

1 **1. SUMMARY**

2 The proposed action is the adoption and implementation of the Redevelopment Plan for the
3 Oakland Army Base Area Redevelopment Project (herein the “Redevelopment Plan”). The lead
4 agency for environmental review is the City of Oakland.

5 This document is a Redevelopment Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that discloses the
6 environmental effects of establishing and redeveloping a redevelopment project area. By such
7 disclosure, this EIR is intended to inform the public as well as the decisions of City officials, the
8 Redevelopment Agency of the City of Oakland (ORA), and other approving agencies regarding
9 redevelopment activities.

10 This EIR discloses impacts to the environment of redevelopment that would or could be adverse
11 and significant, describes measures that would mitigate these impacts, and describes a range of
12 alternatives to redevelopment as proposed.¹

13 **1.1 OVERVIEW**

14 The Oakland Army Base (OARB) area redevelopment project area is an approximately 1,800-
15 acre area located in West Oakland. Figure 1-1 depicts the general location of the project area.
16 In July 2000, the City adopted the Redevelopment Plan, establishing the redevelopment project
17 area and a program of redevelopment, rehabilitation, and revitalization of the project area. The
18 project area encompasses the OARB, the Port of Oakland industrial maritime area, and an area
19 near 16th and Wood streets in West Oakland. The center of the project area is the OARB, at one
20 time an active military base, which the U.S. Congress approved for closure. Build-out is
21 expected to occur by 2020.

22 **1.2 PROCESS OVERVIEW**

23 Closure and reuse of a military facility and the establishment and implementation of a related
24 project area entail numerous inter-related processes.

25 **1.2.1 Base Closure Process**

26 In 1995, the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission recommended closure and
27 realignment/disposal of the OARB. In July 1995, the President of the United States approved
28 the BRAC Commission’s recommendation; Congress reviewed the recommendation, and it
29 became law on September 28, 1995. The U.S. Army, the lead agency for base closure and
30 transfer, conducted or participated in several required environmental processes. The Army:

31 ¹ The Redevelopment Plan describes a series of related actions, or a program, which constitutes a “project” under CEQA. The terms “program” and “project” are used interchangeable in this EIR.

- 1 Insert
- 2 Figure 1-1 Redevelopment District Location
- 3

- 1 • prepared an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental
2 Policy Act (NEPA) disclosing the effects of base closure and disposal on the environment;
- 3 • consulted with and received approval of a Coastal Zone Consistency Determination from the
4 San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC);
- 5 • consulted with the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) regarding cultural resources
6 pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA); and
- 7 • consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine
8 Fisheries Service (NMFS) regarding biological resources pursuant to the Endangered
9 Species Act (ESA).

10 1.2.2 Base Transfer Process

11 The Army first reserved three parcels for the U.S. Army Reserves. The Army then decided to
12 convey property to the Oakland Base Reuse Authority (OBRA), as well as to assign parcels to
13 the U.S. Department of the Interior for conveyance to the East Bay Regional Park District
14 (EBRPD). The OBRA plans to transfer its lands to the Oakland Redevelopment Agency, which
15 will in turn transfer a portion of the Base to the Port of Oakland and to the Joint Apprentice and
16 Training Committee (JATC).

17 1.2.3 Reuse Process

18 Once the OARB was slated for closure and transfer, the OBRA was established to direct the
19 OARB reuse planning process. As the Local Reuse Authority (LRA) under federal base closure
20 law, the OBRA is the agency eligible for managing the Base and its assets in the transitional
21 period between base closure and transfer, accepting Base property from the Army, and
22 planning for its reuse.

23 As part of the reuse planning process, OBRA established the West Oakland Community
24 Advisory Group (WOCAG) to examine reuse opportunities and recommend community reuse
25 options for OBRA's consideration. The planning document produced by the OBRA in
26 consultation with WOCAG was the *OARB Draft Final Reuse Plan* (OBRA 1998, as amended
27 2001). The Reuse Plan documents the community reuse planning process and describes the
28 proposed reuse development, including land use classifications and development densities. The
29 Reuse Plan was amended in 2001 to reflect amendments to the Bay and Seaport plans.

30 1.2.4 Redevelopment Process

31 On July 11, 2000, the City adopted and approved the *Redevelopment Plan for the Oakland*
32 *Base Redevelopment Project* (City of Oakland 2000), and established a redevelopment project
33 area with the OARB at its core. The Redevelopment Plan was adopted pursuant to the
34 California Community Redevelopment Law (CRL) (Health and Safety Code, §§ 33000, et seq.).
35 The Redevelopment Plan provides the ORA—the agency primarily responsible for the project

1 area's redevelopment²—powers, duties, and obligations to implement and further a program of
2 redevelopment, rehabilitation, and revitalization of the project area as broadly defined in the
3 Plan. The Redevelopment Plan incorporates the OARB Reuse Plan, as it may be amended from
4 time to time. At the same time, the City adopted a five-year implementation plan as required by
5 the CRL.

6 **1.2.5 Environmental Review**

7 The City of Oakland is the lead agency for environmental review pursuant to the California
8 Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The City determined that redevelopment as proposed may
9 result in significant impacts to the environment, and that an EIR would be required. To inform
10 the public of its determination, and to initiate public participation in the environmental review
11 process, the City issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP, included in Appendix 1). The Governor's
12 Office of Planning and Research, which notifies relevant state agencies of available NOPs,
13 received the NOP August 15, 2001, initiating a 36-day NOP review period, which ended
14 September 19, 2001. The NOP was also mailed to Alameda County, regional regulatory and
15 service agencies, environmental and business groups, and interested individuals. The NOP
16 described the City's intent to prepare an EIR, briefly presented background and descriptive
17 information, and listed the probable environmental effects of redevelopment. The NOP also
18 described how the public should provide written or verbal input and comments on the scope
19 (content) of the EIR, and provided notice of two public scoping meetings.

20 The purpose of the public scoping meetings, held September 13 and 19, 2001, was to provide a
21 forum whereby agencies and interested citizens could provide input to the City regarding the
22 appropriate scope of the EIR. Scoping input helps define the breadth of EIR analysis, and may
23 include and is not limited to, environmental issues, reasonable alternatives, and mitigation
24 recommendations. Citizens provided input at the September 13 scoping meeting; citizens,
25 community board members, and decision-makers provided input at the September 19 scoping
26 meeting held at the Oakland Planning Commission. The staff report for that meeting is included
27 in Appendix 1. Relevant scoping comments are summarized in Section 1.5: Areas of Public
28 Interest Known to the Lead Agency, below.

29 The NOP also served as a notice of the City's intention to use an "alternative baseline" for
30 certain impact analyses, and of a September 19, 2001 public hearing in front of the Oakland
31 Planning Commission regarding the alternative baseline. The physical context in which the type
32 and intensity of impacts of a proposed project are determined is called the "baseline." Normally,
33 the baseline comprises those environmental conditions that exist at the time of issue of an NOP.
34 CEQA Section 21083.8.1 offers agencies preparing an EIR for reuse of a military base such as
35 the OARB the option to analyze impacts in the context of the physical conditions that were
36 present at the time the federal decision became final for closure of the base (in this case,

² The Port will be the agency primarily responsible for redevelopment of those portions of the redevelopment project area within the Port Area, as defined in the City Charter.

September 1995). Use of such an alternative baseline can better represent the actual impact of OARB reuse when compared to the impacts of the base in full operation. After hearing public input regarding this issue, the Planning Commission adopted the alternative baseline for certain environmental factors. A Notice of Determination relating to the use of the alternative baseline was filed with the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) and the County Clerk (see Appendix 1).

The City is preparing this EIR to evaluate and disclose the environmental impacts of establishing and implementing the OARB redevelopment project area, including redevelopment of the OARB as envisioned in the Reuse Plan. The ORA and Port require flexibility for responding to future and evolving market and economic conditions. These fluctuating conditions necessarily require the Redevelopment Plan to be broad and flexible, and analysis in this EIR is consistent with a broad level of detail. To assess the type and intensity of OARB reuse impacts most accurately, this EIR uses an alternative baseline of 1995 when assessing impacts to the following environmental factors:

- Traffic
- Water consumption
- Energy consumption
- Noise
- Air quality
- Schools
- Population and Employment

1.3 NEED AND OBJECTIVES

1.3.1 Need

Redevelopment of the project area is necessary to alleviate physical and economic blight , resulting in part or exacerbated by closure of the OARB.

1.3.2 Objectives

Redevelopment objectives focus on elimination of blight and blighting influences, and strengthening the economic base, and include the following:

- Alleviate economic and social degradation due to closure of OARB
- Eliminate blighting influences, including remediation of contamination
- Create a vibrant and balanced land use pattern
- Strengthen the economic base
- Allow for sustainable job creation
- Expand, improve, and preserve low/moderate-income housing
- Provide for high-quality public/community services

- 1 • Provide for safe, efficient, and effective movement of people and goods
- 2 • Protect, preserve, and enhance environmental resources
- 3 • Minimize waste generation, maximize reuse/recycling
- 4 • Accommodate the Port's share of regional cargo throughput in 2020
- 5 • Respond to trends and requirements of maritime shipping
- 6 • Increase Port productivity and efficiency
- 7 • Provide sufficient capacity to absorb additional cargo throughput in the event that another
- 8 West Coast gateway port is shut down due to an emergency
- 9 • Keep competitive with other West Coast ports

10 **1.4 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT**

11 As depicted by Figure 1-2, the OARB redevelopment project area is subdivided into three sub-
12 districts:

- 13 1. The **OARB sub-district**: This approximately 470-acre sub-district is further subdivided into
14 two development areas:
 - 15 • the **Gateway development area**, generally located in the northwest portion of the sub-
16 district, would be redeveloped by the ORA; and
 - 17 • the **Port development area**, located in the southeast portion of the sub-district would be
18 redeveloped by the Port of Oakland.
- 19 2. The **Maritime sub-district**. This approximately 1,290-acre sub-district comprises the Port of
20 Oakland's industrial maritime area, plus freeway right-of-way and some miscellaneous non-
21 Port parcels. Redevelopment of a former military installation, Fleet and Industrial Supply
22 Center, Oakland (FISCO), located within this sub-district has already occurred under earlier
23 environmental review.
- 24 3. The **16th/Wood sub-district**. This approximately 41-acre sub-district comprises a crescent-
25 shaped area of current and former industrial lands located between Wood Street and I-880,
26 and between 26th and 9th streets.

27 The OARB redevelopment project area is urbanized. There are some vacant parcels; most were
28 industrialized at one time. The OARB sub-district is largely a transportation-oriented military
29 base; the only quasi-natural environment is located at the western tip of the Bay Bridge
30 touchdown peninsula, south of the bridge. The Maritime sub-district contains generally highly
31 industrialized maritime shipping facilities, with approximately 35 acres of waterfront park along
32 the shoreline of the Middle Harbor and one loft development along 2nd Street. The 16th/Wood
33

1 Insert

2 Figure 1-2 OARB Redevelopment Project Area, Sub-Districts, and Area Landmarks

3

1 sub-district encompasses light and medium industrial uses such as recyclers and
2 warehousing/distribution facilities; in addition, there are several large vacant parcels that were
3 formerly industrial and the former Southern Pacific Railroad (SPRR)/Amtrak railroad station.

4 **1.5 AREAS OF PUBLIC INTEREST KNOWN TO THE LEAD AGENCY**

5 As lead agency under CEQA, the City elicited input from agencies and interested citizens
6 regarding the appropriate scope of this EIR. In response, the City received both verbal and
7 written input. Written input in the form of letters and comment cards appears in its entirety in
8 Appendix 1 of this EIR. Below is a summary of verbal and written input. The source of the input
9 is first identified, the input is summarized, and the reader is directed to the location in the EIR
10 where relevant input is addressed.

11 Some input received during the EIR scoping period did not relate to the scope (content) of the
12 EIR, but pertained to other issues, such as a preferred alternative Redevelopment Plan
13 boundary different than that approved by the ORA, or a preferred alternative Redevelopment
14 Plan different than that proposed by the City. The Redevelopment Plan was presented for public
15 comment at several public meetings and at two public hearings (the hearings were conducted
16 by the City and ORA in June and July 2001). Some input regarding preferred alternative
17 redevelopment program elements is incorporated into alternatives evaluated in Chapter 7:
18 Alternatives to the Proposed Redevelopment Program; other suggestions that do not meet the
19 vision of the Redevelopment Plan are not.

20 **1.5.1 Input of Interested Individuals (by Topic)**

21 The following verbal input/comments were provided at the September 13, 2001 scoping
22 meeting.

23 **Description of Redevelopment**

- 24 1. Housing should be for all levels of income.
- 25 2. A connection from Mandela to 3rd Street should be included in the traffic analysis.
- 26 3. The 16th/Wood sub-district should include recreational amenities, including swimming pool,
27 tennis courts, and a putting green.
- 28 4. Public access to and along the waterfront should be maximized. Trails and connectors
29 should be included between the proposed Gateway Park and the community along 7th Street
30 and West Grand Avenue.
- 31 5. Big box retail should not be included.
- 32 6. Land uses allowing smaller-scale retail should be included in the 16th/Wood sub-districts.

1 Items 1 through 6 are addressed in Chapter 3: Description, which describes elements of
2 redevelopment that are known at this time, and describes proposed General Plan land use
3 classifications, development intensities, and required infrastructure. The description includes
4 funding for affordable housing, transportation improvements, public access improvements, and
5 transportation and other infrastructure. Some input regarding suggestions for redevelopment
6 elements is at a greater level of detail than is planned at this time, or analyzed in this EIR.

7 **Impact Analysis and Mitigation**

- 8 1. As mitigation for demolition of historic structures in the OARB, use the Youth Employment
9 Program to deconstruct the buildings and recycle the material.
- 10 2. Reduce air emissions from trucks traveling through neighborhoods.
- 11 3. Comparison of 1995 (baseline) and 2000 (setting) employment conditions is really irrelevant,
12 because the people that lost their jobs in 1995 will not be the ones employed through
13 redevelopment.
- 14 4. New jobs created by redevelopment should have a first right of refusal to West Oakland
15 residents.
- 16 5. Analyze the visual impacts of high-stack containers from the Bay Bridge.

17 Items 1 through 4 are addressed in Chapter 4: Setting and Baseline, Impacts, and Mitigation,
18 which analyzes impacts that could result from redevelopment as proposed in Chapter 3:
19 Description, including cultural resources, aesthetic resources, air quality, employment (and
20 anticipated job capture rates for Oakland residents). Chapter 4 also includes numerous
21 measures to mitigate those impacts that are considered significant. Regarding item 5,
22 redevelopment as proposed would not result in additional high-stack containers at the Port of
23 Oakland, and may ultimately eliminate those adjacent to Interstate-80 (I-80). Under the
24 proposed Redevelopment and Reuse Plans, the lands adjacent to I-80 and most visible from the
25 Bay Bridge would become part of the City's Gateway development area, and existing container
26 storage would be replaced with a variety of "flex" uses, including office, research and
27 development (R&D), light industrial, and commercial uses.

28 **Alternatives**

- 29 1. Move existing West Grand Avenue businesses/light industrial uses that support the Port to
30 the OARB property to open up the West Grand Avenue area for higher scale uses.
- 31 2. Put forth an Adaptive Reuse alternative for detailed analysis.
- 32 3. Develop an alternative that reduces truck traffic in West Oakland.
- 33 4. Consider the development of a tramway system as a way to reduce traffic congestion and
34 air emissions.

1 Regarding item 1, the West Grand Avenue corridor is not located within the project area, and is
2 therefore not a part of the description of proposed redevelopment or further addressed in this
3 EIR. Items 2 through 4 are addressed in Chapter 7: Alternatives to the Proposed
4 Redevelopment Program, which examines a range of reasonable alternatives to the
5 redevelopment program proposed in Chapter 3: Description. These include, among others,
6 alternatives that would adaptively reuse existing structures, and a reduced level of intensity that
7 would reduce traffic and related impacts. Some alternatives fail to fundamentally fulfill objectives
8 of redevelopment, and are not put forth for detailed analysis. The tramway was not considered
9 because of the relatively few trips with origins or destinations in Alameda associated with
10 proposed redevelopment.

11 **Miscellaneous**

- 12 1. Why does East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) have to pay for land they receive?
13 Originally, EBMUD was supposed to receive the land for free.

14 As noted in Chapter 3: Description, EBMUD is currently negotiating with the U.S. Army
15 Reserves for properties located adjacent to, not within, the OARB or the project area.
16 Development or redevelopment of those properties is not a part of the redevelopment program
17 analyzed in this EIR nor were these properties included in the Army's BRAC actions, and terms
18 of that negotiation have not been concluded. Chapter 5: Cumulative Impacts, includes
19 evaluation of proposed redevelopment in light of past, present, and probable future actions,
20 including potential expansion of nearby EBMUD facilities.

21 **1.5.2 Input of Community Board Members, Interest Groups, and Decision-Makers (by Entity)**

22 The following were provided as verbal input/comments at the September 19, 2001 scoping
23 meeting.

24 **Landmarks Preservation Board**

- 25 1. The EIR should identify historical assets, recommend opportunities for reuse of historical
26 buildings, and suggest creative mitigation measures.
- 27 2. When taking down other buildings, raw materials (especially redwood timbers) should be
28 saved and salvaged.
- 29 3. At least two of the buildings designated as "temporary" by the Army should be preserved
30 and reused.
- 31 4. The Diesel Shop (Building No. 812) and the Administration Building, Building No. 1
32 (permanent buildings) should be preserved and reused.
- 33 5. A curated exhibit should be located within one of the preserved buildings.
- 34 6. The parade grounds should be seen as an opportunity for an urban park.

7. A report regarding reuse of OARB buildings should be made available for review by the Landmarks Preservation Board.

Items 1, 2, and 5 are addressed in Chapter 4: Setting and Baseline, Impacts, and Mitigation. Chapter 4 identifies historic resources, the anticipated impacts of redevelopment on such resources, and a suite of measures that would partially mitigate effects to them, including deconstruction and recycling rather than demolition. Items 3 and 4 are addressed in Chapter 7: Alternatives to the Proposed Redevelopment Program, which evaluates reuse of historic structures. Regarding item 6, evidence of the existence of a formal parade ground at the OARB was not identified during the course of this investigation, and this input is not further addressed in the EIR. Regarding item 7, the City conducted an analysis of the feasibility of adaptive reuse of buildings at the OARB; portions of this report are incorporated by reference into this EIR.

West Oakland Commerce Association

1. The OARB should be considered almost entirely for ancillary maritime support uses.
2. If lands are not dedicated to ancillary maritime services, the EIR should identify the impacts associated with trucking business having to relocate as far away as Tracy, Fairfield, and/or Sacramento to find available land.
3. Although the City feels the need to maximize the number of job opportunities at the OARB, it should also look at the types of jobs that are needed.
4. Existing trucking operations and related businesses should be moved to the OARB, thereby freeing opportunities for redevelopment with higher and better uses at other in-town locations (*i.e.*, along Grand Avenue and Mandela Parkway).
5. An alternative that includes a transit village with a tram linking to Alameda needs to be considered.

Items 1 and 2 are addressed in Chapter 3: Description, which explains that redevelopment as proposed includes substantial ancillary maritime services in the project area. Approximately 105 acres would be dedicated to this use. Item 1 is also addressed in Chapter 7: Alternatives to the Proposed Redevelopment Program. Item 3 is addressed in Chapter 4: Setting and Baseline, Impacts, and Mitigation, and in Appendix 4.8: Employment Model, which include an analysis of job generation, including general job types. Regarding item 4, as explained above, the Redevelopment Plan boundary was established with several opportunities for public input. The West Grand Avenue corridor is not located within the redevelopment project area, and is therefore not a part of the description of proposed redevelopment or further addressed as an element in this EIR. Item 5 is addressed above.

City of Oakland Planning Commission

1. Market demand may not call for high-end uses as suggested in the Reuse Plan.
2. Redevelopment should consider more light industrial uses or other uses not as susceptible to fluctuating market conditions.

OARB Area Redevelopment EIR

- 1 3. Public access to the waterfront is important and must be considered as part of
2 redevelopment.
- 3 4. Truck parking and other ancillary maritime support land uses should be moved to the OARB
4 from the Prescott neighborhood.
- 5 5. West Grand Avenue corridor, Mandela Parkway corridor, and other areas outside of the
6 defined redevelopment area need to be studied.
- 7 6. The EIR should consider the impact of Port development activities on the entire surrounding
8 area.
- 9 7. The EIR should evaluate aesthetic effects of containers stacked up along the side of the Bay
10 Bridge, unless such containers will be eliminated under proposed redevelopment.
- 11 8. The EIR must study a full range of alternatives to the Reuse Plan, including OARB as a full-
12 maritime use area, preservation of historic buildings, maximum development including
13 benefits/effects of research and development uses as compared to light industrial uses.
- 14 9. An alternative should be considered that includes an expansion of ancillary maritime support
15 uses greater than indicated in the current Reuse Plan.
- 16 10. One alternative should be to consider conveyance of the entire OARB to the Port for their
17 use, with the Port serving as lead agency.
- 18 11. The City may find it difficult to require conditions/mitigation measures from the EIR on Port
19 activities.
- 20 12. The Reuse Plan appears as if it were designed by committee—trying to accomplish too
21 many competing objectives.

22 Items 1 through 4 are addressed Chapter 3: Description, which describes elements of
23 redevelopment that are known at this time, and describes proposed General Plan land use
24 classifications, development intensities, and required infrastructure. The description is flexible,
25 and is intended to allow for a range of uses within a given land use classification, zoning, and
26 maximum intensity, to allow for market response over the nearly 20-year build-out period.
27 Regarding item 5, the West Grand Avenue and Mandela Parkway corridors are not located
28 within the redevelopment project area, and are therefore not a part of the description of
29 proposed redevelopment or further addressed in this EIR other than for traffic analysis issues.
30 Item 6 is addressed in Chapter 4: Setting and Baseline, Impacts, and Mitigation, which includes
31 analyses of impacts across study areas that vary by environmental factor, and which represent
32 the area of potential effect for each factor. Regarding item 7, redevelopment as proposed would
33 not result in additional high-stack containers at the Port of Oakland, and may ultimately
34 eliminate those adjacent to I-80; the visual impact of such stacking is not evaluated in this EIR.

35 Items 8 through 10 are addressed in Chapter 7: Alternatives to the Proposed Redevelopment
36 Program, which addresses a range of reasonable alternatives to the redevelopment proposed in
37 Chapter 3: Description. These include, among others, alternatives that would result in an all-
38 maritime development of the OARB sub-district; this alternative assumes such development

would occur under the lead of the Port of Oakland. Regarding item 11, the mechanism for enforcing mitigation measures would be through the City's implementation of the Mitigation Monitoring Program, the Port's role as a responsible agency to the EIR, and potentially through subsequent land conveyance conditions from the City to the Port. Regarding item 12, the Reuse Plan was a product of substantial and often conflicting community input. However, the Plan is not intended to satisfy particular groups, but rather to be broad and flexible to allow for fluctuating market conditions over the build-out period and to provide a basis for further refinements and detailed planning efforts throughout the implementation period.

1.5.3 Input of Resource and Service Agencies, and Interest Groups (by Entity)

The following were provided as written input/comments during the scoping period. They are reproduced in their entirety in Appendix 1 of this document.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans): Letter Dated September 10, 2001

1. Redevelopment will put heightened demand on the existing, congested transportation infrastructure. Caltrans should be involved early in the planning process, and will look toward the EIR for detailed transportation data.
2. Caltrans has a Class II bikeway project along Burma Road, beginning at Maritime Street. This bikeway will connect Maritime Street to the proposed Gateway Park, and beyond to the Bay Bridge.

Items 1 and 2 are addressed in Chapter 4: Setting and Baseline, Impacts, and Mitigation, which contain detailed information regarding both vehicular and non-vehicular transportation networks. Item 2 is also addressed in Chapter 3: Description, which explains public access proposed as part of redevelopment.

East Bay Regional Park District: Letter Dated September 12, 2001

1. The EBRPD plans to acquire 15 acres of OARB land at the Bay Bridge touchdown peninsula for a shoreline regional park, the Gateway Park. This area will serve as the convergence of the Bay Trail from Emeryville, Oakland, and the Bay Bridge.
2. The EIR should address impacts to traffic of trucks.
3. The EIR should address safe vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian access to the Gateway Park.
4. The EIR should address transit connections.
5. The EIR should address recreational demand generated by proposed redevelopment, and mitigation for that demand.
6. The EIR should address public waterfront access.

1 7. The EIR should address utility infrastructure, and how needed infrastructure will be financed.

2 Item 1 is addressed in Chapter 3: Description, which explains the District's intent to acquire
3 OARB lands for park use, and also describes proposed public access improvements, to the
4 extent they have been planned to date.

5 Items 2 through 7 are addressed in Chapter 4: Setting and Baseline, Impacts, and Mitigation,
6 which addresses all issues identified by the EBRPD, as well as mitigation to avoid or otherwise
7 mitigate significant impacts.

8 **California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control**
9 **(DTSC): Letter Dated September 12, 2001**

10 1. Pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21083.8.1(d)(2), alternative baseline
11 provisions do not apply to the OARB.

12 2. The EIR should analyze the no project alternative for conditions as they exist at the time the
13 EIR is prepared.

14 3. The EIR should state the correct acreage of the OARB.

15 4. The EIR should address impact to the environment from lead.

16 5. The EIR should address waste oil contamination at Building No. 1.

17 6. The EIR should address management of shallow groundwater during construction and
18 operation.

19 7. The EIR should consistently present the project title.

20 8. The EIR should clearly identify any planned schools and state whether schools are a part of
21 planned redevelopment.

22 9. The City cannot assume that remediation ultimately determined to be necessary to protect
23 public health and the environment are consistent with redevelopment as proposed.

24 10. Siting of residential uses must be at locations with unrestricted use.

25 Regarding item 1, the EIR is prepared in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, including
26 Section 21083.8.1(d)(2). While the EIR does use an alternative baseline for assessment of
27 impacts for a select group of environmental factors, hazardous materials and waste are not
28 among those factors. The City is aware of the restrictions regarding the use of alternative
29 baselines, and prepared this EIR pursuant to those restrictions. Item 2 is addressed by Chapter
30 7: Alternatives to the Proposed Redevelopment Program, which analyzes a no project
31 alternative reflecting conditions for all environmental factors as they existed at the time the NOP
32 was filed, and as can be reasonably expected to occur in the absence of redevelopment. Items

3 and 7 are addressed consistently and correctly throughout the EIR. Items 4 through 6 are addressed in Chapter 4: Setting and Baseline, Impacts, and Mitigation, which addresses all issues identified by the DTSC, as well as mitigation to avoid or otherwise mitigate significant impacts. Items 8 and 10 are addressed by Chapter 3: Description. Regarding item 9, for purposes of this EIR, the City does assume that remediation ultimately determined to be necessary to protect public health and the environment is consistent with redevelopment as proposed. Should this assumption prove unfounded, the redevelopment program would be modified.

West Oakland Commerce Association: Letter Dated September 11, 2001

During the scoping period, the West Oakland Commerce Association (WOCA) submitted this letter to the OBRA regarding the U.S. Army’s EIS for OARB disposal and reuse, and the OARB planning process. The letter expresses “cautious support” for the preferred OARB reuse alternative, which is the basis of the Redevelopment Plan for the OARB sub-district, but also recommends this sub-district be developed primarily as an industrial enclave.

Chapter 7: Alternatives to the Proposed Redevelopment Program, evaluates an alternative that would result in OARB sub-district uses that are entirely industrial maritime and maritime support.

West Oakland Commerce Association: Letter Dated September 18, 2001

1. Reuse of the OARB should consider the relationship of the Base to the West Oakland/Downtown nexus.
2. Jobs should accrue to West Oakland as a whole, as opposed to a certain segment.
3. An aerial tramway can be extended between Alameda and the Middle Harbor Shoreline Park through the Bay Area Rapid Transit West Oakland station and Jack London Village.
4. The redevelopment scoping process should properly include all of West Oakland.

Items 1 and 4 are addressed in Chapter 5: Cumulative Impacts, which evaluates impacts of proposed project area redevelopment in the context of other related past, current and future probable actions. Regarding item 2, Chapter 4: Setting and Baseline, Impacts, and Mitigation, describes total job generation of redevelopment, as well as net direct jobs generated. The analysis of employment estimates the number of jobs that would be filled by Oakland residents. Regarding item 3, an aerial tramway is not a redevelopment element, and is not analyzed in this EIR. Redevelopment elements are described in Chapter 3: Description. Regarding item 4, the NOP and notice of scoping meetings were mailed to agencies, interest groups, as well as to individuals who participated in OARB reuse planning or who requested such notice. In addition, scoping meeting notices were published in the Oakland Tribune, a newspaper of general circulation, so that all citizens of Oakland could participate. The NOP and newspaper advertisements are included in Appendix 1.

1 9. EBMUD Policy No. 73 mandates customers use non-potable recycled (reclaimed) water
2 when it is available at a reasonable cost, not detrimental to public health, and not injurious to
3 plant life, fish, and wildlife. The redevelopment project area could be served by the East
4 Bayshore Recycled Water Project. EBMUD recommends the redevelopment program
5 require dual plumbing for landscaping, toilet water flushing, wash down water, decorative
6 fountains, and other approved uses of tertiary treated recycled water.

7 10. Use of recycled water will reduce the redevelopment program's demand for potable water.

8 11. In compliance with Senate Bill 2095, the City of Oakland approved a recycled water
9 ordinance, including requirements for dual plumbing. Developers of redevelopment activities
10 should confer with the City regarding requirements of this ordinance.

11 12. The City should further contact EBMUD's Office of water Recycling to determine how to
12 accommodate the use of recycled water in design.

13 Item 1 is addressed in Chapter 3: Description, which describes anticipated major infrastructure
14 needs to serve the redevelopment program. Item 2 is addressed in Section 4.9: Utilities and
15 Public Services, which presents results of the Water Supply Assessment; the actual
16 assessment and correspondence with EBMUD is located in Appendix 4.9. Items 3 and 4 are
17 addressed in Section 4.7: Hazardous Materials, which describes current project area conditions
18 regarding environmental impairments, impacts redevelopment related to environmental
19 impairments, and health-protective measures to effectively address such impairments. Items 5,
20 6, 9, 10, 11, and 12 are addressed in Chapter 3: Description, which describes anticipated
21 infrastructure to serve the proposed redevelopment program, including the potential for inclusion
22 of recycled water facilities. In addition, Section 4.9, recommends measures requiring
23 subsequent redevelopment activities of a certain magnitude to incorporate potable water
24 conservation measures, including dual plumbing to accommodate recycled water, in design. In
25 addition, this section as well as Chapter 5: Cumulative Impacts, describe the City's recent
26 adoption of a recycled water ordinance, as well as current Port efforts to develop and adopt a
27 similar ordinance. Section 4.9 also describes the anticipation that redevelopment would be
28 served by the East Bayshore Recycled Water Project as well the expected reduction in use of
29 potable water due to the use of reclaimed water.

30 Item 7 is addressed in Section 4.9, which describes results of a wastewater capacity analysis;
31 the analysis itself and correspondence with the City's Public Works Department is included in
32 Appendix 4.9. Item 8 is addressed in Chapter 3: Description, which explains the necessity of re-
33 construction of much of the sewerage infrastructure in the OARB and 16th/Wood sub-district,
34 which would address existing I/I problems.

35 **1.6 ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER BENEFITS OF REDEVELOPMENT**

36 The proposed redevelopment program would result in social, economic, and environmental
37 benefits. Decision-makers may elect to consider these benefits when they also consider the

1 adverse environmental effects of the proposed redevelopment program. Benefits include the
2 following:

- 3 • Approximately 16,400 total new direct jobs (of these, more than 10,600 are expected to be
4 located onsite), and more than 46,000 indirect/induced jobs.
- 5 • 375 new live/work units, and dedication of 20 to 25 percent of tax increment monies
6 generated by redevelopment to improve the stock of low- and moderate-income housing in
7 Oakland.
- 8 • Advancement (beyond simple consistency) of plans and policies of the Oakland General
9 Plan, the San Francisco Bay Plan, the San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan, the East Bay
10 Regional Park District Master Plan, and the Bay Trail Plan, and the San Francisco Bay
11 Region Water Quality Control Plan.
- 12 • Development of a vibrant and compatible mix of land uses.
- 13 • Improvement of historic character at the 16th/Wood sub-district.
- 14 • Remediation of contaminants in soil and groundwater.
- 15 • Replacement of aged infrastructure.
- 16 • Development of local and region-serving public access and recreation facilities.
- 17 • Elimination of visual blight and development of a vibrant and modern visual setting.
- 18 • Reduction in dredging leading to improved wildlife water and audio environments.
- 19 • Reduction in seismic risks.
- 20 • Long-term improvement of surface water quality.

21 **1.7 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF REDEVELOPMENT, AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION**

22 Chapter 4: Setting and Baseline, Impacts, and Mitigation, presents results of an evaluation of
23 the adverse impacts that could occur from redevelopment as proposed. The evaluation
24 assesses potential effects to 15 environmental factors. If the City determines, based on
25 established significance criteria and thresholds, that the magnitude of an impact is great enough
26 to warrant corrective action, the impact is considered “significant.” Feasible measures are
27 recommended in this EIR to avoid or reduce each significant impact to a level that is less than
28 significant (and warranting no further corrective action), thus “mitigating” the impact. Even with
29 implementation of all feasible corrective measures, some impacts cannot be mitigated to a level
30 that is less than significant; the mitigated, or “residual” impact is considered significant. These
31 residually significant impacts are termed unavoidable and adverse. Table 1-1, located at the end
32 of this chapter, summarizes significant impacts of redevelopment and mitigation.
33 Redevelopment as proposed would result in unavoidable adverse impacts to the following
34 environmental factors:

- 1 • Increases in traffic on certain Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) facilities already
2 experiencing degraded levels of service (LOS)—I-80 east of the I-80/I-580 split; I-880
3 connector to I-80 east; I-880 from 7th Street to the segment south of I-238; I-580 east and
4 west of I-980/SR-24; and SR-24 east of I-580.
- 5 • Contribute considerably to traffic on certain MTS freeway facilities experiencing cumulatively
6 degraded LOS—I-80 from the Bay Bridge to east of the I-80/I-580 split; I-880 connector to I-
7 80 east; I-880 from I-980 to the segment south of I-238; I-580 from west of I-980/SR-24 to I-
8 238; and SR-24 east of I-580.
- 9 • Degrade LOS at the Maritime Street/West Grand Avenue intersection under the cumulative
10 condition.
- 11 • Inadequate truck-related parking supply under the cumulative condition.
- 12 • Short-term increases in criteria air pollutants and diesel emissions from construction
13 equipment.
- 14 • Long-term substantial increases in criteria air pollutants and diesel emissions from Maritime,
15 rail, and trucking operations.
- 16 • Long-term increases in certain criteria pollutants from passenger vehicles and delivery
17 trucks.
- 18 • Contribute considerably to long-term cumulative increases in criteria pollutants and diesel
19 emissions.
- 20 • Loss of structures contributing to the National Register–eligible OARB Historic District.
- 21 • Loss of the integrity of the OARB Historic District.
- 22 • Contribute considerably to the cumulative loss of Bay Area military historic resources.
- 23 • Loss of visual evidence of the military history of West Oakland.
- 24 • Increases in risk of introduced invasive species in San Francisco Bay under redevelopment-
25 specific and cumulative conditions.

26 **1.8 IMPACTS OF REDEVELOPMENT FOUND TO BE NOT SIGNIFICANT**

27 If the City determines the magnitude of an impact is minor, corrective action is not warranted,
28 and the impact is considered “less than significant.” Redevelopment would result in less than
29 significant impacts to all 15 environmental factors evaluated for this EIR.

30 **1.9 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

31 Chapter 7: Alternatives to the Proposed Redevelopment Program, examines alternative
32 redevelopment scenarios for their ability—like mitigation—to avoid or substantially reduce the
33 significant environmental effects of the proposed redevelopment program. A suite of alternatives
34 was initially evaluated. Of these, the following five were put forth for detailed analysis:

OARB Area Redevelopment EIR

- 1 • **No Project.** Continuation of current interim leasing program at the OARB, and build-out of
2 remainder of the project area in accordance with the Oakland General Plan and the Bay
3 Plan.
- 4 • **High Intensity.** The upper range of potential mixed-use development within the project
5 area.
- 6 • **Reduced Intensity.** The lower range of potential mixed-use development within the project
7 area.
- 8 • **Full Maritime.** Development of the Base and Maritime sub-districts solely for Port and
9 ancillary maritime support uses.
- 10 • **Gateway Adaptive Reuse/Eco-Park.** Adaptive reuse of historic structures within the
11 Gateway development area as an eco-park.

12 Analysis of these alternatives finds the No Project alternative to be environmentally superior to
13 the other alternatives. Of the “action” alternatives, the Gateway Reuse/Eco-Park is the
14 environmentally superior alternative.

15 Table 1-1 provides a summary of mitigation measures. All measures proposed are intended to
16 serve as specific, enforceable requirements. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan
17 required by CEQA will ensure compliance with all measures described herein and where the
18 timing for implementing the measures will fully avoid or minimize the impacts. While the
19 timetable for future redevelopment activities cannot be known with certainty given market
20 uncertainties, the measures mitigating impacts from future remediation, demolition, or
21 construction activities will be required to be implemented in tandem with those activities.

22

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
Consistency of Plans and Policies		
Impact 4.1-2: Proposed land uses in a portion of the 16 th /Wood sub-district would be fundamentally inconsistent with Seaport and Bay plan Port Priority Use designations.	Mitigation 4.1-1: Amend the Bay and Seaport plans to eliminate, where necessary, Port Priority Use designations within the 16th/Wood sub-district.	L
Land Use		
Impact 4.2-1: Under proposed redevelopment, dissimilar land uses may be located proximate to one another.	Mitigation 4.2-1: The City shall ensure that Gateway development area redevelopment activities adjacent to Port of Oakland industrial maritime facilities are designed to minimize any land use incompatibilities to the extent feasible.	L
	Mitigation 4.2-2: If any land use incompatibility is subsequently identified, the Port of Oakland shall use its best efforts, consistent with meeting cargo throughput demand, to locate maritime activities that could result in land use incompatibilities as far away from the property boundary as feasible.	
	Mitigation 4.2-3: The City and Port shall coordinate to implement Mitigation Measures 4.2-1 and 4.2-2; if despite these efforts, subsequent land use incompatibilities are identified, the Port and City shall jointly develop, implement, and fund on a fair share basis additional strategies to reduce incompatibilities.	

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
Transportation and Traffic		
<p>Impact 4.3-1: Redevelopment would cause the level of service to degrade to worse than LOS D at three intersections located outside the Downtown area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Grand Avenue/Maritime Street • West Grand Avenue/I-880 Frontage Road • 7th/Maritime Street 	<p>Mitigation 4.3-1: <i>West Grand Avenue/Maritime Street</i>. As part of the design for the realignment of Maritime Street, the Port shall also provide modifications to the West Grand Avenue/Maritime Street intersection.</p>	L
	<p>Mitigation 4.3-2: <i>West Grand Avenue/I-880 Frontage Road</i>. Project area developers shall fund, on a fair-share basis, modifications to the West Grand Avenue/I-880 Frontage Road intersection.</p>	
	<p>Mitigation 4.3-3: <i>7th/Maritime Street</i>. As part of the design for the realignment of Maritime Street, the Port shall also provide modifications to the 7th/Maritime Street intersection.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.3-2: Redevelopment would cause some roadway segments on the MTS to operate at LOS F and increase the V/C ratio by more than three percent on segments that would operate at LOS F without redevelopment.</p>	<p>Mitigation 4.3-4: The City and Port shall jointly create and maintain a transit access plan(s) for the redevelopment project area designed to reduce demand for single-occupant, peak hour trips, and to increase access to transit opportunities. Major project area developers shall fund on a fair share basis the plan(s).</p>	S
<p>Impact 4.3-3: Redevelopment could result in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicycles, or pedestrians due to inadequate design features or incompatible uses.</p>	<p>Mitigation 4.3-5: Redevelopment elements shall be designed in accordance with standard design practice and shall be subject to review and approval of the City or Port design engineer.</p>	L

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
	Mitigation 4.3-6: The Port shall fund signage designating through transport truck prohibitions through the interior of the Gateway development area.	
	Mitigation 4.3-7: The City and the Port shall continue to work together and shall create a truck management plan designed to reduce the effects of transport trucks on local streets. The City and Port shall fund on a fair share basis implementation of this plan.	
Impact 4.3-4: Due to site constraints, it may not be possible to provide two emergency access routes to the western portion of the Gateway development area, which would be in excess of 1,000 feet from the nearest major arterial.	Mitigation 4.3-8: Construct an emergency vehicle access to the western portion of the Gateway development area or provide an emergency service program and emergency evacuation plan using waterborne vessels.	L
Impact 4.3-5: Redevelopment could fundamentally conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).	Mitigation 4.3-9: Redevelopment plans shall conform to City of Oakland or Port development standards with facilities that support transportation alternatives to the single-occupant automobile.	L
Impact 4.3-6: Redevelopment could result in an inadequate parking supply at the Gateway development area, the 16th/Wood sub-district, or for trucks serving the Port of Oakland.	Mitigation 4.3-10: The number of parking spaces provided in the project area shall comply with City code or Port requirements and/or with recommendations of a developer funded parking demand analysis.	L
	Mitigation 4.3-11: During both construction and operation, the Port shall provide truck parking within the Port development area or Maritime sub-district, at a reasonable cost to truck operators and provide advance information to operators where the parking is located.	

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
Impact 4.3-9: Redevelopment would increase the peak hour average ridership at the West Oakland BART station by 3 percent where average waiting time at fare gates could exceed 1 minute.	Mitigation 4.3-12: The City and Port shall provide detailed information regarding redevelopment to BART to enable BART to conduct a comprehensive fare gate capacity assessment at the West Oakland BART station. Pending the results of this assessment, the City and the Port may need to participate in funding the cost of adding one or more fare gates at the West Oakland BART station.	L
Impact 4.3-11: Remediation, demolition/deconstruction, and construction activities within the redevelopment project area would utilize a significant number of trucks and could cause significant circulation impacts on the street system.	Mitigation 4.3-13: Prior to commencing hazardous materials or hazardous waste remediation, demolition, or construction activities, a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) shall be implemented to control peak hours trips to the extent feasible, assure the safety on the street system and assure that transportation activities are protective of human health, safety, and the environment.	L
Impact 5.3-1: Increased congestion at intersections exceeding the cumulatively significant threshold.	See Mitigation Measures 4.3-1, 4.3-2 and 4.3-3, above. Mitigation 5.3-1: 7th/Maritime Street. Project area developers shall fund a fair share of additional modifications at the 7th /Maritime Street intersection. Mitigation 5.3-2: 7th Street/I-880 Northbound Ramps. Project area developers shall fund a fair share of modifications at the 7th Street/I-880 Northbound ramp.	L:all but Maritime/ Grand S: Maritime/Grand

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
	Mitigation 5.3-3: 3rd/Adeline Street. Project area developers shall fund a fair share of the modifications at the 3rd/Adeline Street intersection.	
	Mitigation 5.3-4: 3rd/Market Street. Project area developers shall fund a fair share of modifications at the 3rd/Market Street intersection.	
	Mitigation 5.3-5: 12th /Brush Street. Project area developers shall fund a fair share of modifications to the 12th/Brush Street intersection to increase the signal cycle length to 102 seconds. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce cumulative impacts at the 12th /Brush Street intersection to a level that is less than significant.	
	Mitigation 5.3-6: Powell Street/I-80 Northbound Ramps. Project area developers shall fund a fair share of modifications at the Powell Street/I-80 northbound ramps intersection.	
Impact 5.3-2: Increased congestion on the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) exceeding the cumulatively significant threshold.	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-4, above.	S
Impact 5.3-3: Increased traffic hazards.	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-5, above.	L
Impact 5.3-4: Inadequate emergency access.	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-8, above.	L
Impact 5.3-5: Inadequate truck-related parking.	See Mitigation Measures 4.3-10 and 4.3-11, above.	S

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
	Mitigation 5.3-7: The City and Port shall cooperatively develop a program that combines multiple strategic objectives and implementation tools designed to reduce cumulative truck parking and other AMS impacts.	
Impact 5.3-6: Increased ridership on AC Transit during peak weekday hours.	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-12, above.	L
Impact 5.3-7: Increased ridership on BART trains.	Mitigation 5.3-8: The City and Port shall work with BART to ensure adequate BART train capacity will be available for riders to and from the redevelopment project area, and possibly fund, on a fair share basis, BART train capacity improvements.	L
Impact 5.3-8: Increased waiting time during peak weekday hours at BART fare gates.	See Mitigation Measure 4.3-12, above.	L
Air Quality		
Impact 4.4-1: PM as fugitive dust would be emitted during construction and remediation activities.	Mitigation 4.4-1: Contractors shall implement all BAAQMD “Basic” and “Optional” PM10 (fugitive dust) control measures at all sites, and all “Enhanced” control measures at sites greater than four acres.	L
Impact 4.4-2: Construction equipment exhaust could increase levels of NO _x , ROG, CO, and PM ₁₀ (the latter primarily as diesel PM) that could exceed 15 tons per year, or result in substantial increase in diesel emissions.	Mitigation 4.4-2: Contractors shall implement exhaust control measures at all construction sites.	S

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
Impact 4.4-3: Increased Port maritime and rail operations, as well as trucking activities associated with all redevelopment operations would emit NO _x , ROG, and PM ₁₀ in excess of 15 tons per year or 80 pounds per day, substantially increase diesel emissions, and potentially expose pollution-sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Mitigation 4.4-3: The Port shall develop and implement a criteria pollutant reduction program aimed at reducing or off-setting Port-related emissions in West Oakland from its maritime and rail operations. The program shall be sufficiently funded to reduce and/or off-set redevelopment related contributions to local West Oakland air quality to the maximum extent feasible.	S
	Mitigation 4.4-4: The City and the Port shall jointly create, maintain, and fund on a fair share basis, a truck diesel emission reduction program. The program shall be sufficiently funded to reduce and/or off-set redevelopment related contributions to local West Oakland diesel emissions to the maximum extent feasible.	
Impact 4.4-4: Passenger vehicles and delivery trucks associated with redevelopment would emit NO _x , ROG, CO, and PM in excess of 15 tons per year or 80 pounds per day.	Mitigation 4.4-5: Major developers shall fund on a fair share basis BAAQMD-recommended feasible Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) for reducing vehicle emissions from commercial, institutional, and industrial operations, as well as all CAP TCMs the BAAQMD has identified as appropriate for local implementation.	S
Impact 4.4-5: Space and water heating as well as routine maintenance of office buildings, warehouses, retail stores, and live-work space, could emit NO _x , ROG, CO, and PM ₁₀ in quantities that could exceed thresholds.	Mitigation 4.4-6: Title 24 of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) requires that new construction include energy-conserving fixtures and designs. Additionally, the City and Port shall implement sustainable development policies and strategies related to new development design and construction.	L

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
<p>Impact 5.4-1: Redevelopment would result in significant cumulative air quality impacts associated with emissions of nitrogen oxides (NOx), reactive organics gases (ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM10), and diesel exhaust (almost entirely particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter [PM2.5]), the latter defined as a toxic air contaminant by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).</p>	<p>See Mitigation Measures 4.4-1 4.4-2, 4.4-3, 4.4-4, and 4.4-5, above.</p>	<p>S</p>
	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.4-1: The City and the Port shall encourage, lobby, and potentially participate in emission reduction demonstration projects that promote technological advances in improving air quality.</p>	
Noise		
<p>Impact 4.5-1: Construction could result in short-term noise levels in excess of established standards, or that violate the City of Oakland Noise Ordinance at and near the redevelopment project area, and along construction haul routes.</p>	<p>Mitigation 4.5-1: Developers and/or contractors shall develop and implement redevelopment-specific noise reduction plans.</p>	<p>L</p>
Cultural Resources		
<p>Impact 4.6-1: Redevelopment has the potential to encounter previously unknown subsurface cultural resources during ground-disturbing activities.</p>	<p>Mitigation 4.6-1: Should previously unidentified cultural resources be encountered during redevelopment, work in that vicinity shall stop immediately, until an assessment of the finds can be made by an archaeologist. If the resource is found to be significant under CEQA, an appropriate mitigation plan must be developed.</p>	<p>L</p>

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
Impact 4.6-2: Redevelopment would remove all resources contributing to the OARB Historic District.	Mitigation 4.6-2: The City, Port and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair-share basis development of a commemoration site at a public place located within the Gateway development area.	S
	Mitigation 4.6-3: The City shall ensure the commemoration site is linked to the Gateway Park and the Bay Trail via a public access trail.	
	Mitigation 4.6-4: The City, Port and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair-share basis collection and preservation of oral histories from OARB military and civilian staff.	
	Mitigation 4.6-5: The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair share basis collaboration with "military.com" or a similar military history web site.	
	Mitigation 4.6-6: The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair share basis distribution of copies of the complete OARB HABS/HAER documentation prepared by the Army to: Oakland History Room, Oakland Public Library; Bancroft Library, University of California; and Port of Oakland Archives for the purpose of added public access to these records.	

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
	<p>Mitigation 4.6-7: The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair share basis distribution of copies of "A Job Well Done" documentary video published by the Army to: the Oakland History Room, Oakland Public Library; Bancroft Library, University of California; the Port of Oakland Archives; local public schools and libraries; and local public broadcasting stations.</p>	
	<p>Mitigation 4.6-8: The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair share basis preservation and long-term curation of murals from OARB Building No. 1, and OBRA shall either donate the murals to the Oakland Museum of California, or provide a permanent location within the project area.</p>	
	<p>Mitigation 4.6-9: The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair share basis a program to salvage to the maximum extent feasible as whole timber posts, beams, trusses and siding of warehouses to be deconstructed. These materials shall be used on site, used in other East Bay Area construction, or be sold into the recycled construction materials market. Landfill disposal of salvageable construction material from contributing historic structures shall be prohibited by contract specification. Salvage and reuse requirements shall be enforced via contract specification.</p>	

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
	Mitigation 4.6-10: The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair share basis production and distribution of a brochure describing history and architectural history of the OARB to local libraries and schools.	
	Mitigation 4.6-11: The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair share basis acquisition of copies of construction documentation and photographs of historic buildings currently in the OARB files. Copies shall be transferred to the Oakland History Room files and Port historic archives, including funding to cover costs of archiving and cataloging these materials at the Oakland History Room.	
	Mitigation 4.6-12: At least one building each in the Gateway and Port development areas of the OARB sub-district, if feasible, shall include architectural design elements such as double eaves and clerestory windows evocative of the warehouse structures.	
Impact 4.6-3: Redevelopment would render the OARB Historic District no longer eligible to the National and/or California Registers of Historic Places or the Local Register.	See Mitigation Measures 4.6-2, 4.6-3, 4.6-4, 4.6-5, 4.6-6, 4.6-7, 4.6-8, 4.6-9, 4.6-10, 4.6-11, and 4.6-12, above.	S

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
Impact 4.6-4: Redevelopment would result in renovation of the SPRR (Amtrak) Station and 16 th Street Tower, which could alter the historic character of the buildings in a manner that could affect their eligibility.	Mitigation 4.6-13: Prior to major renovation of a historically significant structure, the redeveloper of the SPRR Station and 16 th Street Tower shall ensure that historically significant artifacts and features, if present within the building, are recorded and deposited with the appropriate museum. All renovation of the exterior of a historic structure shall be consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Studies.	L
Impact 5.6-1: Loss of historic resources.	See Mitigation Measures 4.6-2, 4.6-3, 4.6-4, 4.6-5, 4.6-6, 4.6-7, 4.6-8, 4.6-9, 4.6-10, 4.6-11, and 4.6-12, above.	S
Hazardous Materials		
Impact 4.7-2: Hazardous or acutely hazardous materials (AHMs) may be handled or emitted within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school.	Mitigation 4.7-1: For use of hazardous materials within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school, business operators shall prepare Business Plan, update annually, and keep on file with the Oakland Fire Department.	L
	Mitigation 4.7-2: For use of AHMs within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school, in addition to a Business Plan, business operators shall prepare, implement, and update a Risk Management and Prevention Plan (RMPP) on at least an annual basis.	
Impact 4.7-4: Site preparation, remediation and development of areas that contain contaminated soil and groundwater could expose remediation and construction workers, and future utility workers, tenants, and visitors to soil and groundwater contamination conditions.	Mitigation 4.7-3: Implement RAP/RMP as approved by DTSC, and if future proposals include uses not identified in the Reuse Plan and incorporated into the RAP/RMP, or if future amendments to the remediation requirements are proposed, obtain DTSC and City approval.	L

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
	Mitigation 4.7-4: For the project area not covered by the DTSC-approved RAP/RMP, investigate potentially contaminated sites; if contamination is found, assess potential risks to human health and the environment, prepare and implement a clean-up plan for DTSC or RWQCB approval, prepare and implement a Risk Management Plan, and prepare and implement a Site Health and Safety Plan prior to commencing work.	
Impact 4.7-5: Potential exposure to contaminants in soil and groundwater remaining in place after remediation could be a hazard to future residents, employees and visitors.	Mitigation 4.7-5: For the project areas not covered by the DTSC-approved RAP/RMP, remediate soil and groundwater contamination consistent with the City of Oakland ULR Program and other applicable laws and regulations.	L
Impact 4.7-6: Workers and others could be exposed to LBP in buildings, ACM or PCBs during demolition, remediation, renovation and site work activities.	Mitigation 4.7-6: Buildings and structures constructed prior to 1978 slated for demolition or renovation that have not previously been evaluated for the presence of LBP shall be sampled to determine whether LBP is present in painted surfaces, and the safety precautions and work practices as specified in government regulations shall be followed during demolition.	L
	Mitigation 4.7-7: Buildings, structures and utilities that have not been surveyed for ACM, shall be surveyed to determine whether ACM is present prior to demolition or renovation, and the safety precautions and work practices as specified in government regulations shall be followed during demolition.	

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
Impact 4.7-7: Workers or others could be exposed to hazardous materials and contamination in and around ASTs and USTs during remediation and redevelopment activities.	Mitigation 4.7-8: Buildings and structures proposed for demolition or renovation shall be surveyed for PCB-impacted building materials, and the safety precautions and work practices as specified in government regulations shall be followed during demolition. Mitigation 4.7-9: For ASTs/USTs on the OARB, implement the RAP/RMP, which incorporates the steps enumerated below.	L
Impact 4.7-8: Workers or others could experience direct contact exposure to LBP-contaminated soil, concrete, and pavement surrounding buildings that have LBP.	Mitigation 4.7-10: For the remainder of the redevelopment project area (non-OARB areas), if an AST or UST is encountered, it would be closed in place or removed and the soil would be tested and remediated, if necessary, pursuant to regulatory approvals and oversight. Mitigation 4.7-11: For LBP-impacted ground on the OARB, implementation of RAP/RMP to be approved by DTSC as part of the project will result in avoidance of this potentially significant impact. For the remainder of the redevelopment project area, sampling shall be performed on soil or paved areas around buildings that are known or suspected to have LBP, and the safety precautions and work practices specified in government regulations shall be followed.	L
Impact 4.7-10: During interim or future use of existing buildings, people could be exposed to ACM or other environmental hazards.	Mitigation 4.7-12: The condition of identified ACM shall be assessed annually, and prior to reuse of a building known to contain ACM.	L

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
	Mitigation 4.7-13: No future tenancies shall be authorized at the OARB for use categories that are inconsistent with the Reuse Plan without an updated environmental analysis and DTSC approval as provided for in the RAP/RMP.	
	Mitigation 4.7-14: For the remainder of the redevelopment project area (non-OARB areas), any building that has not been surveyed for ACM but potentially contains ACM shall be surveyed to determine whether ACM is present prior to demolition, renovation or reuse.	
Impact 4.7-11: Workers could be exposed to polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) and PCB-contaminated equipment during remediation, construction and future operations.	Mitigation 4.7-15: Known PCB transformers or PCB-contaminated transformers at the OARB shall be removed, monitored and/or maintained in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.	L
	Mitigation 4.7-16: Oil-filled electrical equipment in the redevelopment project area that has not been surveyed shall be investigated prior to the equipment being taken out of service to determine whether PCBs are present.	
	Mitigation 4.7-17: PCB-containing or PCB-contaminated equipment taken out of service shall be handled and disposed in compliance with applicable laws and regulations.	
Impact 5.7-1: Increased exposure to hazardous wastes during construction.	See Mitigation Measures 4.7-3, 4.7-4, 4.7-6, 4.7-7, 4.7-8, 4.7-9, 4.7-10, 4.7-11, and 4.7-14, above.	
Population, Housing, and Employment		
No significant impacts.		

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

OARB Area Redevelopment EIR

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
Public Services and Utilities		
Impact 4.9-1: Construction activities and increases in employees and residents as well as increased building density would increase demand for fire, hazmat, and first responder medical emergency services.	Mitigation 4.9-1: The City and Port shall cooperatively investigate the need for, and if required shall fund on a fair-share basis construction and operation of a fire station in the OARB sub-district. Construction and operation of this fire station shall occur in accordance with all applicable measures recommended in this EIR to mitigate environmental impacts of such construction and operation.	L
Impact 4.9-6: Redevelopment construction could interfere with operation of the Maritime Street emergency response staging area, or with the West Grand Avenue and 7th Street evacuation routes.	Mitigation 4.9-2: The Port and City shall work with OES to ensure changes in local area circulation are reflected in the revised Response Concept.	L
	Mitigation 4.9-3: The Port and City shall require developers within their respective jurisdictions to notify OES of their plans in advance of construction or remediation activities.	
Impact 4.9-8: Redevelopment would increase potable water demand.	Mitigation 4.9-4: Individual actions with landscaping requirements of one or more acres shall plumb landscape areas for irrigation with reclaimed water.	L
	Mitigation 4.9-5: Individual buildings with gross floor area exceeding 10,000 square feet shall install dual plumbing for both potable and reclaimed water, unless determined to be infeasible by the approving agency (City or Port).	
	Mitigation 4.9-6: Site design shall facilitate use of reclaimed water, and shall comply with requirements of CCR Title 22 regarding prohibitions of site run-off to surface waters.	

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
Impact 4.9-10: Redevelopment would increase the quantity of solid waste, and demand for solid waste services.	Mitigation: 4.9-7: To the maximum extent feasible, the City and Port shall jointly participate in a deconstruction program to capture materials and recycle them into the construction market.	L
	Mitigation 4.9-8: Concrete and asphalt removed during demolition/construction shall be crushed on-site or at a near-site location, and reused in redevelopment or recycled to the construction market.	
	Mitigation 4.9-9: The City and Port shall require developers to submit a plan that demonstrates a good faith effort to divert at least 50 percent of operations phase solid waste from landfill disposal.	
Impact 4.9-12: Both construction/remediation vehicles and increased operations vehicle activity would accelerate or advance deterioration of local roadways and the timing and extent of roadway maintenance/repair.	Mitigation 4.9-10: The Port and City of Oakland shall work cooperatively to develop an ongoing joint program to identify and evaluate impacted local roadways and identify required maintenance/repair activities. The agencies will fund needed repairs and maintenance on a fair-share basis.	L
Impact 5.9-1: Increased demand for fire-related services.	See Mitigation Measure 4.9-1, above.	L
Impact 5.9-2: Increased demand for police protection services.	Existing funding mechanism	L
Impact 5.9-3: Increased demand for library services.	Existing funding mechanism	L
Impact 5.9-5: Increased demand for water.	See Mitigation Measures 4.9-4 and 4.9-5, above.	L
Impact 5.9-7: Increased demand for solid waste services.	See Mitigation Measures 4.9-7, 4.9-8, and 4.9-9, above.	L

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
Recreation and Public Access		
Impact 4.10-2: Construction and/or operation of the Gateway Park could have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	See Mitigation Measures 4.12-1, 4.12-2, 4.12-3, 4.15-1, and 4.15-2, below	L
Aesthetics		
Impact 4.11-2: Redevelopment would remove buildings contributing to a historic district, including visually striking warehouse structures visible from I-80, a locally designated scenic route, and a portion of the state scenic highway system.	See Mitigation Measure 4.6-12, above.	S
Impact 4.11-3: New security lighting and/or lighting for night time operations would alter current patterns of light or glare, and could alter nighttime views in the area.	Mitigation 4.11-1: New lighting shall be designed to minimize off-site light spillage; "stadium" style lighting shall be prohibited.	L
	Mitigation 4.11-2: At or near the boundary of the proposed Gateway Park, new lighting shall be shielded to prevent light spillage into natural areas.	
Impact 4.11-4: New construction could introduce building or landscaping elements that would now or in the future cast shadow on existing collectors or photovoltaic cells, or a building using passive solar heat collection.	Mitigation 4.11-3: New active or passive solar systems within or adjacent to the project area shall be set back from the property line a minimum of 25 feet.	L
	Mitigation 4.11-4: New construction within the Gateway development area adjacent to a parcel containing permitted or existing active or passive solar systems shall demonstrate through design review that the proposed structures shall not substantially impair operation of existing solar systems.	

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
<p>Mitigation 4.11-5: The City and Port shall coordinate with respect to the design of new, permanent buildings constructed along the Port/Gateway boundary to minimize conflicts over solar access.</p> <p>Impact 4.11-5: New construction could introduce building or landscaping elements that would now or in the future cast shadow that substantially impairs the beneficial use of a public park or open space.</p>	<p>Mitigation 4.11-6: New construction adjacent to a public park or open space shall demonstrate through design review that development shall not substantially impair enjoyment of the public using the space.</p>	<p>L</p>
Biological Resources		
<p>Impact 4.12-1: Redevelopment could result in the loss of 15 acres of ruderal/beach habitat.</p>	<p>Mitigation 4.12-1: EBRPD shall maintain and enhance beach habitat where feasible between the shoreline and the park in order that water birds have space to forage and roost on the peninsula, and comply with all applicable resource agency requirements.</p>	<p>L</p>
<p>Impact 4.12-2: Redevelopment could result in increased raptor predation on least terns that may forage near the Gateway peninsula.</p>	<p>Mitigation 4.12-2: Tall ornamental trees that could provide perches for raptors shall be prohibited in the design of the Gateway Park.</p>	<p>L</p>
	<p>Mitigation 4.12-3: Raptor deterrents shall be placed on light standards and other tall elements installed within the Gateway Park.</p>	
	<p>See Mitigation Measure 4.11-2, above.</p>	
<p>Impact 4.12-3: Redevelopment would result in net loss of approximately 27 acres of open and covered water at New Berth 21; minor amounts of fill and revetment could occur along the shoreline of the Gateway Park, with a loss of near-shore habitat.</p>	<p>Mitigation 4.12-4: Contractors, developers, the Port, and EBRPD shall comply with all permit conditions from the Corps, RWQCB, USFWS/NMFS and CDFG for fill.</p>	<p>L</p>

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

OARB Area Redevelopment EIR

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
Impact 4.12-4: Redevelopment could result in both temporary impacts to herring spawning habitat during construction, and a permanent net loss of Pacific herring spawning habitat associated with the wharf pilings at existing Berths 9, 10, 20 and 21 due to construction of New Berth 21.	Mitigation 4.12-5: A qualified observer shall be present on site during all in-water construction activities near potential herring spawning areas between December 1 and March 1.	L
	Mitigation 4.12-6: If spawning is observed, in-water construction activities shall be redirected for 200 meters around the spawning area for two weeks.	
Impact 4.12-6: Redevelopment may result in loss of protected trees measuring 4 inches dbh (or larger) or trees with a dbh of greater than 9 inches.	Mitigation 4.12-7: Application for a tree preservation/tree removal permit from the City of Oakland for all protected trees shall comply with the Tree Ordinance, which includes replacement of native trees at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio.	L
Impact 4.12-7: Redevelopment may result in the loss of breeding bird nesting habitat with the removal of certain trees.	Mitigation 4.12-8: Trees shall be removed between September 1 and January 31 to avoid the nesting season (February 1 to August 31). Alternatively, field surveys shall be conducted no earlier than 45 days and no later than 20 days prior to the removal of any trees during the nesting/breeding season of bird species potentially nesting on the site to determine whether birds are present.	L
	Mitigation 4.12-9: Construction shall not occur within 150 feet of an active nest until the nest is vacated or the juveniles have fledged.	

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
Impact 4.12-8: Redevelopment could result in a substantial increase in the risk of establishment of invasive species in the San Francisco Bay.	Mitigation 4.12-10: The Port shall continue to enforce its tariff requirements regarding ballast water and if the State law sunsets, shall implement the remainder of its ballast water ordinance, as it may be amended from time to time.	S
	Mitigation 4.12-11: The Port shall continue to develop and implement a carrier ballast water education program.	
	Mitigation 4.12-12: The Port shall support international and United States efforts to adopt uniform international or national standards to avoid introduction of exotic species through shipping activities.	
Impact 4.12-9: Loss of up to approximately 0.5 acre of isolated, urban wetlands	Mitigation 4.12-13: Contractors and developers shall comply with all conditions imposed by the RWQCB for fill of wetlands.	L
Impact 5.12-1: Effects to sensitive species.	See Mitigation Measures 4.12-1, 4.12-2, and 4.12-3, above.	L
Impact 5.12-2: Loss of protected wetlands and waters of the U.S.	See Mitigation Measures 4.12-4 and 4.12-13, above.	L
Impact 5.12-3: Redevelopment could increase potential risk of invasive species being established in San Francisco Bay.	See Mitigation Measures 4.12-10, 4.12-11, and 4.12-12, above.	S
Geology, Seismicity, and Soils		
Impact 4.13-1: Redevelopment could expose increased numbers of people and structures to strong seismic ground shaking.	Mitigation 4.13-1: Redevelopment elements shall be designed in accordance with criteria established by the UBC, soil investigation and construction requirements established in the Oakland General Plan, the Bay Conservation and Development Commission Safety of Fill Policy, and wharf design criteria established by the Port or City of Oakland (depending on the location of the wharf).	L

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
	Mitigation 4.13-2: Redevelopment elements shall be designed and constructed in accordance with requirements of a site-specific geotechnical evaluation.	
Impact 4.13-2: Redevelopment could expose increased numbers of people or structures to seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse.	See Mitigation Measures 4.13-1 and 4.13-2, above.	L
Impact 4.13-3: Localized landsliding may occur in sloped shoreline areas.	See Mitigation Measures 4.13-1 and 4.13-2, above.	L
Impact 4.13-4: Under certain conditions, disturbance of soils during construction could result in erosion.	Mitigation 4.13-3: Prior to ground-disturbing activities, the contractor shall develop and implement a Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)-acceptable Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that includes erosion control measures.	L
Impact 4.13-5: Redevelopment could occur on expansive soils.	See Mitigation Measures 4.13-1 and 4.13-2, above.	L
Impact 4.13-6: Redevelopment elements may be located above a well, pit, sump, mound, tank vault, unmarked sewer line, landfill, or unknown fill soils.	See Mitigation Measure 4.13-2, above	L
	Mitigation 4.13-4: The project applicant shall thoroughly review available building and environmental records.	
	Mitigation 4-13.5: The developer shall perform due diligence, including without limitation, retaining the services of subsurface utility locators and other technical experts prior to any ground-disturbing activities.	
Impact 5.13-1: Exposure of persons or property to seismic risk.	See Mitigation Measures 4.13-1 and 4.13-2, above.	L

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
Groundwater		
Impact 4.14-1: Operation of wells could cause saltwater to intrude into shallow groundwater.	Mitigation 4.14-1: Installation of groundwater extraction wells into the shallow water-bearing zone or Merritt Sand aquifer for any purpose other than construction de-watering and remediation shall be prohibited.	L
Impact 4.14-2: Operation of wells could cause contaminants to migrate to uncontaminated groundwater.	Mitigation 4.14-2: Extraction of groundwater for construction de-watering or remediation shall be minimized where practicable.	L
Impact 5.14-1: Concurrent operation of multiple remediation wells or construction dewatering activities could further impair groundwater quality.	See Mitigation Measures 4.14-1 and 4.14-2, above.	L
Surface Water		
Impact 4.15-1: In-water construction or remediation would increase turbidity, and could release contaminants, affecting water quality.	Mitigation 4.15-1: Prior to in-water construction, the contractor shall prepare a water quality protection plan acceptable to the RWQCB, including site-specific best management practices for protection of Bay waters, and shall implement this plan during construction.	L
	Mitigation 4.15-2: Contractors and developers shall comply with all permit conditions from the Corps, RWQCB, and BCDC.	
Impact 4.15-2: Under certain circumstances, disturbance of soils during construction could result in erosion, which in turn could increase sediment loads to receiving waters.	Mitigation 4.15-3: Prior to ground-disturbing activities, the contractor shall develop and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan to be reviewed by the City or the Port, including erosion and sediment control measures.	L

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation**

Significant Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Residual Significance
Impact 4.15-3: During construction or remediation, shallow groundwater may be encountered that could be contaminated with sediment or chemicals, and could enter nearby receiving waters as could contaminated stormwater.	Mitigation 4.15-4: Prior to construction or remediation, the contractor shall develop and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, including protocols for determining the quality and disposition of construction water which includes shallow groundwater encountered during construction/remediation.	L
Impact 4.15-4: Net changes in impervious surface could result in higher pollutant loads to receiving waters.	Mitigation 4.15-5: Post-construction controls of stormwater shall be incorporated into the design of new redevelopment elements to reduce pollutant loads.	L
Impact 4.15-5: Use of recycled water for non-potable purposes could lead to degradation of surface water quality.	Mitigation 4.15-6: Site-specific design and best management practices shall be implemented to prevent runoff of recycled water to receiving waters.	L
Impact 4.15-6: New construction could result in changes in localized flooding.	Mitigation 4.15-7: New development shall conform with the policies of the City of Oakland's Comprehensive Plan Environmental Health Hazards Element regarding flood protection.	A
	Mitigation 4.15-8: The City and the Port shall complete flood hazard mapping in the project area, where necessary and applicable to delineate 100- and 500-year flood hazard zones.	
Impact 5.15-1: Construction-related increases in erosion and sedimentation/turbidity.	See Mitigation Measures 4.15-1, 4.15-2, and 4.15-3, above	L
Impact 5.15-2: Increases in 303(d) pollutants and toxics.	See Mitigation Measures 4.15-4 and 4.15-5, above	L

1
2
3

~ ~ ~
~

Legend: S = Significant and unavoidable; L = Less than significant; A = Impact avoided