

# CHAPTER V

---

## ALTERNATIVES

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires an evaluation of the comparative effects of a range of feasible alternatives to the project that would attain the basic objectives of the project and avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant effects of the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6). The range of alternatives is governed by the “rule of reason” that requires the environmental impact report (EIR) to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f]). Evaluation of a No Project Alternative and identification of an environmentally superior alternative are required. The significant effects of the alternatives may be discussed in less detail than the significant effects of the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[d]). Significant effects of the alternatives, studied in this EIR, are addressed in the text and summarized in Table V-1. It should be noted that the alternatives’ significance levels reflect levels of significance after implementation of mitigation measures, as appropriate, and as identified for the project in Chapter IV. Mitigation requirements are also noted to lessen impacts of alternatives to less than significant levels.

This section evaluates three alternatives to the proposed project: 1) a No Project Alternative, in which the project would not be undertaken, 2) a Full Preservation Alternative, in which the seven buildings identified as historic resources pursuant to CEQA would be retained, and 3) a Partial Preservation Alternative, which would retain three existing buildings located at the northeast and southeast corners of 23rd and Valley Streets that are deemed historic resources pursuant to CEQA. These alternatives are described below, followed by a discussion of their impacts and how they would differ from those of the proposed project and each other.

### **ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE**

#### **DESCRIPTION**

Under the No Project Alternative, the project would not be undertaken. None of the buildings on the project site would be demolished, and there would be no new construction of residential or commercial uses on the site. Existing uses, mostly related to automobile sales and service, are presumed to remain for the foreseeable future. Because some of the buildings on the project site are vacant, those buildings could be reoccupied with new uses under this alternative. This alternative would not preclude the project sponsor or another developer from proposing another project in the future: given that the project site is relatively underutilized, compared to other large properties in greater downtown Oakland, and given the proposed Uptown Mixed-Use Project, about two blocks south of the site, the likelihood that the project site would be redeveloped at some time in the near future probably can be considered relatively strong.

It should be noted that many of the buildings on the project site are constructed of unreinforced masonry and would have to be strengthened in accordance with city ordinance, to the extent that such work has not already been undertaken, in order to be reused over a long-term period.

## IMPACTS

Under this alternative, the project's significant unavoidable impacts related to demolition of historic resources would not occur, because development of the project would not move forward. The No Project Alternative would not result in significant, but mitigable, impacts resulting from increased traffic, air pollution, or noise impacts that would be generated by the proposed project, nor would the No Project Alternative result in significant, but mitigable, impacts related to potential disturbance of archaeological and paleontological resources, nor to hazardous materials exposure and/or use during construction. The site conditions would remain essentially as discussed in the setting sections of Chapter IV.

This alternative would not meet any of the project sponsor's objectives, or those of the City, relative to increasing residential opportunities in close proximity to job opportunities in the greater downtown, providing for a 24-hour population in the greater downtown, implementing of the City of Oakland's 10K Downtown Housing Initiative, provision of new housing to help meet regional housing needs and alleviate the regional jobs/housing imbalance, or improvement of the streetscape of an important gateway site to downtown.

Should another project be proposed for the project site, that project would be subject to CEQA review at the time. To the extent that a future project is similar in size and scale to the currently proposed project, effects could be similar to those described in this EIR.

## **ALTERNATIVE 2: FULL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE**

### DESCRIPTION

The Full Preservation Alternative would retain, rehabilitate, and reuse all seven buildings on the project site that are identified as historic resources, and would construct residential units, commercial space, and parking on the remainder of the site. No new construction would occur atop the retained structures. Most likely, the project sponsor would re-use the historic buildings for various types of commercial uses and accommodate the appropriate parking elsewhere on-site, in a reconfigured layout. According to the sponsor, some buildings are more viable conversions for retail than others, given the more visible location and construction type.

For purposes of analysis, it is assumed that this alternative would include essentially the same ground-floor commercial space as would the proposed project (40,000 square feet), but would have about 350 residential units, or 25 percent fewer than the 475 units proposed with the project. Of the 350 units, approximately 105 units (15 percent fewer than the project) would be on Parcel A and about 245 units (30 percent fewer than the project) would be on Parcel B. (The difference would be greater on Parcel B because more existing buildings would be retained

there.) It is assumed that the number of commercial parking spaces also would be the same as with the project, and that residential parking would be reduced proportionately (with a further reduction of 5 percent on Parcel A and 10 percent on Parcel B to account for the less efficient site layout). Thus, this alternative would have about 500 parking spaces in total (130 commercial and 370 residential), compared to 675 spaces with the proposed project. The residential parking ratio would be 1.05 spaces per unit, compared to 1.15 spaces per unit with the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would result in a less clear circulation pattern within the project's garages, particularly on Parcel B, in that there would be three separate areas on that parcel in which existing buildings would protrude into the layout of the garage.

The Full Preservation Alternative would construct buildings similar to those proposed with the project, except that the site plan for this alternative would include "cutouts" around the seven existing historic buildings to be preserved. The buildings that would be retained with this alternative are as follows (buildings numbered in accordance with Figure IV.E-1, p. IV.E-11):

- 1 – 441-449 23rd Street
- 2 – 439 23rd Street
- 4 – 440-448 23rd Street
- 5 – 2366-2398 Valley Street
- 9 – 2335 Broadway
- 10 – 2343 Broadway
- 11 – 2345 Broadway

Because it would develop approximately 75 percent of the residential units that would be built with the proposed project, the Preservation Alternative effectively would be a reduced-intensity alternative, as well.

## IMPACTS

This alternative would avoid the significant, unmitigable impacts of the project with respect to demolition of historic resources. All seven historic buildings on the project site would be retained and rehabilitated; it is assumed that rehabilitation would be undertaken consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Secretary's Standards). The state CEQA Guidelines indicate that projects that are consistent with the Secretary's Standards generally "shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historic resource" (Section 15064.5(b)(3)).

Other impacts of the Full Preservation Alternative would, in general, be similar to or less severe than those of the proposed project. In the case of impacts related to construction activities, such as noise and dust emissions during construction, use of or potential exposure to hazardous materials, or the potential to disturb unknown archaeological and paleontological resources, impacts of this alternative generally would be similar to those of the project because, while fewer residential units would be developed, the project site would be the same size and the duration of construction would not vary markedly.

In the case of impacts related to the intensity of development, including effects of traffic, traffic-generated air quality and noise, the Full Preservation Alternative would have lesser impacts because, with fewer residential units than the proposed project (and equal commercial use), this alternative would generate less traffic. With fewer parking spaces per residential unit, this alternative would have a residential parking shortfall of about 20 spaces. However, the demand could be met by nearby on- and off-street parking; furthermore, a parking shortfall, even if it occurred, would not normally be considered a significant impact under CEQA. This alternative would meet the zoning requirement for parking.

The Full Preservation Alternative would have similar visual effects to those of the proposed project because, while the overall mass of the development would be less substantial, this alternative still would include development of buildings of up to seven stories over the majority of the two project blocks. The visual relationships between the historic buildings and the new construction would be addressed through the City’s design review process.

Shadow impacts of this alternative would be somewhat less substantial than those of the proposed project, because the buildings, in total, would be less massive; in particular, effects on existing residential units on Valley Street would be incrementally lesser than with the project, because there would be no new construction at the location of the three historic buildings on Valley Street (at the intersections of 23rd and 24th Streets).

The Full Preservation Alternative would not result in any significant, unmitigable impacts, and thus would be considered the “environmentally superior” alternative. However, by developing one-fourth fewer residential units than the proposed project, this alternative would be less responsive to the Mayor’s and the City Council’s 10K Downtown Housing Initiative than would the project. It would not, however, be considered the alternative that would most advance the City’s housing goals for Downtown, revitalization within the redevelopment area, increased sales revenues, and opportunities for temporary (e.g., construction) or permanent employment opportunities in Oakland. Furthermore, the fewer number of units, compared to the project, could reduce the potential for the sponsor to provide a diversity of unit sizes and types by increasing the economic pressure to provide more, smaller units, compared to the proposed project.

### **ALTERNATIVE 3: PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE**

#### **DESCRIPTION**

The Partial Preservation Alternative would retain, rehabilitate, and reuse the three buildings that are identified as historic resources that are located at the east corners of the intersection of 23rd and Valley Streets. The three buildings are the following (buildings numbered in accordance with Figure IV.E-1, p. IV.E-11):

- 1 – 441-449 23rd Street
- 2 – 439 23rd Street
- 4 – 440-448 23rd Street

As with the Full Preservation Alternative, the retained historic buildings would likely be re-used for various types of commercial uses, with the parking reconfigured on the site. Residential units, commercial space, and parking would be developed on the remainder of the site. No new construction would occur atop the retained structures. For purposes of analysis, it is assumed that this alternative would include essentially the same ground-floor commercial space (40,000 square feet) as would both the proposed project and the Full Preservation Alternative (Alternative 2). However, the Partial Preservation Alternative would have approximately 425 residential units, or 10 percent fewer than the 475 units proposed with the project, and about 21 percent more than the 350 units in the Full Preservation Alternative. Of the 425 units, approximately 105 units (15 percent fewer than the project) would be on Parcel A and about 320 units (20 percent fewer than the project) would be on Parcel B. (The difference would be greater on Parcel B because the four other buildings on the project site that are identified as historic resources pursuant to CEQA, which would not be retained in this alternative, are on Parcel B.) The number of commercial parking spaces would be essentially the same as with the project and the Full Preservation Alternative, and residential parking would be reduced proportionately (with a further reduction of 5 percent on Parcel A and 10 percent on Parcel B to account for the less efficient site layout as was warranted for the Full Preservation Alternative). Thus, the Partial Preservation Alternative would have about 580 parking spaces in total (130 commercial and 450 residential), compared to 675 spaces with the proposed project and about 500 spaces in the Full Preservation Alternative. The residential parking ratio would be 1.05 spaces per unit (equal to the ratio in the Full Preservation Alternative), compared to 1.15 spaces per unit with the proposed project. As discussed for the Full Preservation Alternative, maintaining some of the existing buildings on the project site will likely result in less optimal parking garage circulation since the retained buildings would protrude into the layout of the garage. However, this effect would be less than in the Full Preservation Alternative since fewer buildings would be maintained and since the building(s) to be maintained are contiguous and located in the corner-most sections of each parcel.

The Partial Preservation Alternative would construct buildings similar to those proposed with the project, except that the site plan for this alternative would include “cutouts” around the three existing historic buildings to be preserved. Also, it would develop approximately 90 percent of the residential units that would be built with the proposed project and therefore effectively be a reduced-intensity alternative, as well (although to a lesser extent than the Full Preservation Alternative which would construct 75 percent of the residential units propose in the proposed project.)

The two buildings to be retained on Parcel A would likely be used for retail parking, in the same location as parking would be developed under the proposed project; that is, openings would be cut into rear and side walls of the buildings and their floor plates would be integrated as possible into the ground-floor parking garage. Because Building 2 (439 23rd Street) extends deeper into Parcel A than does Building 1 (441-449 23rd Street), it is likely that approximately 30 feet of Building 2 would be removed; however, this change would not be apparent to sidewalk observers. To create pedestrian interest along the sidewalk in front of the retained buildings, “shadow boxes” or similar features could be built inside the windows to allow the windows to be

used for display purposes, and to hide the cars behind. The building to be retained on Parcel B (Building 4 at 440-448 23rd Street) is located where residential units and residential parking would be developed under the proposed project. It is possible that residential units could be constructed within the existing building; should this prove infeasible, the building could be used, to the extent feasible, for parking.

## IMPACTS

This alternative would minimize, but not fully avoid, the significant, unmitigable impacts of the project with respect to demolition of historic resources; adverse effects of this alternative would be less than those of the proposed project, but greater than those of the Full Preservation Alternative. An identifiable group of three historic buildings in close proximity to one another on the project site, including the two-building 23rd Street Group Area of Secondary Importance (Buildings 1 and 2), would be retained and rehabilitated; it is assumed that rehabilitation would be undertaken consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Secretary's Standards) and would thus be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historic resource," according to the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.5(b)(3)).

Other impacts of the Partial Preservation Alternative would, in general, be similar to or less severe than those of the proposed project and, in several cases, somewhat more severe than those of the Full Preservation Alternative, in that the Partial Preservation Alternative would develop a quantity of housing units midway between those of the project and the Full Preservation Alternative. In the case of impacts related to construction activities, such as noise and dust emissions during construction, use of or potential exposure to hazardous materials, or the potential to disturb unknown archaeological and paleontological resources, impacts of this alternative generally would be similar to those of the project and the Full Preservation Alternative. Despite the variation in the number of residential units that would be developed, the project site would be the same size and the duration of construction would not vary markedly.

The effects of traffic, traffic-generated air quality and noise would be less, compared to the project, with the Partial Preservation Alternative, which would have fewer residential units (and equal commercial use) and would generate less traffic. With nearly 75 more units, the Partial Preservation Alternative would, however, generate more traffic than the Full Preservation Alternative. With fewer parking spaces per residential unit, this alternative would have a residential parking shortfall of about 25 spaces, compared to the 19-space surplus that would occur with the proposed project and the 20-space shortfall under the Full Preservation Alternative. However, the demand could be met by nearby on- and off-street parking; furthermore, a parking shortfall, even if it occurred, would not normally be considered a significant impact under CEQA. Like the Full Preservation Alternative, this alternative would meet the zoning requirement for parking.

Like the Full Preservation Alternative, the Partial Preservation Alternative would have similar visual effects to those of the proposed project. The overall mass of the development at the corner

of 23rd and Valley Streets would be less substantial, but this alternative still would include development of buildings of up to seven stories over the majority of the two project blocks, as would the Full Preservation Alternative.

Shadow impacts of this alternative would be somewhat less substantial than those of the proposed project, because there would be no new construction at the location of the three historic buildings on Valley Street at the intersections of 23rd Street. Conversely, shadow impacts would be somewhat greater than with the Full Preservation Alternative.

Although the Partial Preservation Alternative would retain a greater number of historic resources than the proposed project, it would still result in significant, unmitigable impacts related to the demolition of four other existing CEQA historic resources on the project site. Also, like the proposed project, it would result in a cumulative impact on historic resources when considered with other nearby projects in the vicinity that would demolish or substantially alter other historic resources. The Full Preservation Alternative is deemed the “environmentally superior” alternative because it would avoid the significant, unmitigable impacts on historic resources, however, the Partial Preservation Alternative would more fully address the Mayor’s and the City Council’s 10K Downtown Housing Initiative by developing more housing. The proposed project is most responsive to this City initiative. Also, the Partial Preservation Alternative would provide fewer units, compared to the project, and thus less opportunity to meet the city’s need for diverse housing unit types and unit sizes, particularly to attract new residential populations Downtown.

Table V-1 summarizes the impact comparison between the proposed project and the three alternatives described in this chapter.

## **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT FURTHER ANALYZED**

The three project alternatives discussed above present a reasonable range of alternatives to the project in accordance with CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6(a)). Other project alternatives suggested in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) (response letters and NOP included in Appendix A) were considered and not analyzed further in this Draft EIR because they would not substantially lessen any significant impacts identified for the proposed project. Specifically, alternatives that propose various levels of underground parking would not alter the appearance or height of the proposed structures because, with the project, the proposed two-level parking garage would be concealed by the upper, residential building stories along the street facades. The entrance to the above-ground parking on Parcel A would be visible for approximately 20 feet along Valley Street and approximately 30 feet on 23rd Street, while the Parcel B garage driveways would be similarly visible on both 23rd and 24th Streets. However, even subsurface parking would necessitate ground-level entrances and exits.

Alternatives that shift massing from Valley Street to locations along Broadway would affect the design and in some cases (i.e., residential high-rise element) the construction type required.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In general, building codes permit no more than four stories of “stick-frame” construction (wood or metal studs with drywall partitions) may be built atop a concrete base, and the project as proposed would be at this maximum.

While such an alternative might reduce aesthetic and shadow impacts of the project on Valley Street, no significant impacts have been identified with regard to either aesthetics or shading and, therefore, such an alternative is not required to lessen any identified significant impacts of the project.

Alternatives that would construct vertical additions atop one or more of the existing buildings were not evaluated because none of the existing buildings were designed to accommodate multi-story additions. Adding stories to one or more of the existing buildings would require construction of a completely new structural system within the existing buildings, which would essentially amount to preservation of the building facades only (which is proposed as part of the project for the two buildings on either side of 23rd Street at Valley Street), which would not be considered “preservation” of the structures and thus would not eliminate or substantially reduce the adverse effect of the project on historic architectural resources.

Retention and reuse of the existing buildings with no new construction was not evaluated; this would be essentially equivalent to the No Project Alternative, in that such reuse could be undertaken at present with no permits required other than perhaps building permits for remodeling or tenant improvements. As noted in connection with the No Project Alternative, seismic strengthening of the existing buildings would be required where this work has not already been completed.

---

Therefore, to increase the height along Broadway, the project would have to include concrete- or steel-frame construction above the parking podium.

**TABLE V-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

<u>Description of Alternative</u>	<u>Proposed Project</u>	<u>No Project Alternative</u>	<u>Full Preservation Alternative</u>	<u>Partial Preservation Alternative</u>
Residential Units	475	0	350	425
Commercial Square Footage	40,000	0	40,000	40,000
Parking Spaces	675	0	500	580
Historic Buildings Demolished	7	0	0	4
Historic Buildings Remaining	0	7	7	3

**Environmental Impact**

**SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS (WITH PROJECT)**

**E. Cultural Resources**

**E.3:** The project would result in demolition or substantial alteration of seven buildings that qualify as historic resources, as defined in Section 15064.5. These buildings include: 1) 2335 Broadway, 2) 2343 Broadway; 3) 2345 Broadway, 4) 2366-2398 Valley Street, 5) 439 23rd Street, 6) 440-448 23rd Street, and 7) 441-449 23rd Street. *(For Partial Preservation Alternative: The project would result in demolition or substantial alteration of three buildings that qualify as historic resources, as defined in Section 15064.5. These buildings include: 1) 439 23rd Street, 2) 440-448 23rd Street, and 3) 441-449 23rd Street.)*

SU	N↓	LS↓	SU↓
----	----	-----	-----

**E.5:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative development including new construction and other alterations to historic resources in the project vicinity, could result in cumulative impacts to historic resources.

SU	N↓	N↓	SU↓
----	----	----	-----

SU – Significant, Unmitigable Impact, even with mitigation; SM – Significant Impact; less than significant with mitigation; LS – Less than Significant Impact; N – No Impact  
 ↑ Impact of alternative *more* severe than that of project  
 ↓ Impact of alternative *less* severe than that of project

**TABLE V-1 (continued)**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Full Preservation Alternative</b>	<b>Partial Preservation Alternative</b>
<b><u>SIGNIFICANT BUT MITIGABLE IMPACTS (WITH PROJECT)</u></b>				
<b>B. Transportation, Circulation, and Parking</b>				
<b>B.2:</b> Traffic generated by the project would affect traffic levels of service at local intersections under future (2010) conditions.	SM	N↓	SM↓	SM↓
<b>B.3:</b> Traffic generated by the project would affect traffic levels of service at local intersections under cumulative (2025) conditions.	SM	N↓	SM↓	SM↓
<b>B.11:</b> Project construction would affect traffic flow and circulation, parking, and pedestrian safety.	SM	N↓	SM	SM
<b>C. Air Quality</b>				
<b>C.1:</b> Activities associated with demolition, site preparation and construction would generate short-term emissions of criteria pollutants, including suspended and inhalable particulate matter and equipment exhaust emissions.	SM	N↓	SM	SM
<b>D. Noise</b>				
<b>D.1:</b> Construction activities would intermittently and temporarily generate noise levels above existing ambient levels in the project vicinity.	SM	N↓	SM	SM
<b>E Cultural Resources</b>				
<b>E.1:</b> Construction of the proposed project could cause substantial adverse changes to the significance of currently unknown cultural resources at the site, potentially including an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 or CEQA Section 21083.2(g), or the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	SM	N↓	SM	SM
<b>E.2:</b> The proposed project may damage or degrade unidentified paleontological remains.	SM	N↓	SM	SM

SU – Significant, Unmitigable Impact, even with mitigation; SM – Significant Impact; less than significant with mitigation; LS – Less than Significant Impact; N – No Impact

↑ Impact of alternative *more* severe than that of project

↓ Impact of alternative *less* severe than that of project

**TABLE V-1 (continued)**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Full Preservation Alternative</b>	<b>Partial Preservation Alternative</b>
<b><u>SIGNIFICANT BUT MITIGABLE IMPACTS (CONT'D.)</u></b>				
<b>E.2:</b> The proposed project may adversely affect unidentified paleontological resources at the site.	SM	N↓	SM	SM
<b>F. Hazardous Materials</b>				
<b>F.1:</b> Disturbance and release of contaminated soil or building materials during demolition and construction phases of the project could expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to adverse conditions related to hazardous substance handling.	SM	N↓	SM	SM
<b>F.2:</b> Improper disposal of contaminated soil components from the demolition and excavation phases of the project could expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to adverse conditions.	SM	N↓	SM	SM
<b>F.3:</b> Hazardous materials used on-site during construction activities (i.e. solvents) could be released to the environment through improper handling or storage.	SM	N↓	SM	SM
<b><u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS (WITH PROJECT)</u></b>				
<b>A. Aesthetics</b>				
<b>A.1:</b> The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, nor would the project substantially damage scenic resources.	LS	N↓	LS	LS
<b>A.2:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would alter, but would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	LS	N↓	LS	LS
<b>A.3:</b> Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in light and glare at the project site.	LS	N↓	LS	LS

SU – Significant, Unmitigable Impact, even with mitigation; SM – Significant Impact; less than significant with mitigation; LS – Less than Significant Impact; N – No Impact

↑ Impact of alternative *more* severe than that of project

↓ Impact of alternative *less* severe than that of project

**TABLE V-1 (continued)**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Full Preservation Alternative</b>	<b>Partial Preservation Alternative</b>
<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS (CONT'D.)</b>				
<b>A.4:</b> The proposed project, in conjunction with cumulative development, would alter the visual character in the project vicinity.	LS	N↓	LS	LS
<b>B. Transportation, Circulation, and Parking</b>				
<b>B.1:</b> Traffic generated by the project would affect existing traffic levels of service at local intersections.	LS	N↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>B.4:</b> Traffic generated by the project would affect existing traffic levels of service on freeway segments in the project area.	LS	N↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>B.5:</b> Traffic generated by the project would affect traffic levels of service on freeway segments in the project area under future (2010) conditions.	LS	N↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>B.6:</b> Traffic generated by the project would affect traffic levels of service on freeway segments in the project area under cumulative (2025) conditions.	LS	N↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>B.7:</b> ( <i>Non-CEQA Impact</i> ) The proposed project would increase the demand for parking in the project area.	LS	N↓	LS↑	LS↑
<b>B.8:</b> ( <i>Non-CEQA Impact</i> ) The proposed project would contribute to the cumulative increase in parking demand in the project area.	LS	N↓	LS↑	LS↑
<b>B.9:</b> The project would increase ridership on public transit providers serving the area.	LS	N↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>B.10:</b> Development of the proposed project would not conflict with existing pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities.	LS	N↓	LS	LS
<b>C. Air Quality</b>				
<b>C.2:</b> The project would result in an increase in ROG, NOx and PM emissions due to project-related traffic and on-site area sources.	LS	N↓	LS↓	LS↓

SU – Significant, Unmitigable Impact, even with mitigation; SM – Significant Impact; less than significant with mitigation; LS – Less than Significant Impact; N – No Impact

↑ Impact of alternative *more* severe than that of project

↓ Impact of alternative *less* severe than that of project

**TABLE V-1 (continued)**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Full Preservation Alternative</b>	<b>Partial Preservation Alternative</b>
<b><u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS (CONT'D.)</u></b>				
<b>C.3:</b> Project traffic would increase localized carbon monoxide concentrations at intersections in the project vicinity.	LS	N↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>C.4:</b> Emissions generated by vehicular activity within the parking structures could result in a localized increase in carbon monoxide concentrations within the garage and adjacent areas and affect employees of the garage.	LS	N↓	LS	LS
<b>C.5:</b> The project, together with anticipated future cumulative development in Oakland and the Bay Area in general, would contribute to regional air pollution.	LS	N↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>D. Noise</b>				
<b>D.2:</b> Noise from project-generated traffic and other operational noise sources such as mechanical equipment, truck loading/unloading, etc., could exceed the Oakland Noise Ordinance standards and affect nearby residential receptors.	LS	N↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>D.3:</b> The project would locate noise sensitive multifamily residential uses in a noise environment characterized as “conditionally unacceptable” for such uses by the City of Oakland.	LS	N↓	LS	LS
<b>D.4:</b> The proposed project, together with anticipated future development in the Northgate commercial district area as well as Oakland in general, could result in long-term traffic increases that could cumulatively increase noise levels.	LS	N↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b><u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS (CONT.)</u></b>				
<b>E. Cultural Resources</b>				
<b>E.4:</b> The proposed project would construct a new mixed-use, multi-story development adjacent to historic resources including the building at 2355 Broadway and the 25th Street Garage District.	LS	N↓	LS↓	LS↓

SU – Significant, Unmitigable Impact, even with mitigation; SM – Significant Impact; less than significant with mitigation; LS – Less than Significant Impact; N – No Impact

↑ Impact of alternative *more* severe than that of project

↓ Impact of alternative *less* severe than that of project

**TABLE V-1 (continued)**  
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Environmental Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>No Project Alternative</b>	<b>Full Preservation Alternative</b>	<b>Partial Preservation Alternative</b>
<b>F. Hazardous Materials</b>				
<b>F.4:</b> Project operations would generate general commercial, household, and maintenance hazardous waste.	LS	N↓	LS	LS
<b>F.5:</b> Development proposed as part of the project, when combined with other foreseeable development in the vicinity, could result in cumulative hazardous materials impacts.	LS	N↓	LS	LS
<b>G. Shadow</b>				
<b>G.1:</b> The project would create additional shadow on adjacent blocks to the west, north, and east, including casting shadow on contributing buildings in an Area of Primary Importance, but would not introduce landscaping conflicting with the California Public Resource Code; not cast shadow on buildings using passive solar heat, solar collectors for hot water heating, or photovoltaic solar collectors; and not cast shadow that impairs the use of any public or quasi-public park, lawn, garden, or open space.	LS	N↓	LS↓	LS↓

SU – Significant, Unmitigable Impact, even with mitigation; SM – Significant Impact; less than significant with mitigation; LS – Less than Significant Impact; N – No Impact

↑ Impact of alternative *more* severe than that of project

↓ Impact of alternative *less* severe than that of project