

1 **7. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

2 CEQA requires an EIR to consider alternatives to a proposed action that could avoid or
3 otherwise reduce the identified significant environmental impacts of the proposed action. In this
4 manner, alternatives serve the same purpose under CEQA as mitigation—development of an
5 environmentally sound action. Analysis of alternatives is intended to support informed decision-
6 making and public participation.

7 **7.1 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY**

8 The City used the following process to identify a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the
9 proposed redevelopment plan:

- 10 1. Identify objectives.
- 11 2. Identify significant impacts to be avoided or reduced.
- 12 3. Develop a list of potential alternatives.
- 13 4. Develop screening criteria for feasibility.
- 14 5. Screen alternatives to a reasonable range.
- 15 6. Conduct a comparative analysis of the proposed program and each alternative.

16 **7.1.1 Identify Program Objectives**

17 Through the Base reuse and redevelopment planning processes, the City and Port developed
18 basic objectives guiding future development of redevelopment project area lands within their
19 respective jurisdictions. The full text of proposed program objectives is included in Section 3:
20 Description. A summary of basic program objectives follows:

- 21 • Alleviate economic and social degradation.
- 22 • Eliminate blighting influences.
- 23 • Create a vibrant and balanced land use pattern.
- 24 • Strengthen the economic base.
- 25 • Allow for sustainable job creation.
- 26 • Expand low/moderate-income housing.
- 27 • Provide for high-quality public/community services .
- 28 • Provide for safe, efficient, effective movement of people and goods.
- 29 • Protect, preserve, enhance environmental resources.
- 30 • Minimize waste generation, maximize reuse/recycling.

- 1 • Accommodate the Port’s share of regional cargo throughput in 2020.
- 2 • Respond to trends, requirements of maritime shipping.
- 3 • Increase Port productivity and efficiency.
- 4 • Provide sufficient capacity to substitute for West Coast gateways in event of an emergency.
- 5 • Keep competitive with other West Coast ports.

6 **7.1.2 Identify Significant Impacts to Be Avoided or Reduced**

7 Chapter 4: Setting and Baseline, Impacts, and Mitigation, presents a detailed analysis of
8 impacts that could result with implementation of the proposed redevelopment program. A
9 summary of relevant impacts appears in Table 7.5-2, below.

10 **7.1.3 Develop a List of Potential Alternatives**

11 Based on scoping comments and potential significant program impacts, the City developed a
12 suite of reuse or “action” alternatives for consideration, as follows:

- 13 • **High Intensity.** This alternative represents the upper range of potential development
14 options within the redevelopment project area.
- 15 • **Reduced Intensity.** This alternative represents the lower range of potential development
16 options within the redevelopment project area.
- 17 • **Full Maritime.** This alternative examines development of the OARB and Maritime sub-
18 districts solely for Port use and Port-supportive industries and businesses.
- 19 • **No New Intermodal Facility.** This alternative examines replacement of the proposed New
20 Intermodal Railyard with other Port maritime and ancillary maritime support (AMS) uses.
- 21 • **No New Berth 21.** This alternative is the same as the proposed Redevelopment/Reuse
22 Plan, except that New Berth 21 would not be constructed.
- 23 • **Full Adaptive Reuse.** This alternative examines the adaptive reuse of historic structures of
24 the OARB sub-district.
- 25 • **Gateway Adaptive Reuse/Eco-Park.** This alternative examines adaptive reuse of Gateway
26 development area structures in the development of an eco-park.

27 These alternatives are described in detail in Section 7.3: Alternatives Considered and
28 Determined Infeasible, and Section 7.4: Alternatives Put Forth for Further Consideration.

29 **7.1.4 Develop Screening Criteria for Feasibility**

30 Feasibility is an important concept in the selection of alternatives. CEQA (§ 21061) defines
31 feasible as “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period
32 of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.” The

1 CEQA Guidelines (§ 15364) further include “legal” in the definition of feasibility. Specifically
2 regarding alternatives, the *Guidelines* identify the following factors that may be used to assist
3 the lead agency to make its determination of feasibility:

- 4 • site suitability;
- 5 • economic viability;
- 6 • availability of infrastructure;
- 7 • general plan consistency;
- 8 • other plans or regulatory limitations;
- 9 • jurisdictional boundaries; and
- 10 • whether the proponent can acquire or control an optional site.

11 Because the program is fundamentally linked to reuse of a specific area, the City determined
12 locational alternatives to be infeasible. Therefore, alternatives screening for feasibility utilized all
13 but the last CEQA-identified screening criteria listed above.

14 **7.1.5 Screen Alternatives to a Reasonable Range**

15 Potential alternatives underwent a three-tiered screening process, and were first screened
16 against redevelopment basic objectives as criteria. Any potential alternative that fundamentally
17 did not attain one or more objectives (completely failed to achieve or partially achieve an
18 objective) was eliminated from further consideration, other than the No Redevelopment Program
19 alternative, whose complete analysis is required by CEQA. Next, potential alternatives were
20 screened for their ability to avoid or substantially reduce the significant impacts of the proposed
21 redevelopment program. Those potential alternatives that obviously could not accomplish this
22 were eliminated from further consideration. Potential alternatives were lastly screened for
23 feasibility against the relevant criteria identified above. Those found infeasible were eliminated
24 from further consideration.

25 Those alternatives that may meet basic program objectives, that may mitigate significant and
26 potentially significant impacts of the proposed program, and that are considered potentially
27 feasible, were put forth for further consideration and comparative analysis in this EIR.

28 **7.1.6 Conduct a Comparative Analysis**

29 Alternatives put forth for further consideration were comparatively evaluated for their ability to
30 attain program objectives. Alternatives put forth for further consideration were also
31 comparatively evaluated for their ability to achieve benefits of the proposed program; to avoid or
32 substantially reduce significant impacts of the proposed program; and for their potential to result
33 in significant impacts not associated with the proposed program. Each alternative was rated,

1 and then based on the order of its rating was ranked relative to the other alternatives. This
2 analysis is presented in Section 7.5.

3 **7.2 BACKGROUND OF ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT**

4 This EIR evaluates alternatives relative to the proposed redevelopment program as described in
5 Chapter 3: Description. Alternatives for consideration in this EIR were developed as follows:

- 6 • the City included a “no action” alternative pursuant to regulatory requirements;
- 7 • the City developed several alternatives intended to meet basic program objectives and to
8 avoid or substantially reduce anticipated significant impacts of the proposed program; and
- 9 • community members identified several alternatives during EIR scoping.

10 **7.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND DETERMINED INFEASIBLE**

11 The following alternatives were screened and determined to be infeasible:

- 12 • Full Adaptive Reuse;
- 13 • No New Intermodal Facility;
- 14 • No New Berth 21; and
- 15 • Reduced Geographic Area.

16 **7.3.1 Full Adaptive Reuse**

17 The purpose of the Full Adaptive Reuse alternative is to avoid or substantially reduce significant
18 environmental impacts of the proposed redevelopment program to historic resources, disclosed
19 in Section 4.6: Cultural Resources. The OARB includes a historic district comprising 19
20 contributing buildings and three wharves, most of which would be de-constructed (removed)
21 under the proposed redevelopment program. This alternative would preclude the Port from
22 removing buildings that are historic district contributors along existing Maritime Street for
23 construction of the New Intermodal Facility, as well as historic district contributors for
24 construction of New Berth 21. This alternative would also preclude the City from de-constructing
25 historic structures in the Gateway development area to provide for its redevelopment.

26 This alternative is expected to result in the following buildout:

Alternatives to the Proposed Redevelopment Program

**Table 7.3-1
Build-Out of the Full Adaptive Reuse Alternative**

| Potential Land Uses | Units | Redevelopment Sub-District | | | | | Total | |
|---|---------|----------------------------|----------------|------------|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | OARB ^a | | | | | | |
| | | Gateway | | Port | | Maritime 16 th /Wood | | |
| Light Industry | sq. ft. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 305,000 | 305,000 |
| Office, R&D ^c | sq. ft. | 961,000 | 198,000 | 0 | 56,500 | 0 | 1,437,000 | 2,652,500 |
| Retail | sq. ft. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,300 | 1,300 |
| Warehouse/Distribution | sq. ft. | 0 | 444,000 | 0 | 1,195,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,639,000 |
| Total square feet | | 961,000 | 642,000 | 0 | 1,251,500 | 0 | 1,743,300 | 4,597,800 |
| Live/Work units | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 375 | 375 |
| From uses listed above | ac. | 75 | 74 | | 64 | 0 | 40 | 253 |
| Park, Public Access | ac. | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 |
| New Marine Terminals | ac. | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| Marine Terminal Realignment | ac. | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ancillary Maritime Support | ac. | 15 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |
| New Intermodal Facility | ac. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Acres to be redeveloped/reused^d | | 119 | 74 | 121 | 64 | 0 | 41 | 419 |
| Total acres | | 228 | | 241 | | 1,290 | 41 | 1,800 |

Notes:

- ^a Left-hand columns are square footages or acres to be rebuilt, and right-hand columns are square footages or acres to be adaptively reused.
- ^b sq. ft. = square feet; ac. = acres
- ^c Includes 50,000 square feet of training facilities for the Joint Apprentice and Training Committee (JATC).
- ^d Acreages identified above are gross land use acreage, inclusive of roadway and utility rights-of-way.

1
2 The Full Adaptive Reuse alternative would generate approximately 10,370 total direct jobs.
3 Accounting for the number of baseline year (1995) jobs—approximately 2,045—this alternative
4 would generate about 8,325 net direct jobs, or 58 percent of the net direct jobs generated by the
5 proposed redevelopment program.

6 **OARB Sub-District, Gateway Development Area**

7 As required under the Reuse Plan, the Full Adaptive Reuse alternative recognizes certain
8 conveyances and commitments of land within the Gateway development area including the
9 following:

- 10 • the 3-acre conveyance from the ORA to the Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee
11 (JATC);
- 12 • the 15-acre conveyance from the Army to the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD);

- 1 • the commitment of Caltrans to provide public access improvements in the area¹;
 - 2 • the City's commitment to provide 15 acres of land for AMS; and
 - 3 • the Legally Binding Agreement between the OBRA, City, and the Homeless Collaborative.
- 4 This alternative assumes the entirety of homeless assistance programs would be located
5 within the OARB sub-district.

6 Within the remainder of the Gateway development area, approximately 74 acres are located
7 within the OARB Historic District, including Buildings No. 1, 4, 60, 85, 812, 821, 822, and 823,
8 plus portions of Buildings No. 88 and 99, about one-quarter of the total space within the 800-
9 series warehouses, and about two-thirds of the linear frontage of the historic wharves. Under
10 this alternative, these buildings and structures would be retained and adaptively reused for new
11 purposes.

12 With preservation of historic district buildings, and with the land use commitments identified
13 above for other lands, approximately 75 acres of the Gateway development area would be
14 available for construction of new land uses. At an average floor-area ratio (FAR) of 0.35
15 (consistent with the Redevelopment and Reuse plans), this remaining land could accommodate
16 approximately 961,000 square feet of new building space.

17 **OARB Sub-District, Port Development Area**

18 Within the Port development area, approximately 64 acres are located within the OARB Historic
19 District, including Buildings No. 90 and 991, portions of Buildings No. 88 and 99, about three-
20 quarters of the total space within the 800-series warehouses, and about one-third of the linear
21 frontage of the historic wharves. Under the Full Adaptive Reuse alternative, these buildings and
22 structures would be retained and adaptively reused, and the Port would not develop the Port-
23 related improvements anticipated for this area. Improvements precluded under this alternative
24 include the following:

- 25 • full realignment of Maritime Street, plus any extension of that street (to avoid the loss of
26 Buildings No. 802 to 808, and 991);
- 27 • the New Intermodal Facility (to avoid the loss of the same structures); and
- 28 • that portion of New Berth 21 located in the Port development area (to avoid loss of Buildings
29 No. 88, 90, 99, Wharf 6, and a portion of Wharf 6½ for berths and terminals).

30 Without implementation of these Port-related improvements, that portion of Maritime Street
31 south of the OARB Historic District would be realigned in order to incorporate 46 acres of this
32 development area into existing Outer Harbor marine terminals (west of the realigned street). A
33 maritime support center (MSC) would be developed in the area east of the partially realigned
34 Maritime Street. In addition to the MSC, approximately 1.3 million square feet of primarily

¹ This commitment results from BCDC permits conditions for two Caltrans projects: re-construction and realignment of Interstate (I-)-880, and the Bay Bride Replacement project. The requirements of these permits are described in Section 4.10: Recreation and Public Access.

1 Office/R&D and Warehousing/Distribution uses would be developed in the Port development
2 area.

3 **Maritime Sub-District**

4 Under the Full Adaptive Reuse alternative, the Port would continue to develop, and the Port and
5 its tenants to operate, facilities within the Port area, including facilities of the Vision 2000
6 Program. Key differences of sub-district development under this alternative relative to the
7 proposed program include the following:

- 8 • The Port would not develop the New Intermodal Facility within the Port development area,
9 and the Joint Intermodal Facility (JIT) would remain in its current location.
- 10 • Maritime terminal expansion into a portion of the current JIT site would not occur.
- 11 • Development of the 75-acre MSC on a portion of the JIT site would not occur in this sub-
12 district (rather, a MSC would be located in the Port development area).
- 13 • A reduction in the excavation and Bay fill for New Berth 21 would occur (to avoid loss of
14 historic Wharf 6 and a portion of Wharf 6½ during shoreline reconfiguration).

15 Rather than invest in a new berth and terminal with less than optimal operational geometry, the
16 Port may elect to not construct New Berth 21, and to continue to operate existing berths in the
17 vicinity (Berths 8, 9, 10, 20, and 21).

18 **16th/Wood Sub-District**

19 Under the Full Adaptive Reuse alternative, the 16th/Wood sub-district would be developed
20 consistent with the proposed redevelopment program, including the preliminary development
21 concept for adaptive reuse of the historic SPRR (Amtrak) station site and Business Mix uses.

22 **Why this Alternative is Considered Infeasible**

23 This alternative would preserve historic structures (buildings and wharves) for reuse, and
24 maintain the integrity of the National Register OARB Historic District; such preservation would
25 prevent key redevelopment components from being developed. Under this alternative,
26 development of new land uses at the Gateway development area would be substantially
27 reduced. In the Port development area, the New Intermodal Facility would not occur, and New
28 Berth 21 would not be constructed in its entirety. These components are necessary to
29 fundamentally achieve basic project objectives. Moreover, the New Intermodal Facility and New
30 Berth 21 are necessary to achieve goals and for consistency with policies of the *San Francisco*
31 *Bay Plan* and the *San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan*, adopted regional planning documents,
32 regarding projected cargo throughput in 2020, as well as minimization of Bay fill.

33 Under this alternative, the existing JIT would remain in its present location; this would prevent
34 use of the limited land adjacent to the deepwater Outer Harbor, 7th Street, and Inner Harbor
35 areas for expansion of existing marine terminals to 1,000 acres, as is contemplated in the
36 Seaport Plan. A total of 1,000 acres is needed in the Port area for container terminals and
37 related activities for the Port to handle its share of Bay Area throughput of approximately 24.5

1 million metric tons (MT) per year of containerized cargo in 2020, as described the Seaport Plan.
2 In addition, without development of New Berth 21, the Outer Harbor shoreline would not be fully
3 reconfigured, and would continue to operate under a less efficient geometry, with an inadequate
4 amount of marine terminal and related acreage. In the absence of all Bay fill required for New
5 Berth 21, existing land that would have created the container yard for the new berth would
6 continue to function as marine berths, terminals, and AMS, but would operate under a less
7 efficient geometry. All efficiencies made possible by full shoreline reconfiguration for New Berth
8 21 would not occur, nor would all increase in efficiencies in adjacent terminals occur, as planned
9 under the proposed redevelopment program. Development of New Berth 21, along with other
10 elements of the proposed program, is an alternative to filling approximately 153 acres of San
11 Francisco Bay in order to achieve projected throughput as described in the Seaport Plan.

12 As described below, due to the nature of buildings at the Base and existing environmental
13 impairments, this alternative fails to balance historic preservation, site remediation, and
14 economic development goals.

15 **Failure to Achieve Basic Redevelopment Objectives.** This alternative was not put forth for
16 detailed analysis, because it fails to achieve several basic redevelopment objectives, as follows:

- 17 • **Strengthen the economic base.** While this alternative would partially fulfill this objective by
18 creating jobs, it would not create the types of high-quality jobs envisioned in the Reuse Plan.
19 Due to the character of older buildings at the Base, they have been determined to be
20 suitable for reuse as Class “B” office space. Class B office space is not the type of
21 redevelopment contemplated in the OARB Reuse Plan, which instead mandates that Class
22 A office space be constructed to establish the OARB as the “gateway” to the City of
23 Oakland. The alternative would substantially fail to achieve this program objective.

24 Without removal of historic structures designed and located to support a mid-20th century
25 military operation, land use and circulation inefficiencies would prevent generation of
26 sufficient capital to defray anticipated costs of reuse. This alternative would also be limited in
27 its ability to achieve other basic objectives, including alleviation of economic and social
28 degradation, and provision of high-quality public/community services.

- 29 • **Accommodate the Port’s share of regional cargo throughput in 2020.** As described
30 above, this alternative would prevent the Port of Oakland from handling its share of Bay
31 Area 2020 cargo throughput. The alternative fundamentally fails to achieve this basic
32 program objective.

- 33 • **Increase Port productivity and efficiency.** Without the acreage of the existing JIT for
34 marine terminal use, the optimization of rail operations possible with the New Intermodal
35 Facility, and the inter-marine terminal efficiencies made possible by New Berth 21, the
36 productivity and efficiency of the Port would be limited and may, in fact, deteriorate over time
37 as increased throughput is processed through a facility that cannot accommodate it. The
38 alternative fundamentally fails to achieve this program objective.

- 1 • **Provide sufficient capacity to substitute for other West Coast gateway ports in the**
2 **event of natural disaster or other emergency.** In the absence of substantially increased
3 Port productivity and efficiency that cannot be achieved under this alternative, the Port
4 would not be able to provide additional throughput capacity, required in the event an
5 emergency (such as a major earthquake) disabled one of the two other West Coast cargo
6 gateways (Los Angeles/Long Beach or Seattle/Tacoma). The alternative fundamentally fails
7 to achieve this program objective.
- 8 • **Keep competitive with other West Coast ports.** In the absence of future major increases
9 in acreage in the Port area, the Port can best increase its share of the intermodal market
10 through increased rail facility efficiencies, not possible under this alternative. With an
11 efficient rail operation, the Port can decrease the amount of time a container is stored at the
12 Port, and can more efficiently use the land it has, without filling the Bay to create new land
13 for such purposes. The alternative substantially fails to achieve this program objective.

14 **Inability to Reduce Significant Impacts of Redevelopment.** This alternative would result in
15 significant impacts not associated with the proposed redevelopment program.

- 16 • **Inability to balance effective remediation of environmental impairments with**
17 **preservation of historic resources.** Building No. 1, the OARB Main Administration
18 Building, is located centrally within the Gateway development area. This key building has
19 been evaluated for its reuse potential as Class B multi-tenant office space at a rehabilitation
20 cost of approximately \$20 million. This estimate, however, does not consider the necessity
21 of demolishing two wings of the floor space of this four-wing building to remove tarry,
22 contamination-impacted soil and a hazardous plume located beneath the building and on
23 adjacent land. This required remediation is currently projected to be the single most
24 extensive environmental clean up requirement for the Base.
- 25 • **Exposure of residents to potentially hazardous materials in contradiction of OARB**
26 **clean-up levels.** This alternative would locate the Homeless Collaborative program onto the
27 Gateway development area of the OARB. The Homeless Collaborative program includes a
28 childcare facility and transitional housing, among other things. Allowing these residential
29 uses on the Gateway development area would be inconsistent with the remediation levels
30 and land use restrictions contemplated by the City, the Army and the DTSC that will be
31 applicable to the Gateway development area. The proposed Remedial Action Plan/Risk
32 Management Plan (RAP/RMP) for the OARB is consistent with the City of Oakland Urban
33 Land Redevelopment Program, which allows for remediation levels based on a target risk of
34 10^{-5} for sites where contamination issues are known. However, the proposed remediation
35 levels for the Gateway development area are not suitable for residential uses. Therefore,
36 this alternative would result in potentially significant impact from allowing a use inconsistent
37 with proposed remediation on the Gateway development area.

38 **Other Plans or Regulatory Limitations.** Because this alternative would prevent the Port from
39 handling its share of Bay Area 2020 throughput as described in the Seaport Plan, it is
40 fundamentally inconsistent with that plan, as well as the Bay Plan (which incorporates the

OARB Area Redevelopment EIR

Seaport Plan). For this reason, it is unlikely that permits would be obtained for elements of the program under the jurisdiction of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), which implements the Bay Plan.

7.3.2 No New Intermodal Facility

The purpose of this alternative is to identify additional land outside but near the existing Port area to address trucking needs, and to minimize the effect of Port-related trucking operations on the West Oakland community. Under this alternative, approximately 130 acres of the Port development area proposed for the New Intermodal Facility would instead be developed in AMS uses.

This alternative is expected to result in the following buildout:

**Table 7.3-2
Build-Out of the No New Intermodal Facility Alternative**

| Potential Land Uses | Units | Redevelopment Sub-District | | | | Total |
|--|---------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------------|------------------|
| | | OARB | | | | |
| | | Gateway | Port | Maritime | 16 th /Wood | |
| Light Industry ^b | sq. ft. | 494,000 | 0 | 0 | 305,000 | 799,000 |
| Office, R&D | sq. ft. | 1,528,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,437,000 | 2,965,000 |
| Retail | sq. ft. | 185,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,300 | 186,300 |
| Warehouse/distribution | sq. ft. | 300,000 | 500,000 | 0 | 0 | 800,000 |
| Total square feet | | 2,507,000 | 500,000 | 0 | 1,743,300 | 4,750,300 |
| Live/Work units | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 375 | 375 |
| From uses listed above | ac. | 183 | 25 | 0 | 40 | 248 |
| Park, Public Access | ac. | 29 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 |
| New Marine Terminals | ac. | 0 | 55 | 65 | 0 | 120 |
| Marine Terminal Realignment | ac. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ancillary Maritime Support | ac. | 0 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 105 |
| New Intermodal Facility | ac. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Acres to be redeveloped^c | | 212 | 185 | 65 | 41 | 503 |
| Total acres | | 228 | 241 | 1,290 | 41 | 1,800 |

Notes:

^a sq. ft. = square feet; ac. = acres

^b Includes 50,000 square feet of training facilities for the JATC.

^c Acreages identified above are gross land use acreage, inclusive of roadway and utility rights-of way. In addition to land acreage, approximately 3 acres of existing land and wharf (solid and covered fill) will be removed to create open water.

The No New Intermodal Facility alternative would generate approximately 13,750 total direct jobs. Accounting for the number of baseline year (1995) jobs—approximately 2,045—this alternative would generate about 11,705 net direct jobs, or 82 percent of the net direct jobs generated by the proposed redevelopment program.

1 **OARB Sub-District, Gateway Development Area**

2 Under the No New Intermodal Facility alternative, the City would develop the Gateway
3 development area as envisioned under the proposed redevelopment program. This
4 development would include up to a maximum of approximately 2.5 million square feet of new
5 Light Industrial, Office/R&D, and Warehouse/Distribution uses, with High-End Retail and Hotel
6 uses possible.² This alternative recognizes certain conveyances and commitments of land within
7 the Gateway development area, including:

- 8 • the 3-acre conveyance from the ORA to the JATC;
- 9 • the 15-acre conveyance from the Army to the EBRPD;
- 10 • the commitment of Caltrans to provide public access improvements in the area; and
- 11 • the Legally Binding Agreement between the OBRA, City, and the Homeless Collaborative,
12 which requires identification of sites for homeless assistance programs, assumed to be
13 accommodated at appropriate off-site locations.

14 Because, as described below, expanded AMS facilities would be developed in the Port
15 development area, the Baldwin railyard would not be required for AMS, and that site would be
16 available to the City for flexible development uses. Under this alternative, “big box” retail would
17 be developed at the Baldwin Yard site.

18 **OARB Sub-District, Port Development Area**

19 Under the No New Intermodal Facility alternative, the Port would not develop the New
20 Intermodal Facility as envisioned under the proposed redevelopment program. Construction of
21 New Berth 21 (including shoreline reconfiguration) would occur, including cargo terminal
22 expansion on Port development area lands not slated for the New Intermodal Facility.

23 Instead of the New Intermodal Facility, approximately 130 acres of land within the OARB
24 between realigned Maritime Street and I-880 would be dedicated to AMS uses; this amount of
25 AMS exceeds the Port’s requirement to provide 90 acres of AMS, as described in the most-
26 recently amended Bay Plan. This area could accommodate approximately ½ million square feet
27 of Warehouse/Distribution space. AMS would also include facilities for trans-loading cargo, and
28 container handling space (repair, cleaning, empty storage, etc.). Additionally, this area could
29 accommodate a full-service truck stop and a tractor-trailer parking lot. The truck stop could
30 provide a variety of services, including truck fueling and maintenance facilities, as well as a
31 restaurant, convenience store, and motel. It is unlikely that existing buildings within the Port
32 development area could be adaptively re-used to accommodate such uses, other than Jacobs
33 Hall (Building No. 650), which is not a contributing structure to the OARB historic district. Most if
34 not all of the warehouses would to be de-constructed to provide space for AMS uses.

² See Appendix 7 for an evaluation of these land use options.

1 **Maritime Sub-District**

2 Under the No New Intermodal Facility alternative, the Port would continue to develop, and the
3 Port or its tenants to operate, facilities within the Maritime sub-district, including facilities of the
4 Vision 2000 Program. The Port would maintain in its present configuration the JIT adjacent to
5 the Outer, Seventh Street, and Middle Harbor container terminals, and the functions of the JIT
6 would not be relocated to the Port development area. New Berth 21 would be developed within
7 this sub-district as envisioned in the proposed redevelopment program. Key differences in sub-
8 district development under this alternative relative to the proposed program include the
9 following:

- 10 • The existing JIT would remain in its current location.
- 11 • Maritime terminal expansion into a portion of the current JIT site would not occur.
- 12 • Development of the 75-acre MSC would not occur on a portion of the JIT site (but rather at
13 the Port development area, as described above).

14 **16th/Wood Sub-District**

15 Under the No New Intermodal Facility alternative, the 16th/Wood sub-district would be
16 developed consistent with the proposed redevelopment program, including the preliminary
17 development concept for the Amtrak station site and Business Mix uses.

18 **Why this Alternative is Considered Infeasible**

19 Maintaining the existing JIT in its present location under this alternative would prevent use
20 of the limited land adjacent to the deepwater Outer Harbor, 7th Street, and Inner Harbor
21 areas for expansion of existing marine terminals to 1,000 acres, as is contemplated in the
22 Seaport Plan. A total of 1,000 acres is needed in the Port area for container terminals and
23 related activities for the Port to handle its share of Bay Area cargo throughput—
24 approximately 24.5 million metric tons (MT) per year of containerized cargo in 2020, as
25 described the Seaport Plan.

26 **Failure to Achieve Program Objectives.** This alternative was not put forth for detailed
27 analysis, because it fails to achieve basic redevelopment objectives as follows:

- 28 • **Accommodate the Port’s share of regional cargo throughput in 2020.** As described
29 above, this alternative would prevent the Port of Oakland from handling its share of 2020
30 Bay Area cargo throughput. The alternative fundamentally fails to achieve this basic
31 program objective.
- 32 • **Increase Port productivity and efficiency.** By “freeing up” the land area of the JIT for
33 marine terminal use while maximizing the amount of cargo traveling by train rather than
34 truck, the New Intermodal Facility is a key element of increased Port productivity and
35 efficiency. Without the acreage of the existing JIT for marine terminal use, and the
36 optimization of rail operations possible with the New Intermodal Facility, the productivity and

1 efficiency of the Port would not substantially improve over current levels. The alternative
2 substantially fails to achieve this program objective.

- 3 • **Provide sufficient capacity to substitute for other West Coast gateway ports in the**
4 **event of natural disaster or other emergency.** In the absence of substantially increased
5 Port productivity and efficiency that cannot be achieved under this alternative, the Port
6 would not be able to provide substantial additional throughput capacity, required in the event
7 an emergency (such as a major earthquake) disabled one of the two other West Coast
8 cargo gateways (Los Angeles/Long Beach or Seattle/Tacoma). The alternative substantially
9 fails to achieve this basic program objective.
- 10 • **Keep competitive with other West Coast ports.** In the absence of future major
11 increases in acreage in the Port area, the Port can best increase its share of the
12 intermodal market through increased rail facility efficiencies, not possible under this
13 alternative. With an efficient rail operation, the Port can decrease the amount of time a
14 container is stored at the Port, and can more efficiently use the land it has, without filling
15 the Bay to create new land for such purposes. The alternative substantially fails to achieve
16 this program objective.

17 **Other Plans or Regulatory Limitations.** Because this alternative would prevent the Port from
18 handling its share of Bay Area 2020 throughput described in the Seaport Plan, it is fundamentally
19 inconsistent with that plan, as well as with the Bay Plan (which incorporates the Seaport Plan).
20 For this reason, it is unlikely that permits would be obtained for elements of the program under
21 the jurisdiction of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), which
22 implements the Bay Plan.

23 **7.3.3 No New Berth 21**

24 This alternative deviates from the proposed redevelopment program in one aspect: the
25 proposed Outer Harbor shoreline reconfiguration (including excavation and Bay fill) required to
26 achieve an operational geometry for New Berth 21 would not occur. This alternative would avoid
27 impacts to transportation, air quality, biological resources, and water quality associated with the
28 proposed redevelopment program as a result of Bay fill and in-water construction. These
29 impacts are described in Sections 4.3: Transportation and Traffic, 4.4: Air Quality, 4.12:
30 Biological Resources, and 4.15: Surface Water.

31 This alternative is expected to result in the following buildout:

**Table 7.3-3
Build-Out of the No New Berth 21 Alternative**

| Potential Land Uses | Units ^a | Redevelopment Sub-District | | | | Total |
|--|--------------------|----------------------------|------------|--------------|------------------------|------------------|
| | | OARB | | | | |
| | | Gateway | Port | Maritime | 16 th /Wood | |
| Light Industry ^b | sq. ft. | 494,000 | 0 | 0 | 305,000 | 799,000 |
| Office, R&D | sq. ft. | 1,528,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,437,000 | 2,965,000 |
| Retail | sq. ft. | 25,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,300 | 26,300 |
| Warehouse/distribution | sq. ft. | 300,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 300,000 |
| Total square feet | | 2,347,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,743,300 | 4,090,300 |
| Live/Work units | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 375 | 375 |
| From uses listed above | ac. | 168 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 208 |
| Park, Public Access | ac. | 29 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 |
| New Marine Terminals | ac. | 0 | 47 | 65 | 0 | 112 |
| Marine Terminal Realignment | ac. | 0 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 82 |
| Ancillary Maritime Support | ac. | 15 | 2 | 88 | 0 | 105 |
| New Intermodal Facility | ac. | 0 | 130 | 35 | 0 | 165 |
| Acres to be redeveloped^c | | 212 | 179 | 270 | 41 | 702 |
| Total acres | | 228 | 241 | 1,290 | 41 | 1,800 |

Notes:

^a sq. ft. = square feet; ac. = acres

^b Includes 50,000 square feet of training facilities for the JATC.

^c Acreages identified above are gross land use acreage, inclusive of roadway and utility rights-of way.

1

2 The No New Berth 21 alternative would generate approximately 15,680 total direct jobs.
 3 Accounting for the number of baseline year (1995) jobs—approximately 2,045—this alternative
 4 would generate about 13,635 net direct jobs, or 95 percent of the net direct jobs generated by
 5 the proposed redevelopment program.

6 **OARB Sub-District, Gateway Development Area**

7 The No New Berth 21 alternative would include development of the Gateway development area
 8 as envisioned under the proposed redevelopment program. This alternative includes
 9 approximately 2.3 million square feet of new Light Industrial, R&D, Warehouse/Distribution, and
 10 Office uses, with High-End Retail and Hotel uses possible. This alternative recognizes certain
 11 conveyances and commitments of land within the Gateway development area, including the
 12 following:

- 13 • the 3-acre conveyance from the ORA to the JATC;
- 14 • the 15-acre conveyance from the Army to the EBRPD;
- 15 • the commitment of Caltrans to provide public access improvements in the area;
- 16 • the City's commitment to provide 15 acres of land for AMS; and

- 1 • the Legally Binding Agreement between the OBRA, City, and the Homeless Collaborative,
2 which requires identification of sites for homeless assistance programs, assumed to be
3 accommodated at appropriate off-site locations.

4 **OARB Sub-District, Port Development Area**

5 Under the No New Berth 21 alternative, the land use program for the Port development area
6 would remain similar to that envisioned under the proposed redevelopment program, including
7 realignment and extension of Maritime Street, development of a New Intermodal Facility rail
8 yard, and expansion of cargo terminal acreage. While realignment and expansion of the yards
9 of existing Outer Harbor terminals could occur, shoreline reconfiguration for New Berth 21
10 (including excavation and Bay fill) would not occur.

11 **Maritime Sub-District**

12 Under the No New Berth 21 alternative, the Port would continue to develop, and the Port and its
13 tenants to operate, facilities within the Maritime sub-district, including facilities of the Vision 2000
14 Program. In addition, this sub-district would be developed as envisioned under the proposed
15 redevelopment program, including the following:

- 16 • realignment and extension of Maritime Street, (which would be also located in the Port and
17 Gateway development areas);
- 18 • expansion of Berths 55 through 59 into a portion of the current JIT site;
- 19 • development of a new 75-acre MSC at a portion of the current JIT site and of 15 additional
20 acres of AMS near, but not within, the Port area; and
- 21 • re-alignment of existing terminals.

22 This alternative would preclude development of New Berth 21, and the Port would continue to
23 operate its current Outer Harbor terminals.

24 **16th/Wood Sub-District**

25 Under the No New Berth 21 alternative, the 16th/Wood sub-district would be developed
26 consistent with the proposed redevelopment program, including the preliminary development
27 concept for the Amtrak station site and additional Business Mix uses.

28 **Why this Alternative is Considered Infeasible**

29 Without development of New Berth 21, the Outer Harbor shoreline would not be reconfigured,
30 and would continue to operate under its existing inefficient geometry, with an inadequate
31 amount of marine terminal and related acreage. In the absence of Bay fill required for New
32 Berth 21, existing land that would have created the container yard for the new berth would
33 continue to function as marine berths, terminals, and AMS, but would remain in its current
34 fragmented and inefficient geometry. Efficiencies made possible by shoreline reconfiguration for
35 New Berth 21 would not occur, nor would efficiencies increase in adjacent terminals, as planned
36 under the proposed redevelopment program. In addition, in the absence of the net 26 acres of

1 fill for New Berth 21, the Port would not have the required acreage to handle its share of Bay
2 Area containerized cargo throughput in 2020, as described in the Seaport Plan.

3 Development of New Berth 21, along with other elements of the proposed program, is an
4 alternative to filling approximately 153 acres of San Francisco Bay in order to accommodate
5 projected throughput capacities.

6 **Failure to Achieve Program Objectives.** This alternative was not put forth for detailed analysis
7 because it fails to achieve basic redevelopment objectives as follows:

- 8 • **Accommodate the Port's share of regional cargo throughput in 2020.** As described
9 above, this alternative would prevent the Port of Oakland from handling its share of 2020
10 Bay Area cargo throughput as described in the Seaport Plan. The alternative fundamentally
11 fails to achieve this program objective.
- 12 • **Increase Port productivity and efficiency.** In the absence of New Berth 21, substantial
13 efficiencies resulting from consolidation of several older, inefficient terminals into a larger,
14 geometrically optimal, and modern New Berth 21 would not occur. In addition, substantial
15 improvement of efficiency at adjacent terminals sharing equipment, vessels, and land would
16 not be realized. New Berth 21 is a key element of increased Port productivity and efficiency,
17 and without that facility, the Port would not experience substantially improved productivity or
18 efficiency over current levels. The alternative substantially fails to achieve this program
19 objective.
- 20 • **Provide sufficient capacity to substitute for other West Coast gateway ports in the**
21 **event of natural disaster or other emergency.** In the absence of substantially increased
22 Port productivity and efficiency that cannot be achieved under this alternative, the Port
23 would not be able to provide substantial additional throughput capacity, required in the event
24 an emergency (such as a major earthquake) disabled one of the two other West Coast
25 cargo gateways (Los Angeles/Long Beach or Seattle/Tacoma). The alternative substantially
26 fails to achieve this program objective.

27 **Inability to Reduce Significant Impacts of Redevelopment.** This alternative would result in
28 significant impacts not associated with the proposed redevelopment program.

- 29 • **Emissions of pollutants.** The proposed redevelopment program would result in significant
30 impacts related to air quality. New Berth 21 would be a modern terminal with sufficient wharf
31 and draft to accommodate the very large deep-draft modern cargo vessels, unlike the berths
32 it would replace. In the absence of New Berth 21, and in order to attempt to meet its 2020
33 container cargo throughput commitment, the Port would need to continue to operate its
34 smaller and relatively less efficient Outer Harbor terminals at a relatively higher number of
35 calls by smaller vessels. These smaller vessels are generally older, less efficient, and more
36 polluting than new-generation ships. This alternative would result in a relatively higher
37 number of less efficient vessel calls compared to the proposed redevelopment program.

1 This would degrade air quality relative to and would worsen a significant impact of the
2 proposed program.

3 **Other Plans or Regulatory Limitations.** Because this alternative would prevent the Port from
4 handling its share of Bay Area 2020 throughput as described in the Seaport Plan, it is
5 fundamentally inconsistent with that plan, as well as the Bay Plan (which incorporates the
6 Seaport Plan). For this reason, it is unlikely that permits would be obtained for elements of the
7 program under the jurisdiction of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC),
8 which implements the Bay Plan.

9 **7.4 ALTERNATIVES PUT FORTH FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION**

10 As a requirement of CEQA, this EIR puts forth the No Program alternative for further
11 consideration. In addition, the following “action” alternatives were screened, found to be
12 feasible, and are put forth for further consideration:

- 13 • High Intensity;
- 14 • Reduced Intensity;
- 15 • Full Maritime; and
- 16 • Gateway Adaptive Reuse/Eco-Park.

17 These alternatives are described in the following section, and analyzed further in Section 7.5.

18 Appendix 7 includes evaluation of two land use options which may be implemented with any of
19 the “action” alternatives: High-End Retail, and Hotel.

20 **7.4.1 No Project**

21 In accordance with CEQA, the EIR includes an evaluation of future conditions without
22 redevelopment (the so-called “No Project” alternative). The No Project alternative allows City
23 decision-makers and the public to compare anticipated impacts of the proposed project with
24 those impacts anticipated to occur without the project. The No Project alternative described
25 below represents reasonably expected outcomes that could occur within the redevelopment
26 project area in the absence of redevelopment (*i.e.*, if the Redevelopment Plan and Reuse Plan
27 as incorporated therein were not implemented).

28 A “no project” alternative normally assumes build-out of a project area consistent with existing
29 land use designations (or “classifications”) and zoning. The City of Oakland, the Port of
30 Oakland, and BCDC each have land use authority in the redevelopment project area. BCDC
31 has determined that within its land use jurisdiction, some Oakland General Plan land
32 classifications for the OARB sub-district are not consistent with Port Priority land use
33 designations of the Bay Plan, amended in 2001. Build-out of the OARB sub-district consistent
34 with current General Plan land use classifications, therefore, would not be consistent with the
35 current Bay Plan. Because the Oakland General Plan is not consistent with the current Bay

OARB Area Redevelopment EIR

Plan, build-out of the General Plan within BCDC's jurisdiction would not be permitted, and assuming build-out of the OARB consistent with current General Plan land use designations (the usual approach to analysis of a "no project" alternative) would not provide meaningful input to the decision-making process. Moreover, in the absence of funds generated by redevelopment, development of the 16th/Wood sub-district is not likely to occur as envisioned under the current Redevelopment Plan. For these reasons, analysis of the No Project alternative assumes what is most likely to occur under build-out as follows:

- No Economic Development Conveyance of the OARB from the Army to OBRA would occur, nor would subsequent land transfers to the ORA, the Port, or JATC occur.
- The Gateway and Port development areas would not undergo substantial physical change.
- The Maritime sub-district would be developed consistent with the Oakland General Plan, the Bay and Seaport plans, the Port's Vision 2000 Program, and other Port plans.
- The 16th/Wood sub-district would be developed consistent with the Oakland General Plan and the Bay and Seaport plans, but to a substantially lower development intensity.

This alternative is expected to result in the following buildout:

**Table 7.4-1
Build-Out of the No Project Alternative**

| Potential Land Uses | Units ^a | Redevelopment Sub-District | | | | Total |
|--|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--------------|------------------------|------------------|
| | | OARB | | | | |
| | | Gateway | Port | Maritime | 16 th /Wood | |
| Light Industry | sq. ft. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 436,000 | 436,000 |
| Office, R&D | sq. ft. | 198,000 | 650,000 | 0 | 0 | 848,000 |
| Retail | sq. ft. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Warehouse/distribution ^b | sq. ft. | 880,000 | 1,600,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,480,000 |
| Total square feet | | 1,078,000 | 2,250,000 | 0 | 436,000 | 3,764,000 |
| Live/Work units | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| From uses listed above | ac. | 149 | 183 | 0 | 41 | 373 |
| Park, Public Access | ac. | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| New Marine Terminals | ac. | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 51 |
| Marine Terminal Realignment | ac. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ancillary Maritime Support | ac. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New Intermodal Facility | ac. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Acres to be redeveloped^c | | 178 | 183 | 51 | 41 | 453 |
| Total acres | | 228 | 241 | 1,290 | 41 | 1,800 |

Notes:

^a sq. ft. = square feet; ac. = acres

^b Includes the non-housing component of the Homeless Collaborative project.

^c Acreages identified above are gross land use acreage, inclusive of roadway and utility rights-of-way.

1 The No Project alternative would generate approximately 5,860 direct jobs. Accounting for the
2 number of baseline year (1995) jobs—approximately 2,045—this alternative would generate
3 about 3,815 direct jobs, or 27 percent of the net direct jobs generated by the proposed
4 redevelopment program.

5 **OARB Sub-District, City Gateway Development Area**

6 The No Project alternative generally assumes continuation of the current interim leasing
7 program within this sub-district. Therefore, some current interim use Homeless Collaborative
8 elements, such as the food bank, would be located on the OARB. However, the alternative does
9 include conveyances and commitments of land as follows:

- 10
- 11 • the 15-acre conveyance from the Army to the EBRPD;
 - 12 • the commitment of Caltrans to provide public access improvements in the area;
 - 13 • the Legally Binding Agreement between the OBRA, City, and the Homeless Collaborative
14 requires identification of sites for homeless assistance program elements; some non-
15 housing elements would be accommodated on-site, and the housing elements would be
accommodated at appropriate off-site locations.

16 Full lease-up of existing buildings under the interim leasing program would result in occupancy
17 of approximately 198,000 square feet of office space, 880,000 square feet of warehouse space,
18 plus wharves and land.

19 **OARB Sub-District, Port Development Area**

20 Under the No Project alternative, substantial physical changes to the Port development area
21 would not occur. Maritime Street would not be realigned and extended, and neither the New
22 Intermodal Facility nor New Berth 21 would be developed. The interim-leasing program for this
23 area would continue, and full lease-up would occur. Full lease-up of existing buildings in this
24 area would result in occupancy of approximately 2.3 million square feet of primarily Office and
25 Warehouse/Distribution uses, such as the Oakland Military Institute and other interim uses.

26 **Maritime Sub-District**

27 Under the No Project alternative, the Port would continue to develop, and the Port or its tenants
28 to operate facilities within the Maritime sub-district, including facilities of the Vision 2000
29 Program. Key differences between this alternative and the proposed redevelopment project
30 include the following:

- 31
- 32 • The Port would not develop the New Intermodal Facility within the OARB, and the JIT would
remain in its current location.
 - 33 • Maritime expansion into a portion of the JIT site would not occur.
 - 34 • Development of the 75-acre MSC would not occur on a portion of the JIT site.
 - 35 • New Berth 21 would not be developed in a portion of this sub-district.

1 **16th/Wood Sub-District**

2 Under the No Project alternative, some new development would still be anticipated to occur
 3 within this sub-district. In the absence of redevelopment funds, however, the scale and extent of
 4 such new development would be substantially reduced from that predicted under the proposed
 5 redevelopment project, due to environmental and infrastructure constraints and physically
 6 blighted conditions. A lower intensity of new and improved land use in this area would occur, at
 7 an average FAR of approximately 0.25.

8 **7.4.2 High Intensity**

9 Although its analysis is not required under CEQA, the High Intensity alternative assesses an
 10 upper range of potential development intensities within the redevelopment project area, and
 11 provides an understanding of potential “worst-case” environmental impacts that may be
 12 associated with such redevelopment. Under this alternative, land uses for each redevelopment
 13 sub-district would generally remain the same as anticipated under the proposed redevelopment
 14 program, but the intensity of private development would increase.

15 This alternative is expected to result in the following buildout:

**Table 7.4-2
 Build-Out of the High Intensity Alternative**

| Potential Land Uses | Units ^a | Redevelopment Sub-District | | | | Total |
|--|--------------------|----------------------------|------------|--------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| | | OARB | | | | |
| | | Gateway | Port | Maritime | 16 th /Wood | |
| Light Industry ^b | sq. ft. | 1,594,000 | 0 | 0 | 500,000 | 2,094,000 |
| Office, R&D | sq. ft. | 6,512,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,100,000 | 7,612,000 |
| Retail | sq. ft. | 2,050,000 | 0 | 0 | 600,000 | 2,650,000 |
| Warehouse/distribution | sq. ft. | 1,594,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,594,000 |
| Total square feet | | 11,750,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,200,000 | 13,950,000 |
| Live/Work units | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 375 | 375 |
| From uses listed above | ac. | 168 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 208 |
| Park, Public Access | ac. | 29 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 |
| New Marine Terminals | ac. | 0 | 55 | 65 | 0 | 120 |
| Marine Terminal Realignment | ac. | 0 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 82 |
| Ancillary Maritime Support | ac. | 15 | 2 | 88 | 0 | 105 |
| New Intermodal Facility | ac. | 0 | 130 | 35 | 0 | 165 |
| Acres to be redeveloped^c | | 212 | 187 | 270 | 41 | 710 |
| Total acres | | 228 | 241 | 1,290 | 41 | 1,800 |

Notes:

^a sq. ft. = square feet; ac. = acres

^b Includes 50,000 square feet of training facilities for the JATC.

^c Acreages identified above are gross land use acreage, inclusive of roadway and utility rights-of way. In addition to land acreage, approximately 3 acres of existing land and wharf (solid and covered fill) will be removed to create open water.

1
2 The High Intensity alternative would generate approximately 38,680 total direct jobs. Accounting
3 for the number of baseline year (1995) jobs—approximately 2,045—this alternative would
4 generate about 36,145 net direct jobs, or 252 percent of the net direct jobs generated by the
5 proposed redevelopment program.

6 **OARB Sub-District, Gateway Development Area**

7 The proposed redevelopment program anticipates a maximum development potential within
8 the Gateway development area of approximately 2.3 million square feet of land use types
9 consistent with those of the “Flexible Alternative” of the Reuse Plan, resulting in a gross FAR
10 of approximately 0.35. The High Intensity alternative envisions the Gateway development area
11 developed at a gross FAR of 1.5 (or a net FAR on individual development sites of 4.0), the
12 maximum development intensity allowed under the General Plan within the Business Mix land
13 use category. This high intensity of development would yield approximately 11,750,000
14 square feet of Light Industrial, Office and support uses, R&D, Warehouse/Distribution,
15 Ancillary Retail uses. Additionally, this alternative would include “big-box” retail use on the 19-
16 acre Subaru site. This alternative also includes the following conveyances and commitments
17 of land:

- 18
- 19 • the 3-acre conveyance from the ORA to the JATC;
 - 20 • the 15-acre conveyance from the Army to the EBRPD;
 - 21 • the commitment of Caltrans to provide public access improvements in the area;
 - 22 • the City’s commitment to provide 15 acres of additional land for AMS; and
 - 23 • the Legally Binding Agreement between the OBRA, City, and the Homeless Collaborative,
24 which requires identification of off-site locations for homeless assistance programs,
assumed to be accommodated at appropriate off-site locations.

25 **OARB Sub-District, Port Development Area**

26 Under the High Intensity alternative, the Port development area would be developed as
27 envisioned in the proposed redevelopment program. New facilities would include the following:

- 28
- 29 • realigned and extended Maritime Street;
 - 30 • the New Intermodal Facility;
 - 31 • a portion of New Berth 21 (including shoreline reconfiguration); and
 - 32 • cargo terminal expansion.

33 **Maritime Sub-District**

34 Under the High Intensity alternative, the Port would continue to develop and the Port and its
tenant to operate new and expanded facilities within the Maritime sub-district, including facilities

1 of the Vision 2000 Program. In addition, this sub-district would be developed as envisioned
2 under the proposed redevelopment program as follows:

- 3 • realignment and extension of Maritime Street (which would be also located in the Port and
4 Gateway development areas);
- 5 • expansion of Berths 55 through 59 terminals into a portion of the current JIT site;
- 6 • development of a new 75-acre MSC at a portion of the current JIT site, and of 15 additional
7 acres of AMS near, but not within, the Port area;
- 8 • construction of a portion of New Berth 21; and
- 9 • realignment of existing terminals.

10 **16th/Wood Sub-District**

11 The High Intensity alternative for this sub-district would include redevelopment of the Amtrak
12 station site with approximately 1.7 million square feet of new Commercial/Office space,
13 approximately 375 live/work units, and redevelopment of the historic Amtrak station with
14 approximately 70,000 square feet of office and event space. Additional redevelopment activity
15 on the surrounding properties would also be anticipated, resulting in a total of approximately
16 500,000 square feet of Light Industrial and Business Mix uses.

17 **7.4.3 Reduced Intensity**

18 The Reduced Intensity alternative assesses lower-density development options within the
19 redevelopment project area. This alternative was developed to determine whether lower-
20 intensity development would avoid or reduce environmental impacts associated with the
21 proposed redevelopment program. Under this alternative, land use types for each sub-district
22 within the redevelopment project area would generally remain the same as anticipated under
23 the proposed redevelopment program, but intensities of projected future development activities
24 would be reduced.

25 This alternative is expected to result in the following buildout:

Alternatives to the Proposed Redevelopment Program

**Table 7.4-3
Build-Out of the Reduced Intensity Alternative**

| Potential Land Uses | Units ^a | Redevelopment Sub-District | | | | Total |
|--|--------------------|----------------------------|------------|--------------|------------------------|------------------|
| | | OARB | | | | |
| | | Gateway | Port | Maritime | 16 th /Wood | |
| Light Industry ^b | sq. ft. | 266,000 | 0 | 0 | 220,000 | 486,000 |
| Office, R&D | sq. ft. | 1,091,000 | 0 | 0 | 750,000 | 1,841,000 |
| Retail | sq. ft. | 18,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18,000 |
| Warehouse/distribution | sq. ft. | 266,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 266,000 |
| Total square feet | | 1,641,000 | 0 | 0 | 970,00 | 2,611,000 |
| Live/Work units | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 280 | 280 |
| From uses listed above | ac. | 168 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 208 |
| Park, Public Access | ac. | 29 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 |
| New Marine Terminals | ac. | 0 | 55 | 65 | 0 | 120 |
| Marine Terminal Realignment | ac. | 0 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 82 |
| Ancillary Maritime Support | ac. | 15 | 2 | 88 | 0 | 105 |
| New Intermodal Facility | ac. | 0 | 130 | 35 | 0 | 165 |
| Acres to be redeveloped^c | | 212 | 187 | 270 | 41 | 710 |
| Total acres | | 228 | 241 | 1,290 | 41 | 1,800 |

Notes:

^a sq. ft. = square feet; ac. = acres

^b Includes 50,000 square feet of training facilities for the JATC.

^c Acreages identified above are gross land use acreage, inclusive of roadway and utility rights-of way. In addition to land acreage, approximately 3 acres of existing land and wharf (solid and covered fill) will be removed to create open water.

1

2 The Reduced Intensity alternative would generate approximately 11,920 total direct jobs.
 3 Accounting for the number of baseline year (1995) jobs—approximately 2,045—this alternative
 4 would generate about 9,875 net direct jobs, or 69 percent of the net direct jobs generated by the
 5 proposed redevelopment program.

6 **OARB Sub-District, Gateway Development Area**

7 The Reuse Plan anticipates a maximum development potential within the Gateway development
 8 area of approximately 2.3 million square feet of land uses consistent with the “Flexible
 9 Alternative” Reuse Plan, resulting in a gross FAR of approximately 0.35. The Reduced Intensity
 10 alternative envisions the Gateway development area developed at a gross FAR of 0.25, an
 11 approximately 30 percent reduction of development intensity. As a general rule, a Commercial
 12 FAR of 0.25 enables construction of one- to two-story structures, with parking demand met by
 13 surface parking lots. Based on this FAR, the Reduced Intensity alternative would yield
 14 approximately 1.6 million square feet of Light Industrial, Office, R&D, and Ancillary Retail uses.
 15 This alternative also includes the following conveyances and commitments of land:

- 16 • the 3-acre conveyance from the ORA to the JATC;

- 1 • the 15-acre conveyance from the Army to the EBRPD;
- 2 • the commitment of Caltrans to provide public access improvements in the area;
- 3 • the City's commitment to provide 15 acres of land for AMS; and
- 4 • the Legally Binding Agreement between the OBRA, City, and the Homeless Collaborative,
- 5 which requires identification of off-site locations for homeless assistance programs,
- 6 assumed to be accommodated at appropriate off-site locations.

7 **OARB Sub-District, Port Development Area**

8 Under the Reduced Intensity alternative, the Port development area would be developed as
9 envisioned in the proposed redevelopment program. New facilities would include the following:

- 10 • realigned and extended Maritime Street;
- 11 • the New Intermodal Facility;
- 12 • a portion of New Berth 21 (including shoreline reconfiguration); and
- 13 • cargo terminal expansion.

14 **Maritime Sub-District**

15 Under the Reduced Intensity alternative, the Port would continue to develop, and the Port or its
16 tenants to operate, facilities within the Maritime sub-district, including facilities of the Vision 2000
17 Program. In addition, this sub-district would be developed as envisioned under the proposed
18 redevelopment program as follows:

- 19 • realignment and extension of Maritime Street (which would be also located in the Port and
20 Gateway development areas);
- 21 • expansion of Berths 55 through 59 terminals into a portion of the current JIT site;
- 22 • development of a new 75-acre MSC at a portion of the current JIT site, and of 15 additional
23 acres of AMS near, but not within, the Port area;
- 24 • construction of a portion of New Berth 21; and
- 25 • realignment of existing terminals.

26 **16th/Wood Sub-District**

27 Under the Reduced Intensity alternative, there would be approximately 1,000,000 square feet of
28 new Office/R&D space, approximately 280 live/work units, and reuse of the historic Amtrak
29 station with approximately 70,000 square feet of office and event space. Additional
30 redevelopment activity within this sub-district would occur at an average FAR of 0.25, resulting
31 in a total of approximately 220,000 square feet of Light Industrial uses.

1 **7.4.4 Full Maritime**

2 During EIR scoping, several residents and business owners from the West Oakland community
3 expressed the opinion the OARB could provide increased opportunities for AMS industries and
4 businesses. These types of businesses and industries may include the following:

- 5 • intermodal trucking companies,
- 6 • container freight stations,
- 7 • trans-load facilities,
- 8 • refrigerated container depots,
- 9 • container cleaning, repair and storage, and
- 10 • truck repair and fueling.

11 A recent study commissioned by the Port (the Tioga Group 2001) concluded that demand for
12 such uses within or near the Port of Oakland's operations is expected to be approximately 178
13 acres by 2020.³ According to a recent Port survey, currently more than 48 Port-related trucking
14 businesses occupy a total of 128 acres in West Oakland, the OARB, and within the Port's
15 Maritime sub-area (BCDC 2000). However, under the proposed redevelopment program, some
16 of these existing businesses would be displaced by new uses within the OARB and Maritime
17 sub-districts. Additionally, the City of Oakland has recently imposed controls on the issuance of
18 new permits for such businesses in West Oakland in an attempt to alleviate noise, air quality,
19 and traffic impacts on the neighborhood.

20 In an attempt to provide a reasonable accommodation of these uses, the proposed
21 redevelopment program provides for a total of 105 acres of land within the OARB and Maritime
22 sub-districts to support AMS. Sites include the Port's proposed 75-acre MSC at the location of
23 the JIT (Maritime sub-district), 15 acres at the Baldwin Yard (Gateway development area), and
24 an additional 15 acres to be provided by the Port within the Maritime sub-district. Although
25 dedication of this amount of land resource has been considered by the BCDC as "a laudatory
26 achievement" and "a reasonable amount of land to accommodate trucking services," additional
27 maritime support space will eventually be needed. BCDC staff have recommended that the Port
28 should "continue to work with the trucking industry and the West Oakland community to find
29 appropriate amounts and locations of nearby land outside the Port to serve trucking needs, and
30 to minimize the impact of trucking connected to the Port's operation on the West Oakland
31 community." (BCDC 2000).

³ This estimate is based on forecasts of cargo segment growth, typical facility design, industry standards and working assumptions to estimate usable acres for efficient, single-purpose core service facilities. This process is necessarily imprecise, and the resulting estimates are most suitable for planning purposes rather than detailed land allocation or facility design decisions. These figures should therefore be interpreted as approximate minimums that could be achieved under reasonably efficient conditions (the Tioga Group 2001).

OARB Area Redevelopment EIR

1 If additional lands within the OARB sub-district were to be dedicated for such uses, then land
 2 needed for these uses would either be taken out of the Gateway development area or the Port
 3 development area. This alternative is based in part on the Maritime Redevelopment alternative
 4 (Alternative 2) analyzed in the OARB Disposal and Reuse EIS (Corps, Final EIR, December
 5 2001).

6 This alternative is expected to result in the following buildout:

**Table 7.4-4
Build-Out of the Full Maritime Alternative**

| Potential Land Uses | Units ^a | Redevelopment Sub-District | | | | Total |
|--|--------------------|----------------------------|------------|--------------|------------------------|------------------|
| | | OARB | | | | |
| | | Gateway | Port | Maritime | 16 th /Wood | |
| Light Industry | sq. ft. | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 500,000 | 550,000 |
| Office, R&D | sq. ft. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |
| Retail | sq. ft. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,300 | 1,300 |
| Warehouse/distribution | sq. ft. | | 0 | 0 | 305,000 | 305,000 |
| Total square feet | | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,806,300 | 1,856,300 |
| Live/Work units | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 375 | 375 |
| From uses listed above ^b | ac. | 3 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 43 |
| Park, Public Access | ac. | 29 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 |
| New Marine Terminals | ac. | 0 | 55 | 65 | 0 | 120 |
| Marine Terminal Realignment | ac. | 0 | 0 | 157 | 0 | 157 |
| Ancillary Maritime Support | ac. | 161 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 163 |
| New Intermodal Facility | ac. | 0 | 130 | 41 | 0 | 171 |
| Acres to be redeveloped^c | | 193 | 187 | 263 | 41 | 684 |
| Total acres | | 228 | 241 | 1,290 | 41 | 1,800 |

Notes:

^a sq. ft. = square feet; ac. = acres

^b Includes 50,000 square feet of training facilities for the JATC.

^c Acreages identified above are gross land use acreage, inclusive of roadway and utility rights-of way. In addition to land acreage, approximately 3 acres of existing land and wharf (solid and covered fill) will be removed to create open water.

7

8 The Full Maritime alternative would generate approximately 11,565 total direct jobs. Accounting
 9 for the number of baseline year (1995) jobs—approximately 2,045—this alternative would
 10 generate about 9,520 net direct jobs, or 66 percent of the net direct jobs generated by the
 11 proposed redevelopment program.

OARB Sub-District, Gateway Development Area

This alternative includes the following conveyances and commitments of land:

- the 3-acre conveyance from the ORA to the JATC;
- the 15-acre conveyance from the Army to the EBRPD;

- 1 • the commitment of Caltrans to provide public access improvements in the area;
- 2 • the City's commitment to provide 15 acres of additional land for AMS; and
- 3 • the Legally Binding Agreement between the OBRA, City, and the Homeless Collaborative,
- 4 which requires identification of off-site locations for homeless assistance programs,
- 5 assumed to be accommodated at appropriate off-site locations.

6 Allowing for these commitments of land, approximately 161 acres of land within the Gateway
7 development area could be dedicated to AMS. All existing facilities within the Gateway
8 development area would be demolished or de-constructed, and the area would be developed as
9 a MSC. Except for the JATC facility, none of the mixed land uses envisioned in the proposed
10 redevelopment program would occur.

11 **OARB Sub-District, Port Development Area**

12 Under the Full Maritime alternative, the land use program for the Port development area would
13 remain generally the same as under the proposed redevelopment program. Improvements
14 would include the following:

- 15 • realignment and extension of Maritime Street, (which would be also located in the Gateway
16 development area and maritime sub-district);
- 17 • the New Intermodal Facility;
- 18 • portions of New Berth 21 (including shoreline reconfiguration); and
- 19 • cargo terminal expansion.

20 **Maritime Sub-District**

21 Under the Full Maritime alternative, the Port would continue to develop, and the Port and its
22 tenants to operate, facilities within the Maritime sub-district, including facilities of the Vision 2000
23 Program. In addition, this sub-district would be developed generally as envisioned under the
24 proposed redevelopment program as follows:

- 25 • realignment and extension of Maritime Street (which would be also located in the Port and
26 Gateway development areas);
- 27 • expansion of Berths 55 through 59 terminals into the current JIT site;
- 28 • construction of a portion of New Berth 21; and
- 29 • realignment of existing terminals.

30 It is likely the location for the Port's MSC would be re-located to the Gateway development area
31 under this alternative. This would enable the entire JIT site to be used for additional marine
32 cargo terminal needs.

33 **16th/Wood Sub-District**

34 Under the Full Maritime alternative, the 16th/Wood sub-district would support maritime
35 development with the inclusion of Warehouse/Distribution uses and an increase in Light
36 Industrial uses. Similar to the proposed program, this sub-district would also include Office/R&D,
37 Retail, and Live/Work uses.

OARB Area Redevelopment EIR

1 7.4.5 Gateway Adaptive Reuse/Eco-Park

2 The Gateway Adaptive Reuse/Eco-Park alternative provides for partial avoidance of significant
 3 impacts to historic resources associated with the proposed redevelopment program, as
 4 disclosed in Section 4.6: Cultural Resources. Historic resources located within the Gateway
 5 development area except for Building No. 1 and a portion of Wharf 6½,⁴ would be adaptively
 6 reused, but not those within the Port development area. The remainder of the redevelopment
 7 project area would be redeveloped consistent with the proposed redevelopment program. In
 8 addition to adaptive reuse of historic buildings and structures in the Gateway development area,
 9 this alternative also reduces less than significant effects of the proposed redevelopment
 10 program relative to public services and utilities (as disclosed in Section 4.9: Public Services and
 11 Utilities) by developing an eco-park (described below) within the Gateway development area.

12 This alternative is expected to result in the following buildout:

**Table 7.4-5
Build-Out of the Gateway Adaptive Reuse Alternative**

| Potential Land Uses | Units ^a | Redevelopment Sub-District | | | | | Total |
|---|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | OARB | | | | | |
| | | Gateway ^b | Port | Maritime | 16 th /Wood | | |
| Light Industry | sq. ft. | 500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 305,000 | 805,000 |
| Office, R&D ^c | sq. ft. | 461,000 | 198,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,437,000 | 2,096,000 |
| Retail | sq. ft. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,300 | 1,300 |
| Warehouse/distribution | sq. ft. | 0 | 444,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 444,000 |
| Total square feet | | 961,000 | 642,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,743,300 | 3,346,300 |
| Live/Work units | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 375 | 375 |
| From uses listed above | ac. | 75 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 189 |
| Park, Public Access | ac. | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 |
| New Marine Terminals | ac. | 0 | 0 | 55 | 65 | 0 | 120 |
| Marine Terminal Realignment | ac. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 82 |
| Ancillary Maritime Support | ac. | 15 | 0 | 2 | 88 | 0 | 105 |
| New Intermodal Facility | ac. | 0 | 0 | 130 | 35 | 0 | 165 |
| Acres to be redeveloped/reused^d | | 119 | 74 | 187 | 270 | 41 | 691 |
| Total acres | | 228 | | 241 | 1,290 | 41 | 1,800 |

Notes:

^a sq. ft. = square feet; ac. = acres

^b Left-hand columns are square footages or acres to be rebuilt, and right-hand columns are square footages or acres to be adaptively reused.

^c Includes 50,000 square feet of training facilities for the Joint Apprentice and Training Committee (JATC).

^d Acreages identified above are gross land use acreage, inclusive of roadway and utility rights-of way.

13

14 The Gateway Adaptive Reuse/Eco-Park alternative would generate approximately 13,160 total
 15 direct jobs. Accounting for the number of baseline year (1995) jobs—approximately 2,045—this

⁴ Building No. 1 must be demolished to remediate the tarry residue located beneath that building, and a portion of Wharf 6 ½ will be demolished as part of the Port's development.

1 alternative would generate about 11,115 net direct jobs, or 77 percent of the net direct jobs
2 generated by the proposed redevelopment program.

3 **OARB Sub-District, Gateway Development Area**

4 As required under the Reuse Plan, the Gateway Adaptive Reuse alternative includes certain
5 conveyances and commitments of land, including the following:

- 6 • the 3-acre conveyance from the ORA to the JATC;
- 7 • the 15-acre conveyance from the Army to the EBRPD;
- 8 • the commitment of Caltrans to provide public access improvements in the area;
- 9 • the City's commitment to provide 15 acres of additional land for AMS; and
- 10 • the Legally Binding Agreement between the OBRA, City, and the Homeless Collaborative,
11 which requires identification of off-site locations for homeless assistance programs,
12 assumed to be accommodated at appropriate off-site locations.

13 The Gateway development area includes eight buildings contributing to the OARB Historic
14 District, portions of two other contributing buildings, portions of five contributing warehouses,
15 and about two-thirds of the linear frontage of historic wharves. Under this alternative, these
16 buildings and structures would be retained and adaptively reused for new uses.

17 With preservation of some of the contributing structures of the OARB Historic District and with
18 the land use commitments identified above for other lands, approximately 63 acres of the
19 Gateway development area would be available for new uses.⁵ Under this alternative, this land
20 would be developed with Industrial, Light Industrial, R&D and supporting uses, consistent with
21 eco-park development concepts.

22 **Eco-Industrial Park.** An eco-industrial park can be described as: “. . . a variety of linked
23 manufacturing and service businesses within an industrial ecosystem. Such a park embodies
24 ecological principles to achieve the most beneficial, least damaging interaction with the
25 environment. By integrating all aspects of environmental management into one site, an eco-
26 industrial park offers individual companies savings from waste recycling, avoidance of
27 regulatory penalties, and increased efficiency in terms of materials and energy.”⁶

28 Several basic strategies are fundamental to the generally regarded definition of an eco-industrial
29 park.⁷ These strategies include:

⁵ As a variant of this alternative, preservation of a smaller portion of the OARB Historic District could be considered (e.g., preservation of a portion of Building No. 1, one of the 800-series warehouses, or Wharf 6½). This variant would leave greater land area available for new redevelopment uses.

⁶ Sheila Martin, Economist with the Research Triangle Institute.

⁷ This information has been derived from several sources, including the following web-sites:
<http://www.indigodev.com/Ecoparks.html>, <http://www.rti.org/news/>; <http://www.cfe.cornell.edu/wei/EIDP/design.html>,
and <http://www.cfe.cornell.edu/wei/EIDP/eid.html>

1 **Information Technologies.** New information technologies such as the World Wide Web assist
2 eco-park participants in developing supplier/customer relationships for byproducts and assist in
3 marketing efforts.

4 **Water Reuse.** Because many industries use substantial amounts of water in manufacturing,
5 collaborative efforts can reduce the need for water and minimize the amount of effluent entering
6 water treatment systems.

7 **Recovery, Recycling, Reuse, and Substitution.** Many environmental technologies for eco-
8 parks involve development of new processes for reusing wastes and byproducts, including
9 conversion or separation technologies capable of preparing former wastes for other uses.
10 Rehabilitation and reuse of existing buildings, emphasis on pollution prevention, maximizing re-
11 use and recycling of materials, reduction of toxic materials risks through integrated site-level
12 waste treatment, and business links to companies in the surrounding region as consumers and
13 generators of usable byproducts via resource exchanges and recycling networks are all
14 included in this strategy.

15 **Energy.** Beyond recycling and reuse technologies, three energy technologies are most
16 appropriate for eco-parks: co-generation systems, energy recovery processes, and alternative
17 sources. Eco-parks seek to maximize energy efficiency through facility design or rehabilitation,
18 co-generation (the capture and use of otherwise wasted heat from the electrical generating
19 process), and energy cascading (the use of residual heat in liquids or steam from a primary
20 process to provide heating or cooling to a later process). Other strategies include achieving
21 higher efficiency through inter-plant energy flows; and use of renewable energy.

22 **Transportation.** The transportation sector is a major contributor to a number of environmental
23 problems, including non-point source pollution and air emissions. Eco-parks would provide new
24 means of moving people and goods throughout and beyond the eco-park, including using clean
25 burning alternative fuel vehicles, electric vehicles, and application of sophisticated logistics
26 management systems for delivery of goods and services.

27 **Environmental Monitoring.** Effective environmental monitoring technologies can provide
28 information to environmental regulatory agencies and the public about industrial performance,
29 and enable an objective evaluation of how well the eco-park environmental programs are
30 working.

31 **Effective Management.** In addition to standard industrial park service, recruitment, and
32 maintenance functions, eco-park management includes maintaining a mix of companies over
33 time best suited to use each others' by-products. Management would also be needed to support
34 improvement in environmental performance for individual companies, and operate a park-wide
35 information system that supports inter-company communications, informs members of local
36 environmental conditions, and provides feedback on eco-park performance.

1 Although the eco-industrial park concept is directly interwoven into this alternative because of its
2 adaptive reuse component, similar development concepts could equally be applied to all
3 Gateway development area alternatives that provide for industrial and business support uses,
4 including the proposed redevelopment program. Specific development conditions, regulations
5 and enforcement provisions are required in order to implement eco-park concepts.

6 **OARB Sub-District, Port Development Area**

7 Under the Gateway Adaptive Reuse/Eco-Park alternative, the land use program for the Port
8 development area would remain generally the same as under the proposed redevelopment
9 program. Improvements would include the following:

- 10 • realignment and extension of Maritime Street (which would be also located in the Gateway
11 development area and maritime sub-district);
- 12 • the New Intermodal Facility,
- 13 • portions of New Berth 21 (including shoreline reconfiguration), and
- 14 • cargo terminal expansion.

15 **Maritime Sub-District**

16 Under the Gateway Adaptive Reuse/Eco-Park alternative, the Port would continue to develop,
17 and the Port and its tenants to operate facilities within the Maritime sub-district, including
18 facilities of the Vision 2000 Program. In addition, this sub-district would be developed as
19 envisioned under the proposed redevelopment program as follows:

- 20 • realignment and extension of Maritime Street (which would be also located in the Port and
21 Gateway development areas);
- 22 • expansion of Berths 55 through 59 into a portion of the current JIT site;
- 23 • development of a new 75-acre MSC at a portion of the current JIT site and of 15 additional
24 acres of AMS;
- 25 • construction of a portion of New Berth 21; and
- 26 • realignment of existing terminals.

27 **16th/Wood Sub-District**

28 Under the Gateway Adaptive Reuse/Eco-Park alternative, the 16th/Wood sub-district would be
29 redeveloped consistent with the proposed redevelopment program, including the preliminary
30 development concept for the Amtrak station site and additional Business Mix uses.

31 **7.5 ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES**

32 This section presents the results of a comparative analysis assessing how well each alternative
33 put forth for further consideration may avoid or substantially reduce the unavoidable adverse

OARB Area Redevelopment EIR

1 effects of the proposed program. Table 7.5-1 comparatively summarizes development at build-
 2 out under the proposed program and each alternative put forth for analysis:

Table 7.5-1
OARB Redevelopment Project Area Build-Out, 2002 through 2020, by Alternative

| Potential Land Uses | Units ^a | Proposed Program | No Project | High Intensity | Reduced Intensity | Full Maritime | Gateway Reuse/ Eco-Park |
|--|--------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| Light Industry | sq. ft. | 799,000 | 436,000 | 2,094,000 | 486,000 | 550,000 | 805,000 |
| Office, R&D | sq. ft. | 2,965,000 | 848,000 | 7,612,000 | 1,841,000 | 1,000,000 | 2,096,000 |
| Commercial/Retail | sq. ft. | 26,300 | 0 | 2,650,000 | 18,000 | 500,000 | 1,300 |
| Warehouse/distribution | sq. ft. | 300,000 | 2,480,000 | 1,594,000 | 266,000 | 305,000 | 444,000 |
| Total square feet | | 4,090,300 | 3,764,000 | 13,950,000 | 2,611,000 | 1,856,000 | 3,346,300 |
| Live/Work units | | 375 | 0 | 375 | 280 | 375 | 375 |
| From uses listed above | ac. | 208 | 373 | 208 | 208 | 43 | 189 |
| Park, Public Access | ac. | 30 | 29 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| New Marine Terminals | ac. | 120 | 51 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 |
| Marine Terminal Realignment | ac. | 82 | 0 | 82 | 82 | 157 | 82 |
| Ancillary Maritime Support | ac. | 105 | 0 | 105 | 105 | 163 | 105 |
| New Intermodal Facility | ac. | 165 | 0 | 165 | 165 | 171 | 165 |
| Acres to be redeveloped^b | | 710 | 453 | 710 | 710 | 684 | 691 |
| Total direct jobs generated^c | | 16,415 | 5,860 | 38,680 | 11,920 | 11,565 | 13,160 |

Notes:

^a sq. ft. = square feet; ac. = acres

^b Acreages are gross land use, and are inclusive of roadway and utility rights-of way.

^c These numbers should be reduced by 2,045 to derive net direct jobs generated..

3 7.5.1 Ability to Avoid or Reduce Program Impacts

4 This section presents a comparative evaluation of the ability of each alternative to avoid or
 5 substantially reduce significant impacts of the proposed program. The table also identifies
 6 whether an alternative would result in a significant impact not associated with the proposed
 7 program. The table identifies the level of significance of impacts prior to and after mitigation.

8 Under CEQA, the purpose of alternatives analysis is to identify and evaluate options that both
 9 meet the fundamental purpose of a proposed program, and have the potential to avoid or
 10 substantially reduce one or more significant impact of that proposed program. With mitigation,
 11 most significant impacts of the proposed program can be reduced to a level that is less than
 12 significant. Therefore, the following discussion focuses on those few residually significant
 13 (unavoidable and adverse) impacts of the proposed program that may be avoided or reduced to
 14 a level that is less than significant with implementation of an alternative. These impacts include
 15 the following:

- 16 • Increases in traffic on certain Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) facilities already
 17 experiencing degraded levels of service (LOS)—I-80 east of the I-80/I-580 split; I-880

Alternatives to the Proposed Redevelopment Program

1 connector to I-80 east; I-880 from 7th Street to the segment south of I-238; I-580 east and
2 west of I-980/SR-24; and SR-24 east of I-580.

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

24 The discussion also identifies unavoidable adverse impacts associated with alternatives that are
25 not expected to occur with implementation of the proposed program. Finally, the discussion
26 identifies benefits of the proposed program not realized by alternatives, or benefits of
27 alternatives not realized by the proposed program. In this manner, decision-making can be
28 efficiently informed regarding the most relevant differences between the proposed program and
29 alternatives.

30 Table 7.5-2 summarizes the results of the alternatives analysis.

**Table 7.5-2
Comparative Analysis: Ability to Avoid/Substantially Reduce Significant Environmental Impacts and to Achieve Benefits**

| Benefits and Significant Impacts | Proposed Program | No Project | High Intensity | Reduced Intensity | Full Maritime | Gateway Reuse/ Eco-Park |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| CONSISTENCY WITH PLANS AND POLICIES | | | | | | |
| Advance Bay Plan polices regarding fish and wildlife, water quality, water-related industry, ports, recreation, and public access | B | S/S | B | B | B | B |
| Advance Seaport Plan polices regarding cargo forecasts, Port Priority use areas, marine terminals, and the Port of Oakland | B | S/S | B | B | B | B |
| Advance objectives and policies of the LUTE regarding expansion, retention of the Oakland job base and economic strength; provision of adequate infrastructure; reduction of truck effects on local neighborhoods; encouragement of waterfront access; creation of a high-quality natural and built waterfront environment; promotion of the Port of Oakland; provision of commercial areas; and construction of housing | B | S/S | LTS | B | B | B |
| TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC | | | | | | |
| Degrade LOS to below D at non-Downtown intersections | S/LTS | LTS | S/S | S/LTS | S/LTS | S/LTS |
| Effect LOS on MTS roadway segments | S/S | LTS | S/S | S/S | S/S | S/S |
| Increased traffic hazards | PS/LTS | LTS | S/S | PS/LTS | S/S | PS/LTS |
| Inadequate parking supply | PS/LTS | LTS | S/S | PS/LTS | PS/LTS | PS/LTS |
| Increased peak hour BART ridership at the West Oakland station | PS/LTS | LTS | S/S | PS/LTS | PS/LTS | PS/LTS |
| Contribute considerably to degraded LOS at the Maritime Street/West Grand Avenue intersection under cumulative conditions | S/S | LTS | S/S | LTS | S/S | LTS |

Legend: B = Benefit LTS = Less than significant S = Significant PS = Potentially significant
Significance before mitigation/residual significance

Note: **Boldface** indicates an alternative's residual negative effect is substantially greater than that of the proposed program. **Boldface Italics** indicate an alternative's residual beneficial effect is substantially greater than that of the proposed program

**Table 7.5-2
Comparative Analysis: Ability to Avoid/Substantially Reduce Significant Environmental Impacts and to Achieve Benefits**

| Benefits and Significant Impacts | Proposed Program | No Project | High Intensity | Reduced Intensity | Full Maritime | Gateway Reuse/ Eco-Park |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| PUBLIC SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE | | | | | | |
| Increased sewer flows | LTS | LTS | S/S | LTS | LTS | LTS |
| AESTHETICS | | | | | | |
| Blockage of short-term, mid-ground views | LTS | N | S/S | LTS | LTS | N |
| Loss of visual evidence of the military history of West Oakland | S/S | LTS | S/S | S/S | S/S | LTS |
| BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES | | | | | | |
| Increase in risk of invasive species | PS/S | LTS | PS/S | PS/S | PS/S | PS/S |
| GEOLOGY, SEISMICITY, AND SOILS | | | | | | |
| Reduction in seismic risk by removal of older buildings | B | S/S | B | B | B | S/S |

1

Legend: B = Benefit LTS = Less than significant S = Significant PS = Potentially significant
Significance before mitigation/residual significance

Note: **Boldface** indicates an alternative's residual negative effect is substantially greater than that of the proposed program. **Boldface Italics** indicate an alternative's residual beneficial effect is substantially greater than that of the proposed program

1 **7.5.2 No Project Alternative**

2 The No Project alternative would achieve few of the benefits of the proposed redevelopment
3 program. The alternative would generate only approximately one-quarter of the number of direct
4 jobs generated by the proposed program, and none of the housing. Other direct benefits of
5 redevelopment that would not occur under this alternative include the following:

- 6 • advancement of many planning and environmental policies and goals of area plans;
- 7 • development of a more vibrant and compatible local and regional land use mix;
- 8 • improvement of historic character in the 16th/Wood sub-district;
- 9 • remediation of soil and water on a local, area-wide, and regional basis;
- 10 • replacement of aged infrastructure;
- 11 • development of local and regional public access facilities, including Bay Trail linkages, and a
12 cumulative per-capita increase in Oakland parkland;
- 13 • improvement of the local and area-wide visual environment;
- 14 • improvements in wildlife water and audio environments; and
- 15 • reductions in seismic risks; and long-term improvement of surface water quality. The No
16 Project alternative would generate about 55 percent of the daily trips that would be
17 generated by the proposed redevelopment program.

18 **Avoidance or Substantial Reduction of Significant Redevelopment Impacts**

19 **Traffic.** Compared to the proposed redevelopment program, this alternative would result in a
20 relatively large decrease in economic activity, resulting in about 3,815 net direct jobs, as well as
21 commensurate decrease in traffic. In absolute terms, the alternative would result in a moderate
22 increase in such activity. Based on its substantially lower level of economic activity and
23 employment relative to the proposed program, the alternative is expected to substantially
24 reduce the effect of proposed redevelopment on MTS facilities, including area freeways. It
25 should be noted, however, that the impact to freeways relates to facilities that would operate at
26 degraded levels of service without redevelopment.

27 This alternative is not expected to result in substantially degraded LOS at the Maritime
28 Street/West Grand Avenue intersection under the cumulative condition, as would the proposed
29 program.

30 **Truck Parking.** Compared to the proposed program, this alternative would result in a relatively
31 substantial decrease in economic activity, including economic activity of the Port of Oakland that
32 could result in truck-related demand for parking. However, under this alternative, in absolute
33 terms, Port activities would increase to their maximum extent, without the benefit of additional
34 AMS acreage available under the proposed program. For this reason, the alternative is not

1 expected to substantially reduce the impact of the redevelopment program regarding a
2 cumulative deficit in truck parking facilities.

3 **Air Quality.** Under this alternative, little or no construction/remediation activity would occur, and
4 emissions from construction equipment would not occur, or would be negligible. The alternative
5 would avoid the residually significant impact of the proposed program regarding emissions from
6 construction equipment.

7 Compared to the proposed redevelopment program, this alternative would result in a relatively
8 large decrease in economic activity, as well as a commensurate decrease in activity of mobile
9 pollutant sources. Based on its relatively low level of economic activity, this alternative is
10 expected to generate pollutant emissions in quantities substantially less than those of the
11 proposed program. Nevertheless, in absolute terms it is expected this alternative would still
12 generate amounts of criteria pollutants in excess of significance thresholds.

13 **Cultural Resources.** Under this alternative, historic structures may be adaptively reused or
14 mothballed (they would be closed up and receive minimal maintenance). The alternative does
15 not specifically propose active conservation of historic buildings. Buildings that are mothballed
16 can be expected to physically decline. Nevertheless, OARB buildings would be retained in one
17 form or another under this alternative, and it is expected this alternative would substantially
18 reduce the residually significant direct and cumulative impacts of the proposed program
19 regarding physical loss of historic resources.

20 **Aesthetics.** Under this alternative, OARB buildings would remain (even in a potentially altered
21 state), and this alternative would not eliminate most visual evidence of West Oakland's military
22 history. This alternative substantially reduces the residually significant impact of the proposed
23 program regarding the loss of such visual evidence.

24 **Invasive Species.** Compared to the proposed redevelopment program, this alternative would
25 result in relatively modest Port development and shipping activities, including activities resulting
26 in ballast water discharges to the Bay. The alternative is expected to reduce the potentially
27 significant direct and cumulative impact of the redevelopment program regarding risk from
28 establishment of invasive species in the Bay.

29 **Significant Impacts of the Alternative not Associated with the Proposed Program**

30 The No Project alternative would result in the following potential residually significant impacts
31 not associated with the proposed program:

- 32 • **Fundamental inconsistency with Bay and Seaport plan throughput projections.** The
33 alternative would not allow the Port of Oakland to develop sufficient acreage to handle its
34 share of Bay Area 2020 throughput projections as described in the Seaport Plan. In the
35 absence of adequate Port of Oakland throughput, Bay Area goods could arrive via truck
36 from the Los Angeles/Long Beach cargo gateway, with attendant increases in traffic, noise,
37 and air pollution.

- 1 • **Fundamental inconsistency with the LUTE.** This alternative would fail to meet numerous
2 LUTE policies, including provision of adequate infrastructure, reduction of truck effects on
3 neighborhoods, encouragement of waterfront access, promotion of the Port, and
4 construction of housing.
- 5 • **Increased seismic risk.** The alternative would reuse existing buildings on their current
6 sites, and while some seismic upgrades would occur, correction of underlying strata would
7 not occur.

8 **7.5.3 High Intensity Alternative**

9 Although the High Intensity alternative could, in theory, achieve all benefits of the proposed
10 redevelopment program, resulting traffic levels and other associated impacts could preclude
11 achievement of many of these benefits. The alternative would generate approximately 2½ times
12 the number of direct jobs generated by the proposed program, all of the direct housing, and
13 substantially more housing from tax-increment financing. The High Intensity Alternative would
14 generate about 330 percent of the daily trips that would be generated by the proposed
15 development program.

16 **Avoidance or Substantial Reduction of Significant Redevelopment Impacts**

17 **Traffic.** Compared to the proposed redevelopment program, this alternative would result in very
18 large increases in economic activity, resulting in 36,635 net direct jobs, as well as
19 commensurate high increases in traffic. Based on its substantially higher level of economic
20 activity relative to the proposed program, the alternative is expected to significantly degrade
21 area freeway segments that would operate at a degraded LOS without redevelopment. Due to
22 its scope, the alternative would have a greater negative effect on freeway segment LOS relative
23 to the effect of the proposed program. In addition, the alternative is likely to negatively affect a
24 greater number of freeway segments than the proposed program. The alternative would not
25 avoid or substantially reduce the contribution of proposed redevelopment to the residually
26 significant impact of proposed redevelopment on area freeways, and may substantially worsen
27 the impact.

28 This alternative would result in substantially degraded LOS at the Maritime Street/West Grand
29 Avenue intersection under the cumulative condition, and the alternative would not avoid or
30 substantially reduce the residually significant impact of the proposed program regarding
31 degraded LOS at that intersection and would substantially worsen that input. In addition, the
32 alternative is expected to negatively affect a greater number of intersections than the proposed
33 program.

34 **Truck Parking.** Compared to the proposed program, this alternative would result in substantial
35 absolute and relative increases in economic activity, including economic activity of the Port of
36 Oakland that could result in truck-related demand for parking. For this reason, the alternative is
37 not expected to substantially reduce the impact of the redevelopment program regarding a
38 cumulative deficit in truck parking facilities.

1 **Air Quality.** Compared to the proposed program, this alternative would result in remediation
2 activities of similar type and magnitude, and in construction activities of similar type, but of
3 greater magnitude. Construction/remediation would result in generation of substantial quantities
4 of both criteria pollutants and diesel emissions. The alternative is expected to worsen the
5 significant impact of redevelopment regarding such emissions.

6 Compared to the proposed redevelopment program and in absolute terms, this alternative would
7 result in a very large increase in economic activity, as well as a commensurate very high
8 increase in activity of mobile pollutant sources. Based on its relatively much higher level of
9 economic activity, this alternative is expected to generate pollutant emissions in quantities
10 substantially greater than those of the proposed program and well in excess of significance
11 thresholds. The alternative is expected to worsen the impact of the redevelopment regarding
12 long-term direct and cumulative term increases in criteria pollutants and diesel emissions.

13 **Cultural Resources.** Under this alternative, most historic structures—with the exception of
14 Wharf 7 and the majority of Wharf 6½—would be demolished or de-constructed. This alternative
15 would not avoid or substantially reduce the residually significant direct and cumulative impacts
16 of the proposed program regarding loss of historic resources.

17 **Aesthetics.** Under this alternative, all OARB historic buildings would be removed, and with
18 them, most visual evidence of the military history of West Oakland. This alternative does not
19 avoid or substantially reduce the residually significant impact of the proposed program regarding
20 the loss of such visual evidence.

21 **Invasive Species.** Compared to the proposed redevelopment program, this alternative would
22 result in levels of Port development and shipping activities similar to the proposed
23 redevelopment program, including activities resulting in ballast water discharges to the Bay. The
24 alternative is not expected to substantially reduce the significant direct and cumulative impact of
25 the redevelopment program regarding risk from establishment of invasive species in the Bay.

26 **Significant Impacts of the Alternative not Associated with the Proposed Program**

27 The High Intensity alternative would result in the following potential residually significant impacts
28 not associated with the proposed program:

- 29 • **Degraded LOS at area intersections.** Due to the very high amounts of traffic this
30 alternative would generate, the LOS of numerous area intersections is likely to be
31 substantially degraded, and the local roadway system overwhelmed. The Army's
32 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) analyzes a reuse alternative (Reuse Alternative No.
33 6—Maximum Density) similar in scale to this alternative, with approximately 12 million
34 square feet of office, plus maritime and rail uses. The EIS finds that Reuse Alternative No. 6
35 would result in “significant, long-term, direct adverse effects to onsite and regional traffic.
36 Reuse Alternative No. 6 would generate 183,000 daily trips (U.S. Army 2001) compared to
37 148,000 daily trips for the High Intensity Alternative. The impacts of Reuse Alternative No. 6

1 and the High Intensity Alternative would be similar.⁸ Reuse Alternative No. 6 would generate
2 traffic demand on the local roadway system at levels that could only be accommodated by a
3 freeway system. In essence, both Reuse Alternative No. 6 and the High Intensity Alternative
4 represent total breakdown of the current local roadway system, and would likely require
5 redesign and re-construction of the local circulation system including elevated West Grand
6 Avenue and all connectors to the freeway system.

- 7 • **Traffic hazards.** This alternative would result in both public access via trails, and
8 substantially increased traffic of all types. The extremely high volume of traffic generated by
9 this alternative could pose a substantial hazard to those using non-motorized forms of
10 transportation.
- 11 • **Inadequate parking supply.** According to the Army's EIS, Reuse Alternative No. 6 would
12 require approximately 34,000 parking spaces. Such demand would require numerous multi-
13 story parking structures, or multi-story parking integrated into office buildings. It is not certain
14 this demand can be balanced on-site. In addition, this alternative would generate so much
15 demand for transit service, it could substantially increase parking demand at area BART
16 stations.
- 17 • **Transit demand.** Because this alternative would result in very high amounts of direct
18 employment, it is expected to result in substantial increases in transit use that would be
19 considered significant impacts. While the impact to bus service could be mitigated to less
20 than significant with addition of buses, it is unlikely that cumulative impacts to operations at
21 the West Oakland BART station could be mitigated to a level that is less than significant.
22 Peak commute hour delays to BART riders at exit gates in the cumulative condition would
23 be greater than acceptable under significance criteria.
- 24 • **Inadequate sewage transport and treatment capacity.** This alternative would
25 substantially increase sewage flows over the proposed redevelopment program. Based on
26 the analysis of sewage demand and available transport/treatment capacity for the proposed
27 program (Appendix 4.9), it can be stated that sufficient capacity does not exist in the sewage
28 transport and treatment system to serve the level of demand that would be generated by this
29 alternative.
- 30 • **View blockage.** This alternative would require a fairly compact mass of multiple, multi-story
31 buildings and parking structures. These buildings would substantially block short-term views
32 from the Bay Bridge toward downtown Oakland and the Oakland Hills.

33 **7.5.4 Reduced Intensity Alternative**

34 The Reduced Intensity alternative would achieve all of the benefits of the proposed program, but
35 would not achieve all objectives to the same extent as the proposed program. The alternative

⁸ The number of trips generated by Reuse Alternative No. 6 would be about 400 percent of the number of trips generated by the proposed redevelopment program. The number of trips generated by the High Intensity Alternative would be 330 percent of the number of trips generated by the proposed program. The impacts of Reuse Alternative No. 6 and the High Intensity Alternative would be of similar orders of magnitude.

1 would generate approximately two-thirds of the number of direct jobs generated by the
2 proposed program, three-quarters of the direct housing, and somewhat less housing from tax-
3 increment financing. The Reduced Intensity alternative would generate about 85 percent of the
4 daily trips that would be generated by the proposed redevelopment program.

5 **Avoidance or Substantial Reduction of Significant Redevelopment Impacts**

6 **Traffic.** Compared to the proposed redevelopment program, this alternative would result in a
7 modest decrease in economic activity, resulting in about 12,545 net direct jobs, as well as a
8 commensurate decrease in traffic. In absolute terms, the alternative would result in a high
9 increase in such activity. Based on its somewhat lower level of economic activity and
10 employment relative to the proposed program, the alternative is expected to modestly reduce
11 the effect of proposed redevelopment on MTS facilities, including area freeways. It should be
12 noted, however, that the impact to freeways relates to facilities that would operate at degraded
13 levels of service without redevelopment.

14 This alternative is expected to result in substantially degraded LOS at the Maritime Street/West
15 Grand Avenue intersection under the cumulative condition, as would the proposed program.

16 **Truck Parking.** Compared to the proposed program, this alternative would result in a relatively
17 modest decrease in economic activity, including economic activity of the Port of Oakland that
18 could result in truck-related demand for parking. For this reason, the alternative is not expected
19 to substantially reduce the impact of the redevelopment program regarding a cumulative deficit
20 in truck parking facilities.

21 **Air Quality.** Compared to the proposed program, this alternative would result in remediation
22 and construction activities of similar type and magnitude. Construction/remediation would result
23 in generation of substantial quantities of both criteria pollutants and diesel emissions. The
24 alternative is not expected to substantially reduce the impact of redevelopment regarding such
25 emissions.

26 Compared to the proposed redevelopment program, this alternative would result in a modest
27 decrease in economic activity, as well as a commensurate modest decrease in activity of mobile
28 pollutant sources. Based on its relatively lower level of economic activity, this alternative is
29 expected to generate pollutant emissions in quantities somewhat less than those of the
30 proposed program. Nevertheless, this alternative would generate amounts of criteria pollutants
31 in excess of significance thresholds. The alternative would not avoid or substantially reduce the
32 impact of the redevelopment program regarding long-term direct and cumulative term increases
33 in criteria pollutants and diesel emissions.

34 **Cultural Resources.** Under this alternative, most historic structures—with the exception of
35 Wharf 7 and the majority of Wharf 6½—would be demolished or de-constructed. This alternative
36 would not avoid or substantially reduce the residually significant direct and cumulative impacts
37 of the proposed program regarding loss of historic resources.

1 **Aesthetics.** Under this alternative, all OARB historic buildings would be removed, and with
2 them, most visual evidence of the military history of West Oakland. This alternative does not
3 avoid or substantially reduce the residually significant impact of the proposed program regarding
4 the loss of such visual evidence.

5 **Invasive Species.** Under this alternative, the level of Port development and shipping activities
6 would be similar to the redevelopment program. The alternative is not expected to reduce the
7 significant direct and cumulative impact of the redevelopment program regarding risk from
8 establishment of invasive species in the Bay.

9 **Significant Impacts of the Alternative not Associated with the Proposed Program**

10 The Reduced Intensity alternative would not result in residually significant impacts not
11 associated with the proposed program.

12 **7.5.5 Full Maritime**

13 The Full Maritime alternative would achieve all of the benefits of the proposed program, but
14 would not achieve all objectives to the same extent as the proposed program. Under this
15 alternative, the OARB sub-district would be dedicated entirely to industrial maritime facilities,
16 and the alternative would result in a less balanced land use mix or visual setting than the
17 proposed program. The alternative would generate approximately two-thirds of the number of
18 direct jobs generated by the proposed program, all of the direct housing, and approximately the
19 same amount of housing from tax-increment financing. The Full Maritime alternative would
20 generate about 180 percent of the daily trips that would be generated by the proposed program.

21 **Avoidance or Substantial Reduction of Significant Redevelopment Impacts**

22 **Traffic.** Compared to the proposed redevelopment program, this alternative would result in a
23 moderate decrease in economic activity, resulting in about 11,560 net direct jobs, as well as a
24 commensurate decrease in traffic. In absolute terms, the alternative would result in a high
25 increase in such activity. Based on its somewhat lower level of economic activity and
26 employment relative to the proposed program, the alternative is expected to modestly reduce
27 the effect of proposed MTS facilities, including area freeways. It should be noted, however, that
28 the impact to freeways relates to facilities that would operate at degraded levels of service
29 without redevelopment.

30 This alternative would result in substantially degraded LOS at the Maritime Street/West Grand
31 Avenue intersection under the cumulative condition, as would the proposed program.

32 **Truck Parking.** Compared to the proposed program, this alternative could result in absolute
33 and relative increases in maritime-related economic activity, including activity of the Port of
34 Oakland that could result in truck-related demand for parking. However, this alternative also
35 includes substantially greater acreage in the Port area available to meet parking demand. For

1 this reason, the alternative is expected to substantially reduce the impact of the redevelopment
2 program regarding a cumulative deficit in truck parking facilities.

3 **Air Quality.** Compared to the proposed program, this alternative would result in remediation
4 and construction activities of similar type and magnitude. Construction/remediation would result
5 in generation of substantial quantities of both criteria pollutants and diesel emissions. The
6 alternative is not expected to substantially reduce the impact of redevelopment regarding such
7 emissions.

8 Compared to the proposed redevelopment program, this alternative would result in a modest
9 decrease in employment and non-Maritime economic activity, a modest potential increase in
10 Maritime economic and modest decrease in activity of mobile pollutant sources. Based on its
11 relatively lower level of economic activity, this alternative is expected to generate pollutant
12 emissions in quantities somewhat less than those of the proposed program. Nevertheless, this
13 alternative would generate amounts of criteria pollutants in excess of significance thresholds.
14 The alternative would not avoid or substantially reduce the impact of the redevelopment
15 program regarding long-term direct and cumulative term increases in criteria pollutants and
16 diesel emissions.

17 **Cultural Resources.** Under this alternative, most historic structures—with the exception of
18 Wharf 7 and the majority of Wharf 6½—would be demolished or de-constructed. This alternative
19 would not avoid or substantially reduce the residually significant direct and cumulative impacts
20 of the proposed program regarding loss of historic resources.

21 **Aesthetics.** Under this alternative, all OARB historic buildings would be removed, and with
22 them, most visual evidence of the military history of West Oakland. This alternative does not
23 avoid or substantially reduce the residually significant impact of the proposed program regarding
24 the loss of such visual evidence.

25 **Invasive Species.** Compared to the proposed redevelopment program, this alternative could
26 result in levels of Port development activities greater than that of the proposed redevelopment
27 program, and shipping activities similar in magnitude or somewhat greater than under the
28 proposed program, including activities resulting in ballast water discharges to the Bay. The
29 alternative is not expected to avoid or reduce the significant direct and cumulative impact of the
30 redevelopment program regarding risk from establishment of invasive species in the Bay.

31 **Significant Impacts of the Alternative not Associated with the Proposed Program**

32 The Full Maritime alternative would not result in residually significant impacts not associated
33 with the proposed program.

34 **7.5.6 Gateway Adaptive Reuse/Eco-Park**

35 The Gateway Adaptive Reuse/Eco-Park alternative would achieve all but one of the benefits of
36 the proposed program: because older buildings would be reused, the alternative would not

1 reduce seismic risk related to subsurface conditions. The alternative would generate
2 approximately three-quarters of the number of direct jobs generated by the proposed program,
3 all of the direct housing, and somewhat less housing from tax-increment financing. The
4 Gateway Adaptive Reuse/Eco-Park alternative would generate approximately 90 percent of the
5 daily trips that would be generated by the proposed program.

6 **Avoidance or Substantial Reduction of Significant Redevelopment Impacts**

7 **Traffic.** Compared to the proposed redevelopment program, this alternative would result in a
8 moderate decrease in economic activity, resulting in about 11,115 net direct jobs, as well as a
9 commensurate modest decrease in traffic. In absolute terms, the alternative would result in a
10 high increase in such activity. Based on its somewhat lower level of economic activity and
11 employment relative to the proposed program, the alternative is expected to modestly reduce
12 the effect of proposed redevelopment on MTS facilities, including area freeways. It should be
13 noted, however, that the impact to freeways relates to facilities that would operate at degraded
14 levels of service without redevelopment.

15 **Truck Parking.** Compared to the proposed program, this alternative would result in a relatively
16 modest decrease in economic activity, including economic activity of the Port of Oakland that
17 could result in truck-related demand for parking. For this reason, the alternative is not expected
18 to substantially reduce the impact of the redevelopment program regarding a cumulative deficit
19 in truck parking facilities.

20 This alternative is expected to result in substantially degraded LOS at the Maritime Street/West
21 Grand Avenue intersection under the cumulative condition, as would the proposed program.

22 **Air Quality.** Compared to the proposed program, this alternative would result in remediation
23 and construction activities of similar type but lesser magnitude. Nevertheless,
24 construction/remediation is expected to result in generation of substantial quantities of both
25 criteria pollutants and diesel emissions. The alternative is not expected to substantially reduce
26 the impact of redevelopment regarding such emissions.

27 Compared to the proposed redevelopment program, this alternative would result in a modest
28 decrease in economic activity, as well as a slight decrease in activity of mobile pollutant
29 sources. Based on its relatively lower level of economic activity, this alternative is expected to
30 generate pollutant emissions in quantities somewhat less than those of the proposed program.
31 Nevertheless, this alternative would generate amounts of criteria pollutants in excess of
32 significance thresholds. The alternative would not avoid or substantially reduce the impact of the
33 redevelopment program regarding long-term direct and cumulative term increases in criteria
34 pollutants and diesel emissions.

35 **Cultural Resources.** Under this alternative, all historic structures within the Gateway
36 development area—with the exception of a portion of Wharf 6½, which would be demolished in
37 order to accommodate the Port's New Berth 21—would be retained and adaptively reused. All

1 historic structures within the Port development area, as well as a portion of Wharf 6½ would be
2 demolished or de-constructed. This would alter the integrity of the OARB Historic District
3 sufficiently to make it ineligible for the National Register. Therefore, while this alternative would
4 lessen the impact to cultural resources, it would not avoid or substantially reduce the residually
5 significant direct and cumulative impacts of the proposed program regarding loss of historic
6 resources.

7 **Aesthetics.** Under this alternative, some, but not all, OARB buildings would remain (although
8 they may be in a potentially altered state due to adaptive reuse), and this alternative would not
9 eliminate most visual evidence of West Oakland’s military history. This alternative substantially
10 reduces the residually significant impact of the proposed program regarding the loss of such
11 visual evidence.

12 **Invasive Species.** Under this alternative, the level of Port development and shipping activities
13 would be similar to the redevelopment program. The alternative is not expected to reduce the
14 significant direct and cumulative impact of the redevelopment program regarding risk from
15 establishment of invasive species in the Bay.

16 **Significant Impacts of the Alternative not Associated with the Proposed Program**

17 The Gateway Adaptive Reuse/Eco-Park alternative would result in the following residually
18 significant impact not associated with the proposed program:

- 19 • **Increased seismic risk:** The alternative would reuse existing buildings on their current
20 sites, and while some seismic upgrades would occur, correction of underlying strata would
21 not occur.

22 **7.5.7 The Environmentally Superior Alternative**

23 Based on this analysis, the No Project is the environmentally superior alternative, with the least
24 environmental effect to the environment. The No Project alternative does not fundamentally
25 achieve basic redevelopment objectives, and results in substantially less environmental and
26 socioeconomic benefits than would the proposed redevelopment program (benefits of
27 redevelopment are summarized in Chapter 1: Summary, and described in greater detail
28 throughout Chapter 4: Setting and Baseline, Impacts, and Mitigation). Of the four “action”
29 alternatives and the proposed program, the Full Maritime and Gateway Reuse/Eco-Park
30 alternatives are both environmentally superior to the proposed project. The main advantage to
31 the Full Maritime alternative is that it includes substantially more acreage available for Port-
32 related trucking industries. Such industries currently located in West Oakland could move from
33 the neighborhood closer to the Port area. However, beyond the 2020 build-out date for this EIR,
34 the Full Maritime alternative provides the opportunity, if demand warrants, to increase Maritime
35 activities, resulting in more ship, rail and truck trips; increasing these activities could result in
36 commensurate worsening of impacts related to air quality, traffic, and of risk of establishment of
37 invasive species in the Bay. The main advantage of the Gateway Reuse/Eco-Park is that it
38 would preserve the historic district contributing structures in the Gateway development area and

Alternatives to the Proposed Redevelopment Program

1 would better promote the City's sustainable development policies. Therefore, the Gateway
2 Reuse/Eco-Park alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative.

