

Executive Summary

Introduction

This summary presents the major findings of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) including the following:

- A brief overview of the Union City Station District Mixed-Use Development Project;
- Discussion of areas of known controversy;
- Discussion of the results of analysis of key issues;
- A description of the alternatives considered and their impacts; and,
- A summary of impacts and mitigation measures.

Project Overview

Project Location

The Proposed Project is located in Union City, California (Figure 2-1). The study area of the Proposed Project encompasses Blocks 2 and 3 of the City's Intermodal Station District as shown in Figure 2-2. The Station District is located adjacent to the Union City Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Station, south of Decoto Road between Mission Boulevard and Alvarado-Niles Road.

Background

The City completed the Intermodal Station District and Transit Facility Plan (Station District Plan) in June 2001. This Plan created a vision of a pedestrian-oriented, high-density downtown district. The policy goals of the Station District Plan included the creation of a two-sided BART station with direct transit connections to BART, Capitol Corridor, Altamont Commuter Express (ACE), Dumbarton Rail, Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit), and Union City Transit (local bus service). The underutilized and vacant lands surrounding the BART station were identified for high-density development that would provide retail services, jobs, and housing. The environmental impacts of the Station District Plan were evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Amended and Restated Redevelopment Plan, which was certified in 2002 by the Union City Council.

The Station District includes approximately 50 acres surrounding the BART station. It is comprised of a 29.84-acre site (formerly owned by Pacific Gas & Electric [PG&E] and now owned by the Union City Redevelopment Agency); the 14-acre BART property; and a 6-acre site that is owned by Avalon Bay Communities, Inc. and developed with 438 multi-family residential units. The original land use plan for the 50 acre Station District that was analyzed in the 2002 EIR included development of 630 dwelling units, 100,000 square feet of retail, 1.18 million square feet of office, and 2.85 acres of community open space and public facilities. Transit commuter parking facilities for 2,500 cars were also programmed for the area. Figure 2-3 depicts the layout for the entire Intermodal Station District, the 29.84-acre former PG&E site, and the 6-acre Proposed Project site. In addition, BART, in conjunction with the City, has currently embarked on a rehabilitation and upgrade of the BART Station, which would accommodate future residents of the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project, along with the Avalon Bay project, would exceed the envisioned residential unit count for the Station District. However, the expected office development for the Station District will be reduced by approximately 300,000 square feet as a result of the increased land area devoted to residential uses. In order to be built, the Proposed Project would require amendments to the City's General Plan to accommodate the increase in proposed residential development over what was previously envisioned for the area and evaluated in previous environmental documents prepared for the area. In addition, a Zoning Text Amendment is proposed to incorporate the development standards listed in the Design Guidelines that were prepared for Blocks 2, 3 and 4 (Appendix C) and to accommodate the Proposed Project. This EIR, incorporates the previous EIR analysis of the Station District build-out included in the Amended and Restated Redevelopment Plan, and addresses the potential environmental consequences of redistributing residential, commercial and retail uses within Blocks 2 and 3 of the Station District.

Project Objectives and Goals

The primary objectives of the Proposed Project are to:

- Create a major architectural landmark and a sense of place for Union City while preserving views to and from the hillsides;
- Contribute to the vitality of the Station District area through the introduction of up to 973 units of housing with a mix of ground-level commercial uses;
- Ensure that the first phase of development is of sufficient size and scale to establish a positive sense of place and identity for the new district;
- Provide a range of commercial opportunities including ground-level space suitable for retail and restaurant uses, as well as office and workspace for small businesses, artisans, and entrepreneurs;
- Provide a range of living opportunities including for-sale and rental units including apartments, condominiums, and townhouses;

- Create public-spirited and pedestrian-friendly environment that reinforces a pleasant and safe environment along all of the key street frontages and public spaces within the area including 11th Street, Berger Way, Galliano Way, and Cheeves Way;
- Orient parking to Cheeves Way as well as internal street network, where they would have the least impact on the more pedestrian –intensive areas of the planned community;
- Provide complimentary spatial definition of the Station District area with a composition of low-, mid-, and high-rise buildings that are carefully scaled to create an interesting and diverse “townscape”;
- Apply cost-effective techniques and practices in green-building, sustainable design, energy conservation, and comfortable pedestrian environments that discourage automobile use and reinforce transit.

Project Description

Blocks 2 and 3

Blocks 2 and 3 represent approximately 6 acres of land at the center of the Station District TOD. This Draft EIR analyzes the development of residential, commercial/retail, and business condominiums on Blocks 2 and 3.

The Proposed Project will include up to 973 units of housing, up to 37,500 square feet of commercial/retail and up to 6,200 square feet of business condominiums in a range of building types from low- to mid- to high-rise.¹ The residential development within these blocks will include three strategically located towers. Each block would accommodate one tower that would range in height from 10 – 16 stories, and would measure approximately 110 – 170 feet in height (including podium levels). On Block 3, this tower is proposed on the corner of 11th Street and Berger Way. On Block 2, the 10-16 story tower (i.e. western tower) is proposed on the corner of 11th Street and Galliano Way. One additional tower is proposed on Block 2, on the corner of Cheeves Way and Berger Way. This tower is proposed to measure up to 24 stories (including podium levels) and would be located diagonally across Block 2 from the smaller tower. On both blocks, additional units would be located on top of the podium within mid-rise buildings that measure up to four-stories high. A few townhome units are proposed along Berger Way and Galliano Way that would be directly accessed from the street. The proposed units would be either a for-rent or a for-sale product or initially start out as a for-rent and transition into a for-sale product.

The Proposed Project also includes development of up to 37,500 square feet of commercial/retail space along 11th Street with residential units above. The retail space will average 50 feet in depth and will accommodate a variety of shopping

¹ For the purposes of this project description, buildings that are 1-3 stories are considered “low-rise”, buildings that are 4-7 stories are considered “mid-rise”, and buildings taller than 7 stories are considered “high-rise.” Note that the plans submitted for the project listed in Appendix D and E refer to “low” and “mid” rise units as defined in Chapter 2.0 Project Description as “low-rise.”

and restaurant opportunities. Lastly, the Proposed Project includes development of up to 6,200 square feet of business condominiums constructed along the Pedestrian Promenade located between Blocks 3 and 4 (the Pedestrian Promenade is not included in the Proposed Project). These units are anticipated to accommodate office uses.

Scoping Process

Through issuance of the Initial Study/Notice of Preparation (IS/NOP) (refer to Appendix A) responsible agencies have been provided the opportunity to provide both written and oral comment concerning the scope of this Draft EIR, the alternatives to be considered, and issues of concern and controversy. The comments (refer to Appendix B) are on file with the City of Union City Economic and Community Development Department in Union City, California. All comments provided were considered during the development of the Draft EIR and consideration of alternatives.

The following are the issues of greatest concern raised in scoping comments.

- **Traffic and Safety.** Concerns about the effect of the Proposed Project to traffic and safety on Decoto Road, Alvarado-Niles Road, Mission Boulevard, Isherwood Way, Linda Drive, King Avenue, Paso Padre Parkway, Interstate 880, and State Route 84 and impacts to BART and AC Transit service have been expressed.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality.** Concern about potential impacts related to water supply, distribution infrastructure, and groundwater have been expressed.
- **Rail Safety.** Concern regarding the potential increase in pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the vicinity of the Union Pacific Railroad lines has been expressed.

Summary of Key Issues of Concern

This section discusses the key issues of concern raised in the NOP process and potentially significant impacts to resource areas relative to the Proposed Project and the conclusions of this document regarding those issues. This is not a comprehensive discussion of impacts of the Proposed Project, for which the reader is directed to Tables ES-1 at the end of this Chapter, and Chapters 3 and 4 of the document.

- **Aesthetics:** The Proposed Project would create a new source of light or glare which is potentially significant. Impacts related to light and glare would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of Mitigation Measure AES-4 Implement Measures to Reduce Light and Glare. Given the height of the proposed towers, the project will result in a substantial change in the local visual character as no similar type of development exists at or near the project site. Given the project design and architectural treatments,

the project is not expected to result in the site having less visual quality than that present with the undeveloped location, but given the scale and height of the proposed development, it will result in a significant and unavoidable change in the visual character.

- **Air Quality:** Significant impacts to air quality would occur during construction. Exhaust emitted from construction vehicles would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-2 Implement Dust and Vehicle Emission Control Measures.
- **Hazardous Materials:** Significant impacts could result from upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment at the project site and interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts related to upset and accident conditions and interference with plans would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1a Follow the Alameda County Fire Department and Other Guidelines for Storage and Handling of Hazardous Materials and City of Union City Environmental Programs, Mitigation Measure HAZ-1b Immediately Contain Spills, Excavate Spill-Contaminated Soil, and Disposal at an Approved Facility, Mitigation Measure HAZ-1c Develop and Implement Plans to Reduce Exposure of People and the Environment to Hazardous Conditions During Construction Activities, and Mitigation Measure HAZ-6 Provide and Evacuation Route through the Project Site. In addition, significant impacts could result from fire and explosion risk due to proximity to the Air Liquide Facility. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-2a Develop and Implement a Site-Specific Emergency Response Plan for the Project and Mitigation Measure HAZ-2b Require Safety Glass for Portions of the Project Risk of Overpressure Greater than 1psi would minimize the potential for structural damage and bodily injury, but would not reduce the potential for bodily injury. Therefore, impacts from fire and explosion risks due to proximity to the Air Liquide Facility would remain significant and unavoidable.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality:** Significant impacts to water quality could result from construction-related earth disturbing activities and hazardous materials; construction below the water table; increase surface runoff; and associated impacts on water quality and drainage facilities. Hydrology and water quality impacts related to construction, increased surface runoff, and associated impact on water quality and drainage facilities would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1a Comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Requirements, Mitigation Measure HYD-1b Clean Paved Areas with Street Sweeping Equipment, Mitigation Measure HYD-2 Implement Spill Prevention and Control Program, Mitigation Measure HYD-3 Conduct Geology Study and Implement Provisions for Dewatering, and Mitigation Measure HYD-4 Incorporate Site-Specific Water Quality Treatment Devices into Site Drainage Plan and Implement Best Management Practices.
- **Noise:** Exposure of new land uses to exterior transportation noise levels in excess of City standards and exposure of off-site noise sensitive land use to short-term construction noise is significant. Noise impacts would be reduced

to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 Employ Measures to Reduce Transportation Noise Levels to Comply with Applicable Noise Standards and NOI-4 Employ Measures to Reduce Construction Noise Levels to Comply with Applicable Construction Noise Standards.

- **Traffic and Circulation:** Significant impacts to transportation and circulation would occur related to degradation of Intersection LOS as a result of construction-generated traffic, interference with emergency access and circulation as a result of construction –generated traffic. These impacts during construction can be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1 Develop and Implement a Traffic Control Plan. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce all impacts related to degradation of Intersection LOS as a result of project-generated traffic under Existing Plus Project & Pending Intermodal Development Conditions and Future Cumulative Conditions. Therefore, impacts related to degradation of intersection LOS under these conditions would remain significant and unavoidable.

Alternatives Considered

After considering the input provided in comments on the NOP and at the scoping meetings, the results of the impact analysis in Chapter 3.0, and the cumulative impact analysis in Chapter 4.0, a range of alternatives and alternative options were identified with the potential to avoid or substantially reduce the significant impacts of the project.

Alternatives were screened for feasibility, their ability to meet some or all of the project objectives, and their potential to avoid or substantially reduce significant impacts of the project.

Some alternatives were initially considered but dismissed from more detailed impact analysis because they are either considered infeasible, would not meet at least some of the project objectives, or would not avoid or substantially lower the significant impacts identified for the Proposed Project. The rationale for this determination is explained in Chapter 5.0. The Alternatives being analyzed include the following:

- **Alternative 1—No Project.** Under this alternative, no improvements to the vacant 6-acre site would occur. The site would remain undeveloped.
- **Alternative 2—General Plan Buildout (Station District Plan).** Under this alternative, the Proposed Project site would be developed per the description in the Intermodal Station District and Transit Facility Plan. This alternative proposes 480 residential units (assumes 80 units per acre over 6 acres), 37,500 square feet of retail/commercial uses, and 6,200 square feet of business condominiums. This alternative would also result in the construction of up to 840 parking stalls (1.75 parking stalls per residential unit).

- Alternative 3—Townhouse Alternative. This alternative proposes the development of 78 row townhouses, 37,500 square feet of retail/commercial square footage and 6,200 square feet of business condominiums on the 6 acres. Additionally, this alternative would accommodate up to 156 parking stalls.

All three alternatives are feasible; however, these alternatives failed to meet the objectives and goals of the Project. Alternative 1 would not meet the objectives and goals of the Project as it proposes no development on the 6-acre site.

Alternative 2 would result in a pedestrian-friendly mixed-use development with residential, retail/commercial, and business condominiums. However, under this alternative, the goal of constructing 973 units of housing would not be met.

Similarly, Alternative 3 would also not satisfy the objective of constructing 973 units of housing. Although the No Project Alternative had the fewest identified local impacts, it had the greatest regional impacts. The chosen environmentally superior alternative, that has meet the majority of the goals and objectives, was Alternative 2 General Plan Buildout. This alternative had fewer impacts compared to Alternative 3 in the areas of aesthetics, air quality (regionally), climate change, land use, noise (regionally), and transportation and circulation (regionally). Although the environmentally superior alternative would have fewer *localized* impacts relative to aesthetics, air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, public services and utilities, and transportation circulation relative to the Proposed Project, it would have greater *regional* air quality, hydrology and water quality, and transportation and circulation, and climate change (due to higher GHG emissions overall) impacts than the Proposed Project..

In addition to the alternatives studied in Chapter 5, four other alternatives were considered but dismissed from further analysis. This included a residential-development only alternative (no commercial/retail/business), a retail/commercial/business condominium alternative (no residential), an affordable housing alternative, and an off-site alternative.

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance

The impacts of the Proposed Project, proposed mitigation, and significance conclusions are discussed in detail in Chapter 3.0 and Chapter 4.0. Table ES-1 summarizes the impacts, mitigation measures, and levels of significance identified in this document.

This page intentionally left blank.

Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Levels of Significance

Impacts	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures
Aesthetics		
Impact AES-1: Have A Substantial Adverse Effect on a Scenic Vista	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact AES-2: Damage Scenic Resources	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact AES-3: Degrade Existing Visual Character or Quality	SU	No feasible mitigation.
Impact AES-4: Create A New Source of Substantial Light or Glare	SI	Mitigation Measure AES-4: Implement Measures to Reduce Light and Glare
Air Quality		
Impact AIR-1: Conforms with Implementation of Air Quality Attainment Plan	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact AIR-2: Generation of PM10 and Construction Vehicle Exhaust Emissions	SI	Mitigation Measure AIR-2: Implement Dust and Vehicle Emission Control Measures
Impact AIR-3: Increase in Ozone Precursor (ROG and NOx) and PM2.5 emissions during Project Operation	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact AIR-4: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations of CO	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact AIR-5: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact AIR-6: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Objectionable Odors	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Biological Resources		
Impact BIO-1: Potential Loss or Disturbance of Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species or Their Habitat	NI	Mitigation is not required.
Impact BIO-2: Potential Loss or Disturbance of On-Site Trees, Vegetation, and/or Natural Communities	NI	Mitigation is not required.
Impact BIO-3: Potential Disturbance or Loss of Waters of the United States (including Wetlands)	NI	Mitigation is not required.
Impact BIO-4: Affect Wildlife Dispersal or Migration Corridors	NI	Mitigation is not required.
Impact BIO-5: Conflict with any Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources	NI	Mitigation is not required.
Impact BIO-6: Potential Conflict with Adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or Other Approved Local, Regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan	NI	Mitigation is not required.

Table ES-1. Continued

Impacts	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures
Climate Change		
Impact CLI-1: Emission of GHGs During Construction and Operation	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact CLI-2: Consistency with AB 32	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact CLI-3: Impact of Climate Change on the Project	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Cultural Resources		
Impact CUL-1: Inadvertent Discovery of Buried Archaeological Resources	SI	Mitigation Measure CR-1: Stop Work if Buried Resources Are Discovered
Impact CUL-2: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains	SI	Mitigation Measure CR-2: Comply with State Laws Relating to Native American Remains
Geology, Seismicity, and Soils		
Impact GEO-1: Potential Structural Damage and Injury from Fault Rupture	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact GEO-2: Potential Structural Damage and Injury from Groundshaking	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact GEO-3: Potential Structural Damage and Injury from Development on Materials Subject to Liquefaction	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact GEO-4: Potential Structural Damage and Injury from Slope Failure	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact GEO-5: Potential Accelerated Runoff, Erosion, and Sedimentation from Grading Activities	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact GEO-6: Potential Loss of Topsoil	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact GEO-7: Potential Structural Damage as a Result of Development on Expansive Soils	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact GEO-8: Construction on Soils Incapable of Adequately Supporting the Use of Septic Tanks or Alternative Wastewater Disposal Systems	NI	Mitigation is not required.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
Impact HAZ-1: Upset and Accident Conditions Involving the Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment at the Project site	SI	Mitigation Measure HAZ-1a: Follow the Union City Fire Department and Other Guidelines for Storage and Handling of Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure HAZ-1b: Immediately Contain Spills, Excavate Spill-Contaminated Soil, and Disposal at an Approved Facility Mitigation Measure HAZ-1c: Develop and Implement Plans to Reduce Exposure of People and the Environment to Hazardous Conditions During Construction Activities

Impacts	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures
Impact HAZ-2: Fire and Explosion Risk Due to Proximity to the Air Liquide Facility	SU	Mitigation Measure HAZ-2a: Develop and Implement a Site-Specific Emergency Response Plan for the Project Mitigation Measure HAZ-2b: Require Safety Glass for Portions of the Project at Risk of Overpressure Greater than 1 psi
Impact HAZ-3: Hazardous Emissions or Hazardous Materials, Substances, or Waste Handling Within One-Quarter Mile of a School	NI	Mitigation is not required.
Impact HAZ-4: Location of the Project on a Known Hazardous Material Site	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact HAZ-5: Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact HAZ-6: Interference with an Adopted Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan	SI	Mitigation Measure HAZ-6: Provide an Evacuation Route through the Project Site
Hydrology and Water Quality		
Impact HYD-1: Impacts on Water Quality as a Result of Construction-Related Earth Disturbing Activities	SI	Mitigation Measure HYD-1a: Comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Requirements Mitigation Measure HYD-1b: Clean Paved Areas with Street Sweeping Equipment
Impact HYD-2: Water Quality Impacts as a Result of Construction-Related Hazardous Materials	SI	Mitigation Measure HYD-2: Implement a Spill Prevention and Control Program
Impact HYD-3: Water Quality Impacts from Construction below the Water Table	SI	Mitigation Measure HYD-3: Implement Provisions for Dewatering
Impact HYD-4: Increased Amounts of Surface Runoff and Associated Impacts on Water Quality and Drainage Facilities during Operation	SI	Mitigation Measure HYD-4: Design Adequate Storm Drain Capacity and Implement Best Management Practices to Maximize Stormwater Quality
Impact HYD-5: Decrease in Groundwater Recharge	NI	Mitigation not required.
Impact HYD-6: Substantial Depletion of Groundwater Supplies	NI	Mitigation not required.
Impact HYD-7: Impacts on Groundwater and Surface Water from Infrastructure Failure	LTS	Mitigation not required.
Impact HYD-8: Water Quality Impacts from Discharges to CWA 303(d)-Listed Surface Water Bodies	LTS	Mitigation not required.
Impact HYD-9: Impacts on Housing from Placement in a 100-Year Floodplain	NI	Mitigation not required.
Impact HYD-10: Impacts on Flood flows from Structures in 100-Year Floodplain	NI	Mitigation not required.
Impact HYD-11: Flood Hazards associated with Levee or Dam Failure	LTS	Mitigation not required.

Table ES-1. Continued

Impacts	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures
Land Use		
Impact LAN-1: Division of an Established Community	NI	Mitigation is not required.
Impact LAN-2: Conflict with an Existing Land Use Plan or Policy	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact LAN-3: Conflict with an Existing HCP or NCCP	NI	Mitigation is not required.
Noise and Vibration		
Impact NOI-1: Exposure of New Land Uses to Exterior Transportation Noise Levels in Excess of City Standards	SI	Mitigation Measure NOI -1: Employ Measures to Reduce Transportation Noise Levels to Comply with Applicable Noise Standards
Impact NOI-2: Exposure of Persons to Excessive Groundborne Vibration Levels	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact NOI-3: Exposure of Off-site Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Increased Traffic Noise	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact NOI-4: Exposure of Off-site Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Short-term Construction Noise	SI	Mitigation Measure NOI-4: Employ Measures to Reduce Construction Noise to Comply with Applicable Construction Noise Standards
Population and Housing		
Impact POP-1: Direct Inducement of Substantial Population Growth	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact POP-2: Displacement of Existing Housing or Population	NI	Mitigation is not required.
Public Services, Utilities, and Recreation		
Impact PUB-1: Increased Demand for Utilities	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact PUB-2: Increased Demand for School Facilities	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact PUB-3: Increased Demand for Police and Fire Protection	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact PUB-4: Increased Demand for Parks	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact PUB-5: Increased demand for Solid Waste Collection and Disposal Capacity	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact PUB-6: Increased Demand for Wastewater Treatment and Sewage Capacity	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact PUB-7: Increased Demand for Water Supply	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact PUB-8: Interference with Emergency Access Routes or Adopted Emergency Access Plans	LTS	Mitigation is not required.
Impact PUB-9: Construction-Related Service Disruptions	LTS	Mitigation is not required.

Impacts	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measures
Transportation and Circulation		
Impact TRA-1: Degradation of Intersection LOS as a Result of Construction-Generated Traffic	SI	Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Develop and Implement a Traffic Control Plan
Impact TRA-2: Interference with Emergency Access and Circulation as a Result of Construction-Generated Traffic	SI	Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Develop and Implement a Traffic Control Plan
Impact TRA-3: Inadequate Parking Facilities to Meet Construction-Related Parking Demands	LTS	Mitigation not required.
Impact TRA-4: Degradation of Intersection LOS as a Result of Project-Generated Traffic under Existing Plus Project Conditions	LTS	Mitigation not required.
Impact TRA-5: Degradation of Intersection LOS as a Result of Project-Generated Traffic under Existing Plus Project & Pending Intermodal Development Conditions	SU	Mitigation Measure TRA-5: Roadway Improvements for Decoto Road/11th Street Intersection
Impact TRA-6: Increase in Safety Hazards to Pedestrians/Bicyclists as a Result of a Design Features	LTS	Mitigation not required.
Impact TRA-7: Inadequate Emergency Access during Project Operation	LTS	Mitigation not required.
Impact TRA-8: Increased Transit Demand	LTS	Mitigation not required.
Impact TRA-9: Conflict with an Adopted Plan Supporting Alternative Transportation	NI	Mitigation not required.
Impact TRA-10: Inadequate Parking Supply to Meet Parking Demand during Project Operation	LTS	Mitigation not required.
Impact TRA-11: Degradation of Intersection LOS as a Result of Project-Generated Traffic under Future Cumulative Conditions	SU	Mitigation Measure TRA-5: Roadway Improvements for Decoto Road/11th Street Intersection
Impact TRA-12: Degradation of LOS on CMP/MTS Roadways as a Result of Project-Generated Traffic under Future Cumulative Conditions	LTS	Mitigation not required.
Impact TRA-13: Potential Decrease in Rail Safety	SI	Mitigation Measure TRA-13: Fence, signage, and rail safety education

Notes:

- SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact
- SI = Significant Impact that can be Mitigated to Less-than-Significant
- LTS = Less than Significant Impact
- NI = No Impact or Not Applicable

This page intentionally left blank.