for water, generate additional wastewater, solid waste and energy demand. Under this alternative, however, development would not occur and demand for services would not increase. This alternative would result in impacts less than those of the Project.

6.5.2 RELOCATED HOTEL ALTERNATIVE

Under this alternative, the hotel proposed by the Project would be relocated from its proposed location on Mulford Point Drive. Although Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, of this Draft EIR, found less-than-significant impacts with regard to the hotel's impact on the character of the site and its surroundings as well as a less-than-significant impact on a scenic vista, the Relocated Hotel Alternative is considered to address concerns raised by the public regarding the location of a hotel on Mulford Point. Potential locations that could accommodate the hotel include the parking lot along Pescador Point Drive, southeast of the current proposed location, the parking lot along Mulford Point Drive which is directly adjacent to the northeast of the proposed location, and on the corner of Monarch Point Drive and Monarch Bay Drive. Under this alternative, all other components proposed by the Project, such as square footage, residential units, hotel rooms, and other development of the Project would remain the same.

As a result of the similarities between the Project and this alternative, the assessment of impacts for this alternative is limited to resource topic areas that would be affected by the relocation of the hotel. In this case, only aesthetics would be affected due to the relocation of the hotel. As such, impacts to the resource topic areas listed below would be the same under both the Project and this alternative because the area of disturbance would be similar and the regulatory conditions and mitigation measures identified in Chapters 4.2 through 4.14 would still apply.

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services and Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

6.5.2.1 AESTHETICS

As shown above in Table 6-1, the Relocated Hotel Alternative would result in the same square footages and project components as proposed under the Project. However, under this alternative, the proposed 200-room hotel would be relocated to a site other than at the end of Mulford Point Drive, where it's currently proposed. As described above, sites that could potentially accommodate the hotel include Pescador Point Drive where there's currently a surface parking lot, or at the corner of Monarch Bay Drive and Mulford Point Drive at the current location of a surface parking lot. Although the Project was found to have a less-than-significant impact on community character, relocation of the hotel would open up views from most public viewpoints looking west across the harbor to Mulford Point and to San Francisco Bay and the San Francisco Peninsula beyond. Relocation of the hotel could potentially obstruct public viewpoints from other areas as well; however, relocation of the hotel from its proposed location would

still open up public views looking west given that the proposed location would remain undeveloped under this alternative. Overall, this alternative would result in impacts less than those of the Project regarding aesthetics.

6.5.3 REDUCED DENSITY/INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

A Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative is considered in order to reduce potential impacts to air quality, GHG emissions, noise, population and housing, and traffic that were identified for the Project. Under this alternative, development would occur as described in Chapter 3, Project Description; however, the commercial and convention center areas, residential units, and hotel units would be reduced by 25 percent, as shown above in Table 6-1. This alternative would not reduce the size of the parking garage or the new library/community center. Although this alternative would reduce the overall density/intensity at buildout, the same improvements, land uses, and overall development proposed under the Project would still occur.

6.5.3.1 AESTHETICS

As shown in Table 6-1 above, the Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative would reduce overall development in terms of units and square-footage by 25 percent. The overall type and pattern of development would remain similar to the Project, including construction of a new hotel, residential units, public amenities, and the removal of the Marina. The reduction in hotel rooms under this alternative could allow for a smaller footprint, lower building height, or a break in the mass of the hotel building, and as a result could slightly reduce potential public view impacts looking west as a result of a smaller overall footprint. As discussed in Chapter 4.1, Aesthetics, the Project would result in less-than-significant aesthetic impacts. Although a reduction in the overall intensity and density of development would reduce the overall amount of units and square footage developed, the types and locations of development would still remain similar to the Project. As such, this alternative would result in similar impacts to the Project with respect to aesthetics.

6.5.3.2 AIR QUALITY

Under this alternative, development would still occur similar to the Project but this alternative would result in a 25 percent reduction in the non-residential square footage and residential units proposed. The total criteria air pollutants emissions associated with the Project and the Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative are shown in Table 6-2. The 25 percent reduction in building square footage and units would reduce vehicle trips, mobile-source, and stationary-source emissions. Additionally, the reduction in land use development would reduce short-term emissions related to project construction activities. As discussed in Chapter 4.2, Air Quality, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts to air quality (construction-related criteria air pollutants, operational phase criteria air pollutants, construction-related community risk and hazards, and operational-related community risk and hazards).

TABLE 6-2 SAN LEANDRO SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED PROJECT AND REDUCED DENSITY/INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANTS EMISSIONS FORECAST

	Criteria Air Pollutants (average lbs/day)			
Category	ROG	NO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Existing				
Area[a]	22	<1	<1	<1
Energy[a]	<1	1	<1	<1
On-Road Mobile Sources[a]	10	30	19	5
Boats (Pleasure-Crafts)[b]	144	49	9	9
Total	176	80	28	14
Proposed Project				
Area[a]	48	<1	<1	<1
Energy[a]	<1	4	<1	<1
On-Road Mobile Sources[a]	27	82	52	15
Total	75	86	52	15
Change from 2014 Land Uses	-101	7	25	1
BAAQMD Average Daily Project-Level Threshold	54	54	82	54
Exceeds Average Daily Threshold	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative				
Area[a]	41	<1	<1	<1
Energy[a]	<1	3	<1	<1
On-Road Mobile Sources[a]	21	62	40	11
Total	62	66	40	12
Change from 2014 Land Uses	30	35	21	6
BAAQMD Average Daily Project-Level Threshold	54	54	82	54
Exceeds Average Daily Threshold	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Change from Proposed Project (Average Daily)	-13	-20	-12	-4

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

TABLE 6-2 SAN LEANDRO SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED PROJECT AND REDUCED DENSITY/INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANTS EMISSIONS FORECAST

	Criteria Air Pollutants (tons/year)			
Category	ROG	NO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Existing Tons per Year (tpy)	32	15	5	3
Proposed Project Tons per Year (tpy)	14	16	10	3
Change from 2014 Land Uses	-18	1	5	<1
BAAQMD Annual Project-Level Threshold	10 tpy	10 tpy	15 tpy	10 tpy
Exceeds Annual Threshold	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative Tons per Year (tpy)	11	12	7	2
Change from 2014 Land Uses	-21	-2	2	<-1
BAAQMD Annual Project-Level Threshold	10 tpy	10 tpy	15 tpy	10 tpy
Exceeds Annual Threshold	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Change from the Project (Annual)	-2	-4	-2	-1

Note: Emissions may not total to 100 percent due to rounding. New buildings would be constructed to the 2013 Building & Energy Efficiency Standards (effective July 1, 2014). Assumes all fireplaces are gas-burning fireplaces in accordance with BAAQMD Regulation 6, Rule 3.
New buildings would be constructed to the 2013 Building & Energy Efficiency Standards (effective July 1, 2014). Average daily emissions are based on the annual operational emissions divided by 365 days.
Sources:
a. CalEEMod 2013.2. Based on year 2020 emission rates No trip generation is assumed for the 140 boat residences.
b. Starcrest, 2005. Port of Los Angeles Baseline Air Emissions Inventory.

As shown in Table 6-2, this alternative would also result in less-than-significant operational phase criteria air pollutant emission impacts and this alternative would result in reduced operational-phase emissions as compared to the Project. Likewise, construction emissions would be less than that identified for the Project; and with mitigation would be less than significant. Therefore, the potential to impact air quality would also be reduced beyond what was considered under the Project.

Although the overall type of development would remain similar to the Project and impacts were found to be less than significant, reduced development under this alternative would further reduce long- and short-term pollutant emissions; therefore, would result in impacts less than those of the Project.

6.5.3.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Under this alternative, development would still occur similar to the Project with the exception of a 25 percent reduction in the square footages and units proposed. A reduction in intensity and density would reduce the overall amount of residential units, hotel rooms, and square footages of new structures, which could ultimately result in fewer areas of ground disturbance, and habitat loss due to trees and landscape being altered throughout buildout. While the overall types and locations of development would still occur as proposed, with the exception of a 25 percent reduction in overall density and intensity, this alternative would result in impacts less than those of the Project.

6.5.3.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Under this alternative, development would still occur similar to the Project with the exception of a 25 percent reduction in the square footages and units proposed. A reduction in intensity and density could result in fewer areas of ground disturbance, and therefore reducing the potential to disturb any cultural resources that may be present on the Project site that have yet to be discovered. Similar to the Project, this alternative would require the on-site monuments (a mosaic depicting the oyster beds associated with CHL #824; a plaque commemorating the dedication of the San Leandro channel as the Jack D. Maltester Channel; and a Lost Boats Memorial placed in memory of USS Argonaut and the USS Grampus) to possibly be disturbed in order to allow for development. Mitigation measures included in Chapter 4.4, Cultural Resources, would still apply under this alternative; therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant. Overall, this alternative would result in impacts less than those of the Project.

6.5.3.5 GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY

Under the Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative, development would still occur similar to the Project with the exception of a 25 percent reduction in the square footages and units proposed. As discussed in Chapter 4.5, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, large earthquakes could generate strong to violent ground shaking at the Project site which could result in damage to existing and proposed structures. Additionally, erosion and/or loss of topsoil could result from ground disturbance and excavation from construction activities, as well as coastal erosion due to the Project site's proximity to the ocean which subjects it to wave attack. Although no areas of significant coastal erosion were observed within the Project site, existing erosion control may be required to ensure continued stability of the coastline. Although Chapter 4.5 identified potentially significant impacts with respect to geology and soils, they were reduced to less-than-significant levels with mitigation measures. Although this alternative would result in the same overall type of development proposed under the Project, it would reduce the amount of development by 25 percent therefore reducing the amount of structures susceptible to earthquakes. As such, this alternative would result in impacts less than those of the Project.

6.5.3.6 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Under this alternative, development would still occur similar to the Project but this alternative would result in a 25 percent reduction in the non-residential square footage and residential units proposed. The total GHG emissions associated with the Project and the Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative are shown in Table 6-3. The reduction in units would result in fewer vehicle trips generated upon buildout of the Project, which would reduce the total amount of GHGs emitted. Additionally, GHG emissions from stationary sources and energy usage would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduction in building square footage. Overall, under the Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative, total GHG emissions from stationary and mobile sources and energy use would be substantially reduced by 3,023 $MTCO_2e$ compared to the Project.

TABLE 6 -3 SAN LEANDRO SHORELINE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED PROJECT AND REDUCED DENSITY/INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE GHG EMISSIONS COMPARISON

	GHG Emissions ($MTCO_2e$/Year)		
Category	**Proposed Project**	**Alternative**	**Difference**
Operational Emissions			
Area[a]	37	17	-20
Energy[a]	3,060	2,522	-538
On-Road Mobile Sources[a]	10,027	7,650	-2,377
Waste[a]	355	284	-71
Water/Wastewater[a]	73	56	-17
Total	13,552	10,529	-3,023
Total without Waste[b]	13,197	10,245	-2,952
Service Population (SP)[c]	1,973	1,505	-468
$MTCO_2e$/SP	6.7	6.8	0.1
BAAQMD Efficiency Threshold	4.6 $MTCO_2e$/SP	4.6 $MTCO_2e$/SP	—
Exceeds BAAQMD Target?	**Yes**	**Yes**	—

Note: Emissions may not total to 100 percent due to rounding. New buildings would be constructed to the 2013 Building & Energy Efficiency Standards (effective July 1, 2014). Assumes all fireplaces are gas-burning fireplaces in accordance with BAAQMD Regulation 6, Rule 3.
a. CalEEMod 2013.2.2. Based on year 2020 emission rates.
b. BAAQMD did not include solid waste emissions when developing the per capita significance thresholds. Therefore, total GHG emissions with and without the Waste Generation sector are included. If these emissions are included in the analysis for the Project, Project per capita emissions would be 6.9 $MTCO_2e$/SP/yr. If these emissions are included in the analysis for the Alternative, Alternative per capita emissions would be 7.0 $MTCO_2e$/SP/yr.
c. The Project's service population (SP) is based on 970 residents and 1,003 employees. This Alternative's service population (SP) is based on 729 residents and 776 employees.

However, GHG emissions impacts of the Project are based on BAAQMD's efficiency metric, which is a per capita measure of GHG emissions impacts of a project. The Project would have a GHG emissions efficiency of 6.7 $MTCO_2e$/SP while this alternative would have a GHG efficiency of 6.8 $MTCO_2e$/SP, which is slightly higher than the Project. Therefore, this alternative would be less efficient than the Project. Due to the scale of development that would still occur under this alternative, short- and long-term GHG emissions would still substantially cumulatively contribute to climate change impacts. Therefore, GHG impacts would remain significant and unavoidable under both the Project and this alternative, and this alternative would result in impacts greater than those of the Project regarding GHG emissions impacts.

6.5.3.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

As discussed in Chapter 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts. Under this alternative, the same project components would continue to be built as under the Project, with the exception of reducing overall development density and intensity by 25 percent. Although commercially available hazardous materials would be used at various construction sites within the Project site and may generate small amounts of hazardous waste, the waste would be handled in accordance with applicable federal, State, and local laws. Further, the Project site is within the Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission jurisdiction due to its close proximity to the Oakland International

Airport. Compliance with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan regulations would ensure that future development does not interfere with any air traffic. Overall, given that this alternative would result in the same overall type of development on the Project site, impacts would be similar to the Project.

6.5.3.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Under the Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative, the type of development would occur on the Project site as proposed by the Project, with the exception of a 25 percent reduction in the overall density and intensity of development. As such, the hydrology and water quality impacts would be slightly reduced. As discussed in Chapter 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, the Project would result in less than significant impacts to hydrology and water quality. Given this alternative would reduce the overall amount of development by 25 percent; this alternative would result in smaller building footprints, thereby allowing for larger areas of pervious surfaces. Although the overall type of development would remain similar to the Project and impacts were found to be less than significant, reduced development under this alternative would further minimize potential impacts to hydrology and water quality; therefore, would result in impacts less than those of the Project.

6.5.3.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Under the Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative, the type of development would occur on the Project site as proposed by the Project, with the exception of a 25 percent reduction in the overall density and intensity of development. As described in Chapter 4.9, Land Use and Planning, the project components largely represent intensification of existing uses on the Project site, and would not have the potential to physically divide the site. Further, Project components include circulation improvements and neighborhood serving uses that would serve to reduce the potential division of surrounding community. Additionally, the installation of Class II bicycle lanes along Monarch Bay Drive between Neptune Drive and Fairway Drive within the Project site area would ensure compliance with the San Leandro Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. All required entitlements and permits required for the Project would be required under this alternative. Overall, given this alternative would result in the same type and extent of development as the Project, impacts related to land use and planning would be similar.

6.5.3.10 NOISE

Under the Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative, the type of development would occur on the Project site as proposed by the Project, with the exception of a 25 percent reduction in the overall density and intensity of development. In general, the same type of construction activities and operation as described in Chapter 4.10, Noise, would continue to occur under this alternative. As discussed in Chapter 4.10, potentially significant impacts would result from vibration impacts during construction activities, as well as permanent noise increases from vehicle traffic along Marina Boulevard west of Aurora Drive. Although Mitigation Measure NOISE-2 in Chapter 4.10 would reduce construction related noise and vibration impacts to the extent feasible, a significant and unavoidable impact would remain from the permanent increase in traffic generated noise along Marina Drive and because implementation of Mitigation Measure NOISE-2 is not known at this point if it would provide enough reduction to mitigate levels below thresholds. Although traffic generation and population would be reduced as a result of less density and intensity under this alternative, there would still be an increase in permanent ambient noise levels that would likely exceed the 3 dB standard established under Policy 35.04, Degradation of Ambient Noise

Levels, in the Environmental Hazards Element of the San Leandro General Plan. Overall, this alternative would result in the same type of development as the Project, and impacts related to noise would be similar to the Project, including the identified significant unavoidable impact.

6.5.3.11 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Under this alternative, the same type of development would occur as the Project, with the exception of a 25 percent reduction in density and intensity in the amount of development. As shown in Table 6-1, this alternative would result in a population increase of approximately 728, approximately 265 residential units, and approximately 150 hotel units. As discussed in Chapter 4.11, Population and Housing, while the removal of the marina under the Project could displace the approximately 16 to 20 residents living in 10 boats in the harbor, the displacement is nominal and was found to result in a less-than-significant impact. Under this alternative, approximately 265 new housing would be constructed. This increase in housing units is less than what would be constructed under the Project. Although this alternative would result in the displacement of approximately 10 housing units with removal of the marina, there would still be a net increase in housing units under this alternative. Overall, this alternative would result in similar impacts to the Project.

6.5.3.12 PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION

Under the Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative, the same type of development would occur as the Project, with the exception of a 25 percent reduction in density and intensity in the amount of development. As such, this alternative would result in less population and employee generation, as well as less residential and hotel units as shown above in Table 6-1. Although this alternative would result in an overall reduction in population and amount of development, an increase in the demand for public services, such as fire and police protection, as well as emergency medical services, parks, libraries, and schools would still occur. However, as discussed in Chapter 4.12, Public Services and Recreation, less than significant impacts would occur for fire protection and police services, schools, parks, and the Mulford-Marina library considering the Project. Given this alternative would reduce the overall amount of development and population and employee generation, the Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative would further minimize potential impacts to public services and recreation serving the Project site. As such, this alternative would result in impacts less than those of the Project.

6.5.3.13 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

The Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative would result in the same type of development as the Project, with the exception of a 25 percent reduction in density and intensity of development. Under this alternative, total vehicle trip generation would be reduced over the Project. This alternative would generate approximately 6,637 trips, whereas the Project would generate approximately 7,177 vehicle trips. As discussed in Chapter 4.13, Transportation and Traffic, there would be six significant and unavoidable impacts resulting from the Project. Although there are mitigation measures identified, some may be considered infeasible due to that uncertainty. In general, this alternative would result in the same type of development as the Project, and although a reduction on trips generated would occur under this alternative, the 25 percent reduction is not likely to result in a substantial reduction in traffic and transportation impacts, and significant unavoidable impacts would remain. However, the reduction in trips

generated under this alternative would still result in impacts less than those of the Project regarding transportation and traffic.

6.5.3.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative would result in the same type of development as the Project, with the exception of a 25 percent reduction in density and intensity of the amount of development. As such, this alternative would reduce the increase in population, residential units, hotel units, and public amenities, thereby reducing the overall impact to utilities and service systems. As discussed in Chapter 4.14, Utilities and Service Systems, the Project would result in a less-than-impact to sanitary wastewater, solid waste, and energy. Given that this alternative would reduce the level of development proposed by the Project, impacts to utilities and service systems would therefore be less than those of the Project.

6.5.4 ALTERNATIVES COMPARISON

Table 6-4 compares the impact of each alternative to impacts associated with the proposed project.

TABLE 6-4 COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Topic	No Project	Relocated Hotel Alternative	Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative
Aesthetics	0	-	0
Air Quality	-	0	-
Biological Resources	-	0	-
Cultural Resources	-	0	-
Geology and Soils	0	0	-
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	-	0	+
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	0	0	0
Hydrology and Water Quality	+	0	-
Land Use and Planning	-	0	0
Noise	-	0	0
Population and Housing	-	0	0
Public Services & Recreation	-	0	-
Transportation and Traffic	-	0	-
Utilities and Service Systems	-	0	-

Note: + Indicates that the alternative impact is greater when compared to the Project
0 Indicates that the alternative is similar to the proposed project
- Indicates that the alternative impact is less when compared to the Project.

6.6 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

In addition to the discussion and comparison of impacts of the Project and the Alternatives, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an "environmentally superior" alternative be selected and the reasons for such a selection be disclosed. The environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the least amount of significant impacts. Identification of the environmentally superior alternative is an informational procedure and the alternative selected may not be the alternative that best meets the goals or needs of the City of San Leandro.

As shown in Table 6-4, the No Project Alternative would have the fewest environmental impacts as compared to the other two alternatives, and would therefore be the environmentally superior alternative. However, in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2), if the environmentally superior alternative is the CEQA-required No Project alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Accordingly, the next environmentally superior alternative would be the Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative because, as shown in Table 6-4, this alternative would reduce the overall development density and intensity by 25 percent which would result in slightly less development and less traffic generation at buildout. This alternative would also meet all of the Project Objectives with the exception of meeting the City's Regional Housing Needs Assessment to provide 1,161 above-moderate income housing units by 2022. Therefore, the Reduced Density/Intensity Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative.