

# CHAPTER V

---

## Alternatives

### A. Criteria for Selecting Alternatives

CEQA requires that the EIR compare the effects of a “reasonable range of alternatives” to the effects of the project. The alternatives selected for comparison would attain most of the basic objectives of the project and avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant effects of the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6). The “range of alternatives” is governed by the “rule of reason” which requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit an informed and reasoned choice by the decision-making body and informed public participation (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f]). CEQA generally defines “feasible” to mean an alternative that is capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, technological, and legal factors.

The alternatives addressed in this EIR were selected based on the following factors:

1. The extent to which the alternative would accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project (identified in Chapter III, Project Description);
2. The extent to which the alternative would avoid or lessen any of the identified potentially significant environmental effects of the project (identified throughout Chapter IV, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures);
3. The feasibility of the alternative, taking into account site suitability, availability of infrastructure, property control (ownership), and consistency with applicable plans and regulatory limitations;
4. The extent to which an alternative contributes to a “reasonable range” of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice; and
5. The requirement of the CEQA Guidelines to consider a no project alternative and to identify an environmentally superior alternative in addition to the no-project alternative (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[e]).

### Potentially Significant Impacts Resulting with the Project

To identify alternatives that would avoid or lessen any of the potentially significant environmental effects of the project, as required by CEQA, the potentially significant impacts of the project must be considered.

The analysis in Chapter IV of this EIR identifies the following significant and unavoidable impacts (i.e., impacts for which no feasible mitigation was identified to reduce the impact to less than significant, or impact for which feasibility mitigation is identified by which is not within the City of Oakland's purview to implement) that would result with the project:

- **Transportation and Circulation**

**Impact TRANS-2a, TRANS-3b, and TRANS-4c: The addition of project traffic would cause the City of Oakland's significance criteria for unsignalized intersections to be met at the *East 9th Street at I-880 Northbound Off-Ramp intersection during both peak hours. (Baseline plus Project, 2010 plus Project, and 2025 Cumulative Conditions)*** [Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure TRANS-2a, but requires Caltrans approval and therefore are conservatively considered Significant and Unavoidable.]

**Impact TRANS-4d: *The Clement Avenue at Park Street intersection would operate at LOS E with and without the addition of project traffic. However, the addition of project traffic causes the average delay to increase by over four seconds, which would meet the City of Alameda significance criteria. (2025 Cumulative)*** [Less than Significant with Mitigation Measure TRANS-4d, but requires City of Alameda approval and therefore is conservatively considered Significant and Unavoidable.]

**Impact TRANS-4e: *The Central Avenue at Park Street intersection would operate at LOS E in the a.m. peak hour and LOS F in the p.m. peak hour with and without the addition of project traffic. During the a.m. peak hour, the addition of project traffic would not cause the average delay to increase by over four seconds. However, in the p.m. peak hour, the addition of project traffic would cause the average delay to increase by over four seconds, which would meet the City of Alameda significance criteria. (2025 Cumulative)*** [Also Significant and Unavoidable.]

The analysis also identifies potentially significant impacts for the following environmental topics, and feasible mitigation measures and/or standard conditions of approval are identified to reduce the impact of each to less than significant:

- **Transportation and Circulation** (construction circulation; traffic, bicycle/pedestrian safety and facilities)
- **Air Quality** (Construction-period / Emissions and Dust)
- **Noise** (Construction-period; vibration, operational [traffic]; compatible land use )
- **Hazardous Materials** (Construction-period; public exposure and risk; accidental upset)
- **Water Quality** (Storm runoff, non-point pollution; erosion, and groundwater quality.)

- **Utilities and Service Systems** (Construction impacts for potentially-expanded wastewater facilities)
- **Biological Resources** (Construction-period / special-status bird species)
- **Cultural Resources** (Construction-period archaeological/paleontological resources)

The specific impact for each is stated in **Table V-7** at the end of this chapter. The alternatives selected for comparison in this chapter were selected to reduce the above environmental effects although the EIR analysis finds that these impacts are less than significant under CEQA. The environmental effects of the project and the relative effects of each alternative are summarized in **Table V-7** at the end of this chapter. The comparative technical data related to traffic effects for each of the alternatives is provided in **Appendix E**.

## CEQA-Required “No Project” Alternative

Consideration of a “no project” alternative is required under CEQA. Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines states: “The purpose of describing and analyzing a no project alternative is to allow decisionmakers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project.” It also states that the “no project” alternative is “not the baseline for determining whether the proposed project’s environmental impacts may be significant, unless it is identical to the existing environmental setting analysis which does establish that baseline . . .” (Section 15126.6[e]).

Pursuant to the “existing conditions” scenario, existing or recent conditions on the project site would continue, taking into account reasonably anticipated change that could occur, such as new vacant buildings being reoccupied with tenants and uses similar to existing or recent uses on the site, or continued routine maintenance of buildings and property.

## B. Alternatives Considered but not Analyzed in Detail

During the process to identify feasible alternatives to address in this EIR, the project sponsor considered a scenario in which the proposed project would be developed at an alternative location within the San Antonio /Fruitvale area, specifically near the Fruitvale BART Station. An offsite alternative would evaluate whether developing the project on another site nearby, consistent with the project sponsor’s objectives, would avoid or substantially reduce the significant and unavoidable traffic impacts that would occur with the project. However, it was determined that an off-site alternative would be infeasible due to a number of reasons.

First, diligent efforts conducted for purposes of this EIR identified no potential alternative project site nearby and of comparable size (nearly 10 acres) that would be readily available for the project sponsor to acquire.

Second, even if such a property was located, development of an off-site alternative is not considered feasible because the acquisition and development of real estate in the Bay Area is not routine business practice for the project sponsor. Pacific Thomas Capital's interest in the proposed project site is based on its long-standing ties with the surrounding community, its ownership of a substantial portion of the site (which has been assembled over several years, and on which it currently operates a business), and the potential for it to secure control of adjacent land within the proposed project boundaries (i.e., the Caltrans property), with assistance from the Oakland Redevelopment Agency. The project site has been historically owned by one family who seeks to redevelop the property at a highest and best use as it intends to discontinue the self-storage business at this location. Development at an off-site location would not align with the project sponsor's primary objective of developing the site and other objectives related to developing high-density mixed use development near transit in support of the economic renaissance of the San Antonio/Fruitvale area.

Third, the significant and unavoidable impacts that are identified with the project (traffic impacts listed above, under *Potentially Significant Impacts Resulting with the Project*) are not site specific and therefore, while they may be avoided if the project was developed at an alternative site, the impacts probably would occur elsewhere in the San Antonio /Fruitvale area, including, in particular, along the International Boulevard corridor, the I-880 corridor, or within the City of Alameda. In summary, for the reasons discussed above, an off-site alternative is not considered to be a feasible alternative due to lack of alternative sites, the project sponsor's business practices and desire to develop this site, and the likelihood that the project's significant impacts would not be avoided or reduced at alternative location.

## C. Alternatives Selected for Consideration

With consideration given to the selection criteria identified in Section A, above, the City selected the following reasonable range of project alternatives to be addressed in this EIR at a sufficient level of detail required for a meaningful comparative analysis:

**Alternative 1a:** No Project / Continuation of Recent/Existing Uses and Buildings

**Alternative 1b:** Redevelopment Consistent with General Plan

**Alternative 2:** Partial Site / Development Occurs Only on Portion of the Site Controlled by the Project Sponsor

**Alternative 3:** Light Industrial / Live Work

Each alternative is discussed in Section D below and summarized in the following table:

**TABLE V-1  
COMPARISON OF SELECTED ALTERNATIVES AND PROPOSED PROJECT**

<b>Alternative</b>	<b>No. Stories</b>	<b>Approximate Building Height (Ft.) To Roof</b>	<b>Residential Units</b>	<b>No. Residential Parking Spaces</b>	<b>Parking Spaces Per Unit</b>	<b>Non-Residential Uses (Sf)</b>	<b>Non-Residential Parking Spaces Provided</b>
Proposed Project	3 to 16	30 to 162	810 units	1,056	1.32	30,950 SF	65
1a: No Project/ Continuation of Recent/ Existing Uses and Buildings	1 to 2	15 to 20	-	-	-	158,492 SF commercial / storage	Approx. 12
1b: Redevelopment Consistent with General Plan	3 to 16	30 to 162	390 units	519	1.33	72,000 SF	95
2: Partial Site / Development Occurs Only on Portion of the Site Controlled by the Project Sponsor	3 to 12	30 to 122	538 units	699	1.29	39,060 SF	67
3: Light Industrial / Live-Work	1-3	15 to 30	18 live-work	27	1.50	145,000 SF	97

**TABLE V-2  
DETAILED SUMMARY OF PROPOSED PROJECT**

<b>Site No.</b>	<b>No. Stories</b>	<b>Approximate Building Height (Ft.) to roof</b>	<b>Residential Units</b>	<b>No. Residential Parking Spaces</b>	<b>Parking Spaces Per Unit</b>	<b>Non-Residential Uses (SF)</b>	<b>Non-Residential Parking Spaces Provided</b>
1	3 to 12	30 to 122	180	220	1.20	-	-
2	3 to 10	30 to 102	130	143	1.10	2,900 commercial	0
3	3 to 7	30 to 72	100	144	1.54	2,900 commercial	0
4	3 to 8	30 to 82	100	138	1.38	7,110 commercial 5,000 educational center	24
5	3 to 15	30 to 152	145	205	1.40	13,040 commercial	41
6	3 to 16	30 to 162	155	206	1.32	commercial	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>810 units</b>	<b>1,056</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>30,950 SF</b>	<b>65</b>

## D. Description and Analysis of Alternatives

As permitted by CEQA, the potentially significant effects of the alternatives are discussed in less detail than the effects of the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[d]). However, the alternatives analysis is conducted at a sufficient level of detail to provide the public, other public agencies, and City decision-makers adequate information to fully evaluate the alternatives and for the City to approve any of the alternatives without further environmental review..

Unless indicated otherwise, as with the analysis throughout this EIR, the potential impacts associated with the any of the alternatives are stated as levels of significance that would result *after* implementation of mitigation measures and/or standard conditions identified in Chapter IV, to the extent that any or the same mitigation measures and/or standard conditions would apply appropriately to reduce the impact identified for the alternative. Overall, the analysis seeks to compare the alternatives' impacts to the project's impacts. Cumulative impacts for year 2025 are also identified.

---

### Alternative 1a: No Project / Continuation of Existing/Recent Uses and Buildings

#### Description

In this No Project / Continuation of Existing/Recent Uses and Buildings Alternative (referred to throughout as "Alternative 1a"), the project sponsor would continue to operate the commercial self-storage facility and would find tenants for existing empty commercial buildings. These buildings could be used by a range of industrial and commercial use to the extent that they would meet all requirements of the Oakland Zoning Regulations (considered in concert with the General Plan Guidelines). All existing land uses on the site would remain (or be replaced with similar uses), thus the site would continue to be used for industrial (Caltrans) and commercial activities. Even as new tenants might occupy the site, existing buildings would not change substantially through additions, demolitions, or other alterations, particularly changes that would result in larger facilities. **Table V-2** summarizes Alternative 1a, which reflects existing development on the project site.

Because no change would occur to the existing General Plan land use classifications or zoning designations on the project site under this alternative, the General Plan classification and zoning would continue to be inconsistent within the *Mixed Housing Type Residential* area in the central portion of the project site. However, as part of the City's overall zoning update process, this area would be brought into consistency, either through rezoning or amendment to the General Plan land use map, which particular consideration given to the City's current policy consideration of industrial land conversion to residential use.

**TABLE V-3  
DETAILED SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE 1A – NO PROJECT / CONTINUATION OF RECENT/EXISTING  
USES AND BUILDINGS**

Site No.	No. Stories	Approximate Building Height (Ft.) to roof	Residential Units	No. Residential Parking Spaces	Parking Spaces Per Unit	Non-Residential Uses (SF)	Non-Residential Parking Spaces Provided
1 – 4 (West of 29 <sup>th</sup> Ave.)	1 to 2	15 to 20	–	–	–	103,461 commercial self-storage 17,852 hardware store/commercial building	12
5 – 6 (East of 29 <sup>th</sup> Ave.)	1 to 2	15 to 20	–	–	–	9,179 automotive repair / commercial retail 28,000 Caltrans maintenance facility and yard	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	N/A	N/A	–	–	–	158,492 SF commercial / storage	12

## Impacts (Alternative 1a)

### *Land Use, Plans and Policies*

Existing buildings and land uses would continue to be used for commercial and industrial purposes. The project sponsor could, under existing Zoning Regulations, and to the extent permitted under the General Plan Guidelines, lease facilities to businesses as diverse as administrative offices, general food sales, general retail sales, general wholesale sales, automotive servicing (with limitations), automotive fee parking, and general manufacturing (except electroplating activities). Conditionally permitted uses could include community education, but could also include fast-food restaurants; laundries; automotive sales, rental and delivery; and limited amounts of hazardous waste storage. However, given the floorplates of existing buildings, future businesses would likely be similar to existing or recent businesses on the site, such as a hardware store, a cell phone business, and a small lumberyard.

As discussed above, under Alternative 1a, the existing M-30 General Industrial Zone designation on the project site would remain in conflict with the Mixed Housing Type General Plan land use classification that applies to a portion of the site. While this situation is not a significant environmental impact, the proposed Rezoning that would facilitate development of new, high-density residential mixed use development would not occur at this time. Further, while a lower-density residential project could currently be developed on a portion of the site (without the proposed Rezoning or General Plan Amendment), the parameters of Alternative 1a would preclude this substantial change in use (see Alternative 1b, below).

### ***Visual Quality and Shadow***

With Alternative 1a, the existing appearance of the project site would not change substantially. Therefore existing views across the project site and the appearance of the project site, which is highly visible from adjacent major thoroughfares, including 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue and East 12<sup>th</sup> Street and from passing BART train passengers looking southward and down at the site would not change or improve. Existing shadows also would not change, since the existing buildings would not be demolished. Thus, Alternative 1a would maintain existing conditions related to general appearance and not result in beneficial improvements, such as new, well-designed development, attractive ground-floor commercial spaces, and landscaping and pedestrian amenities on and near the site.

### ***Transportation, Circulation, and Parking***

The following area intersections currently operate at poor conditions and would continue to operate poorly under Alternative 1a since mitigations that would be implemented with development of the project (pending approval of Caltrans and the City of Alameda) would not occur with continuation of existing conditions on the site: East 12th Street and 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue; East 7<sup>th</sup> Street and Kennedy Avenue (PM peak-hour only); East 9<sup>th</sup> Street and I-880 northbound on-ramp; and Clement Avenue and Park Street. No changes would occur to the development on the site to affect circulation on- or off-site.

### ***Air Quality***

No construction or changes to the project site would occur with Alternative 1a, and replacement uses would be similar to existing baseline conditions. Therefore, air quality conditions would be comparable to what exists today (and as they are forecast to be in the future without development of the site).

### ***Noise***

No construction or changes to the project site would likely occur with Alternative 1a, and replacement uses would be similar to existing conditions. Therefore, the noise environment would be comparable to what exists today (and as forecast for future conditions), and less than significant impacts (with standard conditions) related to construction noise would be avoided.

### ***Hazards and Hazardous Materials***

Although no building development or demolition would occur with Alternative 1a, contaminated soils, groundwater, underground and above-ground storage tanks would likely continue to exist on portions of the project site since no remedial work would occur as part of new development. Similarly, while no alterations or demolition of existing buildings would occur, existing structures that could contain hazardous materials (e.g., lead-based paint, asbestos) would remain in place. As a result, these conditions would not be abated, but also would not be released and exposed to the public.

### ***Public Services and Recreation***

No new development or significantly different land uses would occur under Alternative 1a. Thus, the site would not generate new population or employees that would affect existing demand for public services and recreation facilities.

### ***Utilities and Service Systems***

No new development or significantly different land uses would occur on the project site under Alternative 1a. Therefore, when compared to the proposed project, the alternative would not result in increased demand for public water, wastewater (sanitary sewer), stormwater facilities, solid waste disposal, or energy. In particular, the project would not demolish existing structures, generating construction waste.

### ***Hydrology and Water Quality***

No new development or significantly different land uses would occur on the project site under Alternative 1a. Therefore, existing, less-than-optimal conditions on portions of the project site would continue to occur under this alternative. These conditions include expansive paved and unpaved areas east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue and uncontrolled stormwater runoff that may current enter storm drains via contaminated soils. Although the analysis conducted for this EIR does not include an evaluation of existing on-site operations for compliance with any applicable regulatory standards or requirements regarding water quality, it is reasonable to assume that the existing operations and conditions on portions of the site (e.g., amount of paving, exposed soil, lack of measures to detain and/or treat runoff) could have adverse effects to water quality, stormwater runoff, and flooding. Implementation of the project would include adherence to standard conditions and regulations that would improve existing conditions on the site. As a result Alternative 1a is considered to have a greater adverse impact regarding post-construction water quality than would occur with the proposed project.

### ***Geology, Soils, and Seismicity***

No new development or significantly different land uses would occur on the project site under Alternative 1a. However, the existing structures would be subject to the same existing seismic hazards that affect the entire vicinity. Although there is existing daytime population on the site, the potential effect of exposing people and structures to seismic risk would be reduced since no new population or development would result. Overall, this alternative would result in the same or reduced less-than-significant impacts to geology and seismicity compared to the proposed project.

### ***Population, Housing, Employment***

Alternative 1a would not introduce new population or housing on the site, and could potentially facilitate a minor change to onsite employment if new tenants occupy the site. Therefore, Alternative 1a would not affect population, housing, or employment.

### **Biological Resources**

No demolition and new construction would occur with Alternative 1a. Thus, there would be no potential effect to wildlife or plant species. This alternative would avoid the less-than-significant impacts to biological resources identified for the project.

### **Cultural Resources**

No demolition and new construction would occur with Alternative 1a. Thus, there would be no potential effect to archaeological or paleontological resources. Moreover, there would be no impact to historic resources as none, as defined for CEQA, exist on or in close enough proximity to be adversely affected by the project. This alternative would avoid the cultural resources impacts identified for the project.

---

## **Alternative 1b: Redevelopment Consistent with Existing General Plan**

### **Description**

The Redevelopment Consistent with Existing General Plan (referred to throughout this section as “Alternative 1b”) is included in the EIR to provide a comparison of the proposed project to an alternative that could reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans (CEQA 15126.6[3][a]).

As shown in **Table V-4**, Alternative 1b, the developer would redevelop the site in accordance with the three existing General Plan land use classifications for the site: *Business Mix*, *Mixed Housing Type Residential*, and *Regional Commercial*. No General Plan Amendment would be required. This alternative would develop up to 390 residential units, approximately 23,000 square feet of ground-floor commercial/retail use, a 5,000 square-foot education space, and approximately 40,000 square feet of light industrial use. The light industrial uses would occur on the westernmost one-third of the site only (Sites I and II).

### **Residential and Commercial/Retail**

Residential use is allowed in the *Mixed Housing Type Residential* and *Regional Commercial* classifications that currently apply to portions of the project site. The 390 residential units, 23,000 total square feet of ground-floor commercial/retail space, and a 5,000 square-foot educational space would occur in these two areas of the site - the easternmost 6.6 acres (approximately two-thirds of the project site, Sites III through VI) that border 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue (including parcels that the project sponsor does not currently control east of 29th Avenue) (see **Figure IV.A-2** in Section IV.A, *Land Use, Plans, and Policies*, which maps the existing land use classifications).

**TABLE V-4  
DETAILED SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE 1B – REDEVELOPMENT CONSISTENT WITH GENERAL PLAN**

Site No.	No. Stories	Approximate Building Height (Ft.) to roof	Residential Units	No. Residential Parking Spaces	Parking Spaces Per Unit	Non-Residential Uses (SF)	Non-Residential Parking Spaces Provided
1 - 2	1	15 to 20	–	–	–	45,000 light industrial	30
3 - 4	2 to 3	20 to 30	18 townhomes 72-unit apartment building	108	1.20	3,000 commercial 7,000 commercial 5,000 educational center	24
5	3 to 15	30 to 152	145 units	205	1.40	13,000 commercial	41
6	3 to 16	30 to 162	155 units	206	1.32	-	-
TOTAL	N/A	N/A	390 units	519	1.33	72,000 SF	95

Approximately 300 units would be developed on the 3.6 acres east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue on Sites V and VI, which are in the *Regional Commercial* area. Development would occur in two 13- to 14-story buildings with 13,000 square feet of commercial/retail and parking uses on the ground floor. The *Regional Commercial* classification allows a maximum residential density of 125 units per gross acre; the residential density for Alternative 1b would be approximately 100 units per acre. The residential development in this alternative is primarily the same as what the project proposes within this area of the project site.

Approximately 90 units would be developed on the 3.0 acres west of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue on Sites III and IV, which are the *Mixed Housing Type Residential* area. The configuration of development would be similar to what the project proposes for this area. Approximately 18 townhomes would front East 12<sup>th</sup> Street, with a single, a 4-story multifamily building containing 72 units. Ground floor uses would include 10,000 square feet of commercial/retail space (two spaces, approximately 3,000 and 7,000 square feet each), a 5,000 square-foot educational center, and parking. The proposed height of the building would allow for ample ground-level open space or outdoor areas for commercial retail spaces on the site as well. The residential density of this alternative would be the maximum allowed by the *Mixed Housing Type Residential* classification - 30 units per gross acre.

### **Light Industrial**

According to the City's *Guidelines for Determining Project Conformity with the General Plan and Zoning Regulations* (General Plan Guidelines), residential use is not permitted (i.e., "clearly does not conform") in the *Business Mix* classification. Thus, approximately 45,000 square feet of light industrial use would occur in this area of the site – the westernmost 3.0 acres (Sites I and II). Development would occur in a new, one-story structure. Possible "light manufacturing activities" that could occur include manufacturing and/or processing of "articles of merchandise" involving materials specific in Section 17.10.560 of the Oakland Planning Code and would be subject to

operational performance standards to ensure compatibility with nearby residential uses, pursuant to Section 17.70.090. The light industrial use would be immediately adjacent to residential uses.

As indicated in **Table V-4** above, Alternative 1b proposes 420 fewer units, nearly 2,950 fewer square feet of commercial/retail area, and approximately 45,000 square feet of new industrial area – a land use not included in the proposed project. To compare by development site, this alternative proposes the same development as proposed by the project for Sites V and VI; approximately 110 fewer units but the same commercial/retail and educational area as proposed for Sites III and IV; and 45,000 square feet of light industrial space instead of proposed project's 310 units and 2,900 square feet of commercial/retail for Sites I and II.

## **Impacts (Alternative 1b)**

### ***Land Use, Plans and Policies***

No General Plan Amendment would occur under Alternative 1b; three existing General Plan land use classifications on the site would remain. As a result, light industrial use would occur in the existing *Business Mix* area, and residential and commercial/retail uses would occur in the *Mixed Housing Type Residential* and *Regional Commercial* areas and be similar in layout and uses as the proposed project for these areas. As a result, development would vary widely across the site, which could restrict the project sponsor's ability to develop the project as planned unit development (PUD).

The lowest density residential (a multifamily building and townhomes) occurring between the high-rise residential east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue and the 45,000 square feet of light industrial at the western end of the site. This lower density residential development would occur at the southwest corner of East 12<sup>th</sup> Street and 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue (Sites III and IV). Introducing this lower density (72 units in a four-story building, and 18 townhomes fronting East 12th Street would support to a much lesser extent General Plan policies that encourage high-density development along major corridors, particularly near transit. The high-density residential towers, townhomes, and ground-floor commercial uses east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be the same as proposed by the Gateway Community Development Project.

The 45,000 square feet of light industrial space that would occur would not substantially conflict with the adjacent OHA property maintenance building and yard or industrial, office, school, or residential uses nearby because this alternative assumes (see *Description*, above) that only uses consistent with the "light manufacturing activities" defined in the Oakland Planning Code (Section 17.10.560) would occur (considering also the underlying M-30 General Industrial Zone and the City's General Plan Guidelines). Such uses would be further limited by the operational performance standards that address compatibility with nearby residential uses (Oakland Planning Code Section 17.10.560). Moreover, it would likely support *Coliseum Redevelopment Plan* goals regarding employment growth and commercial/light industrial expansion to a greater extent than the proposed project. Conversely, while locating new light industrial use in this location would not result in a significant land use conflict, it may not fully support General Plan policies and that

seek active commercial and residential development along major corridors, particularly in visually-prominent, mixed use residential areas. This alternative assumes, consistent with *Coliseum Redevelopment Plan* goals, that new, light industrial development would be of equal design integrity as the new residential or commercial/retail development that would occur with the project.

Overall, Alternative 1b would result in reduced less-than-significant land use impacts identified with the project.

### ***Visual Quality and Shadow***

Alternative 1b would develop substantially lower (and fewer) buildings on the project site, east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue (Sites I through IV). While Sites III and IV would likely consist of a similar configuration of building on the site as the proposed project, the multifamily residential building would be four stories to accommodate 72 units (versus two buildings of seven and eight stories to accommodate 200 units), and the townhome buildings would continue to be three stories, as with the project. Further, the 45,000 square feet of light industrial use would occur in one or more one- to two-story buildings compared to the nine- and twelve-story residential buildings on Sites I and II. Overall, Alternative 1b would result in reduced less-than-significant impact regarding shadow and scenic vistas and views as identified with the project.

### ***Transportation, Circulation, and Parking***

The total amount of development would be less than with the proposed project; thus, AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips would be 69 and 70 percent, respectively, of the proposed project's trips (representing reductions of 31 and 30 percent; see **Appendix E** to this EIR). As a result, the traffic impacts would be less than what would occur with the project. Specifically, Alternative 1b would avoid the significant impact at the Clement Avenue and Park Street intersection (Impact TRANS- 4d), which is significant and unavoidable with the project because feasible mitigation measure to reduce the impacts to less than significant require City of Alameda approval. Site design conditions affecting circulation would be similar to that proposed by the project, therefore the alternative would have the same or reduced less-than-significant site access and circulation impacts identified for the project. Also, parking configuration under Alternative 1b would be similar to what is proposed by the project; parking supply would continue to exceed parking demand.

Fewer new residents (those associated with 420 fewer units) would occur with Alternative 1b compared to the project), however, there would likely be more employees associated with the *additional* 41,050 square feet of non-commercial space (including 45,000 square feet of light industrial use) that would occur compared to the proposed project. A net increase in transit demand would likely result compared to the project, however, the net increase is not anticipated to result in a significant transit impact; the less-than-significant impact identified for the project would continue to result with Alternative 1b. Overall, Alternative 1b would result in reduced less-than-significant traffic impacts identified with the project.

### ***Air Quality***

The demolition and new construction under Alternative 1b would result in similar less-than-significant construction-related air quality impacts (dust) as would occur with the proposed project. Standard conditions required for the proposed project would also be required for this alternative. As discussed above for traffic, Alternative 1b would result in 69 percent of the project's AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 70 percent of the project's PM peak-hour vehicle trips, representing reductions of 31 and 30 percent, respectively (see **Appendix E** to this EIR). As a result, operational air quality impacts for the alternative would be reduced compared to the project and would continue to be less than significant.

### ***Noise***

The demolition and new construction under Alternative 1b would result in similar less-than-significant construction-related noise impacts as would occur with the proposed project, after implementation of the standard conditions required for the proposed project. As discussed above for traffic and air, Alternative 1b would result in 69 of the AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 70 percent of the PM peak-hour vehicle trips compared to the proposed project, representing reductions of 31 and 30 percent, respectively (see **Appendix E** to this EIR). As a result, although less than significant, the operational traffic noise levels would be reduced compared to the project. The noise effects from the adjacent passing trains (railroad and BART) that border the site would be the same as with the project since Alternative 1b would locate residences adjacent to these noise sources. The standard conditions identified for the proposed project to address noise-sensitive uses (indoor and outdoor noise levels and groundborne vibration) would also be required for the alternative, thus it would result in the same less-than-significant impact. Overall, Alternative 1b would result in the same or reduced less-than-significant noise impacts identified for the project.

### ***Hazards and Hazardous Materials***

Demolition of the existing buildings would occur under Alternative 1b, as with the project. This alternative would result in the same less-than-significant impact that could occur from demolishing a structure that could contain hazardous materials (e.g., lead-based paint, asbestos), as well as the handling of and public exposure to contaminated materials during construction activities and operation of the project; the same standard conditions identified with the project to address hazards would apply to the alternative. In addition, development under this alternative would require the same clean-up of hazardous site conditions as the project. Overall, Alternative 1b would result in the same less-than-significant hazardous materials impacts identified with the project.

### ***Public Services and Recreation***

Alternative 1b would result in similar less-than-significant impacts to public services and facilities as identified with the project. Residents and school-aged children associated with 580 fewer residential units (even considering increased employee population and building area on the site associated with 45,000 square feet of light industrial use) would likely impact public services

to a lesser extent than the proposed project. Regarding parks and recreation facilities in particular, as with the proposed project, the alternative would adhere to the City's requirement for on-site open space, and the project sponsor would still make improvements to local parks and recreation programs to reduce the effects to park and recreation facilities in the project area, which is currently underserved, though possibly to a lesser degree. Overall, Alternative 1b would result in the same less-than-significant impacts to public services and recreation facilities.

### ***Utilities and Service Systems***

Alternative 1b would add approximately 45,000 square feet of light industrial use to the project development, but would develop 580 fewer residential units. While the additional industrial use could likely increase demand for utilities, the increase could also be offset by the absence of demand that would have occurred from the 580 residential uses. Overall, this alternative would result in the same less-than-significant utilities and service systems impacts that would occur with the project, after implementation of standard conditions.

### ***Hydrology and Water Quality***

Alternative 1b would result in less development than the project, but would continue to develop all parts of the site. Like the project, the alternative would not result in a substantial reduction in impervious surface area on the site compared to existing conditions. Development of Alternative 1a would incorporate existing regulatory standards, requirements, and best management practices (during construction and project operations) aimed at reducing untreated runoff, soil erosion, and potential flooding in particular. Standard conditions identified to reduce the project's impacts to less than significant would apply to Alternative 1b as well. Overall, Alternative 1b would result in the same less-than-significant water quality impacts identified for the project.

### ***Geology, Soils, and Seismicity***

Alternative 1b would construct new development on the site that is subject to seismic ground shaking, settlement and other seismic hazards as the project. However, with the reduced development, this alternative would expose fewer people to such risks compared to the project. Since overall development and on-site population would be less than with the project, the effect could be considered less. Alternative 1b would result in the same less-than-significant geology and seismic hazards impact as identified for the project.

### ***Population, Housing, Employment***

Alternative 1b would introduce new population growth, housing, and newly created jobs on the project site. No housing units would be displaced, but the same existing businesses would be incrementally removed from the site as the project is developed over time. With 580 fewer residential units than the project, this alternative would not induce substantial unplanned growth through the provision of new housing or businesses to a greater extent than the project. The effect of Alternative 1b would be less-than-significant and somewhat reduced from that identified for the project.

### **Biological Resources**

The demolition and new construction under Alternative 1b would result in similar less-than-significant biological resource effects as would occur with the proposed project. Standard conditions required to reduce potential impacts to special-status nesting birds and removal of protected trees in particular would also be required for this alternative. Like the project, Alternative 1b would remove any existing “protected” trees identified on the site pursuant to the Oakland Tree Ordinance, and the same number of trees would be affected. This alternative would thus have the same less-than-significant impact identified for the project.

### **Cultural Resources**

Subsurface activities associated with site preparation and construction would be required to develop Alternative 1b to essentially the same degree as the project given the construction of high-rise towers up to 16 stories tall. Thus, the alternative could have the same potentially significant effect identified for the project, and the standard conditions identified to reduce impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources would also apply. No historic resources as defined by CEQA exist on or in close enough proximity to be adversely affected by the project. Therefore, overall, the alternative would maintain the less-than-significant impacts to cultural resources that were identified for the project.

---

## **Alternative 2: Partial Site / Development Occurs Only On Property Controlled by the Project Sponsor**

### **Description**

Alternative 2 is included in the EIR to compare the proposed project to a scenario of similar, but less overall development. This alternative assumes that the proposed project would occur only on property that the project sponsor controls. While the site west of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue is owned in its entirety by the project sponsor, only a portion of the site east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue is owned by the project sponsor. **Figure III-2** in Chapter III (Project Description) delineates the land currently controlled by the project sponsor. As described there, the project sponsor owns vacant land that extends east-west through the middle of the site. (The project sponsor does not currently own or control the land occupied by the Caltrans South Oakland Maintenance Facility or the four commercial buildings east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue.)

As shown in **Table V-5**, the resulting development plan under Alternative 2 would be the same for portions of the site west of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue (Sites I through IV). While the proposed project would result in a total of 300 units (296 high-rise condominiums and 4 three-story townhomes) east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue (Sites V and VI), Alternative 2 would provide a total of 28 three-story townhomes (273 fewer units than the project) in this area. Regarding non-residential uses, Alternative 2 would provide nearly 8,110 more total square feet of commercial space east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue, compared to the project. The alternative would provide a total of 21,150 square feet of

commercial space would on two levels, compare to one 13,040-square foot space on the ground-floor of the proposed project.

**TABLE V-5  
DETAILED SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE 2 – PARTIAL SITE / DEVELOPMENT OCCURS ONLY ON  
PORTION OF THE SITE CONTROLLED BY THE PROJECT SPONSOR**

Site No.	No. Stories	Approximate Building Height (Ft.) to roof	Residential Units	No. Residential Parking Spaces	Parking Spaces per Unit	Non-Residential Uses (SF)	Non-Residential Parking Spaces Provided
1	3 to 12	30 to 122	180	220	1.20	–	–
2	3 to 10	30 to 102	130	143	1.10	2,900	0
3	3 to 7	30 to 72	100	154	1.54	2,900	0
4	3 to 8	30 to 82	100	138	1.38	7,110	24
						5,000 educational center	
5 - 6	3	30	28	44	1.57	21,150	43
TOTAL	N/A	N/A	538 units	699	1.29	39,060 SF	67

## Impacts (Alternative 2)

### *Land Use, Plans, and Policies*

Alternative 2 would require a General Plan Amendment and Rezoning for the project uses west of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue and to establish a consistent land use classification and zoning district for the entire site. The development on this portion of the site would be the same under the alternative and the proposed project since the project sponsor current controls all properties in this area. A General Plan Amendment also would be required for the project sponsor’s property east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue; this existing *Regional Commercial* area allows residential and commercial (retail) use, and, pursuant to the City’s General Plan Guidelines, an interim conditional use permit or Rezoning would be required to develop the residential uses within the M-30 General Industrial Zone that exists on this area of the site. The residential unit count, density, and type (28 three-story townhomes on approximately 1 acre) east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be substantially different than the proposed project (300 condominium units in two high-rise towers on approximately 3.6 acres), and the alternative would create substantially more commercial use (21,150 compared to 13,040 square feet).

This lower density residential development would occur at the southeast corner of East 12<sup>th</sup> Street and 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue (Sites V and VI), and, as with Alternative 1a, introducing this lower density at this location would not support General Plan policies that encourage high-density development along major corridors, particularly near transit, to the extent realized with the project. Also, the property owned by the project sponsor is “wedged” between the Caltrans maintenance facility and yard on the west, and low-rise commercial buildings on the north, including an automotive repair business. While a two-story commercial building would be developed in addition to the 28

townhomes, this alternative could potentially result in a land use conflict given the intensity of adjacent uses involving heavy truck traffic (Caltrans) and existing auto uses.

This alternative does not assume that the project sponsor would acquire and develop additional properties east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue, specifically the existing Caltrans maintenance yard facility. A potentially significant impact regarding land use compatibility impact could result with Alternative 2 with residential use abutting the industrial use. However, such impacts could be reduced to less than significant with mitigation measures involving the location and orientation of land uses within the site, incorporation of strategically placed landscaping and buffering elements. Thus, the alternative would result in a significant impact not identified for the project and that would be reduced to less than significant, after implementation of mitigation measures.

### ***Visual Quality and Shadow***

For Alternative 2, buildings west of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be the same height as buildings west of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue. However, east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue, instead of two high-rise residential towers of 15 and 16 feet, Alternative 2 would result in one, three-story building, which would result in fewer visual impacts. This three-story mixed-use building, with townhomes and commercial on two floors would also result in less new shadow because two-story existing buildings would be located north and south of the new building. Overall, Alternative 2 would result in reduced less-than-significant land use impacts identified with the project.

### ***Transportation, Circulation, and Parking***

Under Alternative 2, total development on the site would be less than the proposed project. With fewer residential units and slightly more space dedicated to commercial, development under this alternative would result in slightly fewer peak-hour vehicle trips than estimated for the proposed project AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips would be approximately 76 and 81 percent, respectively, of the trips estimated for the project (representing reductions of 24 and 19 percent; see **Appendix E** to this EIR). While peak-hour trips would be fewer, Alternative 2 would continue to result in the significant impacts identified with the project, which are considered significant and avoidable because feasible mitigation measure to reduce the impacts to less than significant require City of Alameda approval. Also, site design conditions affecting circulation would be similar to that proposed by the project, thus the alternative would have the same or reduced less-than-significant site access and circulation impacts identified with the project. Also, parking configuration of the alternative would be similar to what is proposed as part of the project, and parking supply would continue to exceed parking demand.

Fewer new residents (those associated with 420 fewer units) would occur with Alternative 2 compared to the project), however, there would likely be more employees associated with the *additional* 8,110 square feet of non-commercial space that would occur compared to the proposed project. A net increase in transit demand would likely result compared to the project, however, the net increase is not anticipated to result in a significant transit impact; the less-than-significant impact identified for the project would continue to result with Alternative 2. Overall, Alternative 2 would result in reduced less-than-significant traffic impacts identified with the project.

### ***Air Quality***

The demolition and new construction under Alternative 2 would result in similar less-than-significant construction-related air quality impacts (dust) as would occur with the proposed project. Standard conditions required for the proposed project would also be required for this alternative. As discussed above for traffic, Alternative 2 would result in approximately 76 percent of the project's AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 81 percent of the project's PM peak-hour vehicle trips – representing reductions of 24 and 19 percent, respectively (see **Appendix E** to this EIR). Thus, the reduced scale of Alternative 2 would result in fewer operational air quality effects as for the proposed project, and the impact would remain a less than significant, as identified for the project.

### ***Noise***

The demolition and construction activities under Alternative 2 would result in similar less-than-significant construction-related noise impacts, but possibly for a shorter time period given the reduced number of units. The same standard conditions and mitigation measures required for the proposed project regarding reducing indoor and outdoor noise levels and groundborne vibration would apply to the alternative. Also, as discussed above for traffic and air, Alternative 2 would result in approximately 76 percent of the project's AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 81 percent of the project's PM peak-hour vehicle trips – representing reductions of 24 and 19 percent, respectively (see **Appendix E** to this EIR). As a result, this alternative would result in relatively lesser noise impact, but would have the same less-than-significant impacts that would occur with the project, after implementation of standard conditions.

The noise effects from the adjacent passing trains (railroad and BART) that border the site west of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be the same as with the project since Alternative 2 would locate residences adjacent to these noise sources. However, effects from these noise sources on the 28 townhomes that would occur east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue could be slightly reduced given the intervening development that would remain between the railroad tracks and the sponsor-owned property. The standard conditions identified for the proposed project to address interior and outdoor noise exposure and groundborne vibration would also be required for the alternative, thus it would result in the same less-than-significant impact. Overall, Alternative 2 would result in the same or reduced less-than-significant noise impacts identified with the project.

### ***Hazards and Hazardous Materials***

Demolition of the fewer existing buildings would occur under Alternative 2 than with the project. Therefore, the alternative may have lesser effects that could occur from demolishing a structure that could contain hazardous materials (e.g., lead-based paint, asbestos), as well as the handling of and public exposure to contaminated materials during construction activities and operation of the project. Also, since Alternative 2 would cover less of the proposed project site, fewer areas of contamination would be addressed. However, all standard conditions identified for the proposed project would be required to reduce potential impacts from contamination to groundwater and

soils to less than significant. Overall, Alternative 2 would result in the same less-than-significant hazardous materials impacts identified with the project.

### ***Public Services and Recreation***

Because Alternative 2 would have fewer units (thus fewer households) than the project, it would also generate fewer school-aged children and result in less demand for public services and facilities, including recreation facilities. Residents and school-aged children associated with 272 fewer residential units (even considering increased employee population and building area on the site associated with an additional 8,110 square feet of commercial use) would likely impact public services to a lesser extent than the proposed project. The useable open space and park area that the project proposes on the portion of the site west of 29<sup>th</sup> Street would be the same under this alternative, therefore there would be more usable open space per unit for the entire development since 282 fewer units proposed with the project would not occur east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue with the alternative. As with the proposed project, the alternative would adhere to the City's requirement for on-site open space and off-site improvements to reduce the effects to park and recreation facilities in the project area, which is currently underserved. The project sponsor would still make improvements to local parks and recreation programs, though possibly to a lesser degree. Overall, this alternative would result in the same less-than-significant impacts on public services and recreation facilities as identified for the project.

### ***Utilities and Service Systems***

Alternative 2 would result in approximately 272 fewer residential units than the proposed project, and nearly 8,110 more square feet commercial use. Taken together, the changes in utility and service systems use demand may result in no net change in effect. Overall, this alternative would result in the same less-than-significant utilities and service systems impacts that would occur with the project.

### ***Hydrology and Water Quality***

Alternative 2 would result in less development than the project, but would continue to develop all parts of the site. Like the project, the alternative would not result in a substantial reduction in impervious surface area on the site compared to existing conditions. Development of Alternative 2 would incorporate existing regulatory standards, requirements, and best management practices (during construction and project operations) aimed at reducing untreated runoff, soil erosion, and potential flooding in particular. Standard conditions identified to reduce the project's impacts to less than significant would apply to Alternative 2 as well. Overall, Alternative 2 would result in the same less-than-significant water quality impacts identified for the project.

### ***Geology, Soils, and Seismicity***

Alternative 2 would construct new development on the site that is subject to seismic ground shaking, settlement and other seismic hazards as the project. However, with the reduced development, this alternative would expose fewer people to such risks compared to the project. Since overall development and on-site population would be less than with the project, the effect

could be considered less. Alternative 2 would result in the same less-than-significant geology and seismic hazards impact as identified for the project.

### ***Population, Housing, Employment***

Alternative 2 would introduce new population growth, housing, and newly created jobs on the project site. No housing units would be displaced, but the same existing businesses would be incrementally removed from the site as the project is developed over time. With 272 fewer residential units and approximately 8,118 square foot more commercial space, the alternative would not have a substantially different effect on unplanned growth than the project would. The effect of Alternative to 2 would be less-than-significant and somewhat reduced from that identified for the project.

### ***Biological Resources***

The demolition and new construction under Alternative 2 would result in similar less-than-significant biological resource effects as would occur with the proposed project. Standard conditions required to reduce potential impacts to special-status nesting birds and removal of protected trees in particular would also be required for this alternative. Like the project, Alternative 2 would remove any existing “protected” trees identified on the site pursuant to the Oakland Tree Ordinance, however, fewer trees may be affected given that the development that would occur east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue with this Alternative would not be located in the area of the existing trees. This alternative would thus have the same less-than-significant impact identified for the project.

### ***Cultural Resources***

Subsurface activities associated with site preparation and construction would be required to develop Alternative 2 to essentially the same degree as the project given the construction of multifamily buildings up to 12 stories tall. Thus, the alternative could have the same potentially significant effect identified for the project, and the standard conditions identified to reduce impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources would also apply. No historic resources as defined by CEQA exist on or in close enough proximity to be adversely affected by the project. Therefore, overall, the alternative would maintain the less-than-significant impacts to cultural resources that were identified for the project.

---

## **Alternative 3: Industrial / Live-Work**

### **Description**

Alternative 3 would redevelop the project site with light industrial uses and new joint living and working units (i.e. live / work units). This alternative helps provide a reasonable range of alternatives as required by CEQA. As indicated in **Table V-6** below, Alternative 3 would only

develop approximately 145,000 square feet of light industrial use and 18 commercial live-work units (and associated parking) across the project site.

Approximately 45,000 square feet of light industrial space would occur in the *Business Mix* area at the westernmost 3.0 acres of the site, and an estimated 100,000 square feet of light industrial use would occur in the *Regional Commercial* area at the 3.6-acres of the site east of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue (including parcels that the project sponsor does not currently control). Three to four new one- and two-story industrial buildings would be developed. Possible light industrial activities that could occur include manufacturing and/or processing of “articles of merchandise” involving materials specified in Section 17.10.560 of the Oakland Planning Code and would be subject to operational performance standards to ensure compatibility with nearby residential uses, pursuant to Section 17.70.090.

As shown in **Table V-6**, 18 new commercial live-work units would be constructed within the *Mixed Housing Type Residential* area of the site – approximately 3.0 acres at the southwest corner of East 12th Street and 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue. These units would be constructed in linear, two- to three-story commercial townhouse style similar to the residential townhomes proposed by the project. The live/work units would be oriented to front directly onto East 12<sup>th</sup> Street. This configuration would allow two rows of units (estimated 10 units each) on the site, with commercial and residential parking and loading areas located internal to the site.

**TABLE V-6  
DETAILED SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE 3 – LIGHT INDUSTRIAL / LIVE-WORK**

Site No.	No. Stories	Approximate Building Height (Ft.) to roof	Residential Units	No. Residential Parking Spaces	Parking Spaces Per Unit	Non-Residential Uses (SF)	Non-Residential Parking Spaces Provided
1 - 2	1	15 to 20			–	45,000 light industrial	30
3 - 4	2 to 3	20 to 30	18 live-work	27	1.5	–	–
5 - 6	1	15 to 20			–	100,000 light industrial	67
<b>TOTAL</b>	N/A	N/A	18 live-work	27	1.5	145,000 SF	97

### Impacts (Alternative 3)

#### *Land Use, Plans and Policies*

No General Plan Amendment would occur under Alternative 3; three existing General Plan land use classifications on the site would remain. The light industrial uses would occur in the existing *Business Mix* and *Regional Commercial* areas, and the live-work uses would occur in the *Mixed Housing Type Residential* area. Only activities consistent with the “light manufacturing activities” defined in the Oakland Planning Code (Section 17.10.560) would occur (considering also the underlying M-30 General Industrial Zone and the City’s General Plan Guidelines). Such uses

would be further limited by the operational performance standards that address compatibility with nearby residential uses (Oakland Planning Code Section 17.10.560). As a result (and as discussed for Alternative 1b, which would introduce 45,000 square feet of industrial use to the site), the light industrial and live-work uses in low-rise buildings would not result in a potentially significant land use conflict with the adjacent OHA property maintenance building and yard or industrial, office, school, or residential uses nearby.

As also discussed for Alternative 1b, this alternative would support *Coliseum Redevelopment Plan* goals regarding employment growth and light industrial expansion to a greater extent than the proposed project would. Conversely, while locating new light industrial use in this location would not result in a potentially significant land use conflict, it may not fully support General Plan policies and that seek active commercial and residential development along major corridors and near public transit, particularly in visually-prominent, mixed use residential areas.

Overall, Alternative 3 would result in reduced less-than-significant land use impacts identified with the project.

### ***Visual Quality and Shadow***

Alternative 3 would develop substantially lower (and fewer) buildings on the project site. Three to four new one- and two-story industrial buildings would be developed, along with 18 three-story live/work units, compared to the eight- to sixteen-story buildings that would occur with the project. As a result, Alternative 3 would result in reduced less-than-significant impact regarding shadow and scenic vistas and views as identified with the project. This alternative assumes, consistent with *Coliseum Redevelopment Plan* goals, that the light industrial development would be of equal design integrity as the new residential or commercial/retail development that would occur with the project. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in the same less-than-significant visual quality effects as the project.

### ***Transportation, Circulation, and Parking***

Alternative 3 would result in substantially fewer AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips that would occur with the project. The light industrial and live-work uses would result in 37 percent of the project's AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 15 percent of the project's PM peak-hour trips, representing reductions of 63 and 85 percent, respectively (see **Appendix E** to this EIR). As a result, the traffic impacts would be less than what would occur with the project. Specifically, Alternative 3 would avoid all significant and unavoidable impacts identified for the proposed project. Site design conditions affecting circulation would be somewhat different, depending on the configuration of site buildings, however, it is not anticipated that site access and circulation effects would be worse with the alternative, particularly considering that the project would continue to be subject to City design review and all site design standards that ensure safe and adequate access and circulation within and around the site. Substantially more parking provided with Alternative 3 than with the proposed project (97 spaces compared to 65), and parking supply would continue to exceed parking demand.

While the light industrial uses in Alternative 3 could potentially result in more on-site population (since it could theoretically include a high-employment operation) than would occur with the proposed project, potentially resulting in a net increase in transit demand, the net increase is not anticipated to result in a significant transit impact. The less-than-significant impact identified for the project would continue to result with Alternative 3. Overall, Alternative 3 would result in reduced less-than-significant traffic impacts identified with the project.

### ***Air Quality***

The demolition and new construction under Alternative 3 would result in similar less-than-significant construction-related air quality impacts (dust) as would occur with the proposed project. Standard conditions required for the proposed project would also be required for this alternative. As discussed above for traffic, Alternative 3 would result in 37 percent of the project's AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 15 percent of the project's PM peak-hour vehicle trips, representing reductions of 63 and 85 percent, respectively (see **Appendix E** to this EIR). As a result, operational air quality impacts for the alternative would be reduced compared to the project and would continue to be less than significant.

### ***Noise***

The demolition and new construction under Alternative 3 would result in similar less-than-significant construction-related noise impacts as would occur with the proposed project, after implementation of the standard conditions required for the proposed project. As discussed above for traffic, Alternative 3 would result in 37 percent of the project's AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 15 percent of the project's PM peak-hour vehicle trips, representing reductions of 63 and 85 percent, respectively (see **Appendix E** to this EIR). While the project's operational noise effects were less than significant, they levels still would be reduced compared to the project. The alternative would not introduce noise-sensitive uses (residential) on the site, so noise effects from the adjacent passing trains (railroad and BART) that border the site would have a reduced effect than identified for the proposed project. Because the City designates live-work uses as commercial activities, this analysis assumes that, although not required, the project sponsor would implement the mitigation measures and standard conditions identified for the proposed project to address the effects of indoor noise exposure and groundborne vibration to live-work tenants. While the noise and vibration effects would be less due to substantially fewer dwelling units (albeit commercial live-work), overall, Alternative 3 would result in the same or reduced less-than-significant noise impacts identified with the project, after implementation of mitigation standard conditions.

### ***Hazards and Hazardous Materials***

Demolition of the existing buildings would occur under Alternative 3, as with the project. This alternative would result in the same less-than-significant impact that could occur from demolishing a structure that could contain hazardous materials (e.g., lead-based paint, asbestos), as well as the handling of and public exposure to contaminated materials during construction activities and operation of the project; the same standard conditions identified with the project to

address hazards would apply to the alternative. In addition, development under this alternative would require the same clean-up of hazardous site conditions as the project. Overall, Alternative 3 would result in the same less-than-significant hazardous materials impacts identified for the project.

### ***Public Services and Recreation***

Alternative 3 would result in similar less-than-significant impacts to public services and facilities as identified with the project. Tenants and relate school-aged children associated with 18 live-work units would occur in this alternative and be substantially less than what would occur with the project. While the commercial uses would have demands for police and fire service, the levels would not likely be substantially more than for 810 residences and 25,095 square feet of commercial retail space. The alternative would likely provide less on-site open space given the proposed uses, the project also would not likely make improvements to local parks and recreation programs to reduce the effects to park and recreation facilities in the project area. Overall, Alternative 3 would result in the same less-than-significant impacts to public services and recreation facilities.

### ***Utilities and Service Systems***

Alternative 3 would result in 145,000 square feet of light industrial use and 18 live-work units compared to approximately 30,095 square feet of commercial use and 810 residential units. While substantially different than the project, the alternative is not expected to result in an increased demand for utilities and services systems compared to the project uses. Overall, this alternative would result in the same less-than-significant utilities and service systems impacts that would occur with the project.

### ***Hydrology and Water Quality***

Alternative 3 would result in less development than the project, but would continue to develop all parts of the site. Like the project, the alternative would not result in a substantial reduction in impervious surface area on the site compared to existing conditions. Development of Alternative 3 would incorporate existing regulatory standards, requirements, and best management practices (during construction and project operations) aimed at reducing untreated runoff, soil erosion, and potential flooding in particular. Standard conditions identified to reduce the project's impacts to less than significant would apply to Alternative 3 as well. Overall, Alternative 3 would result in the same less-than-significant water quality impacts identified for the project.

### ***Geology, Soils, and Seismicity***

Alternative 3 would construct new development on the site that is subject to seismic ground shaking, settlement and other seismic hazards as the project. However, with the reduced development, this alternative would expose fewer people, particularly residents (18 live-work proposed) to such risks compared to the project. Since overall development and on-site population would be less than with the project, the effect could be considered less. Alternative 3

would result in the same less-than-significant geology and seismic hazards impact as identified for the project.

### ***Population, Housing, Employment***

Alternative 3 would not introduce substantial population or housing since 18 live-work units would be created, however, the remainder of the project would be 145,000 square feet of new light industrial uses. No housing units would be displaced, but the same existing businesses would be incrementally removed from the site as the project is developed over time. The alternative would not induce unplanned growth as a result of the new housing or businesses on the site, particularly to any greater extent than the proposed project. The impact would be less-than-significant and somewhat reduced from that identified for the project.

### ***Biological Resources***

The demolition and new construction under Alternative 3 would result in similar less-than-significant biological resource effects as would occur with the proposed project. Standard conditions required to reduce potential impacts to special-status nesting birds and removal of protected trees in particular would also be required for this alternative. Like the project, Alternative 3 would remove any existing “protected” trees identified on the site pursuant to the Oakland Tree Ordinance and would thus have the same less-than-significant impact identified for the project.

### ***Cultural Resources***

Subsurface activities associated with site preparation and construction would be required to develop Alternative 3, but likely to a much lesser extent than would be required for the taller buildings associated with the project. Thus, the Alternative could have the same potentially significant effect identified for the project, and the standard conditions identified to reduce impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources would also apply. No historic resources as defined by CEQA exist on or in close enough proximity to be adversely affected by the project. Therefore, overall, the alternative would maintain the less-than-significant impacts to cultural resources that were identified for the project.

---

## **E. Environmentally Superior Alternative - Light Industrial and Live-Work (Alternative 3)**

None of the alternatives discussed in this analysis would avoid all of the significant environmental impacts associated with the project. Even Alternative 1a (No Project / Continuation of Recent/Existing Uses and Buildings) would maintain potentially significant traffic impacts at existing intersections that would continue to operate at poor conditions and potentially significant hazardous materials impacts associated with the existing site and that

would not be achieved without measures that would otherwise occur with development of the site.

Therefore, based on the analysis of relative environmental effects presented in this chapter, Alternative 3, Light Industrial and Live-work, which would develop the site with approximately 145,000 square feet of light industrial use and 18 commercial live-work units (and associated parking) on the 9.7-acre proposed site, emerges as the Environmental Superior Alternative under CEQA.

Alternative 3 would develop a combination of uses that would substantially reduce the peak-hour vehicle trips, and thus the corresponding operational effects to air quality and noise. Alternative 3 would result in 37 percent of the project's AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 15 percent of the project's PM peak-hour trips, representing reductions of 63 and 85 percent, respectively (see **Appendix E** to this EIR). As a result, Alternative 3 would avoid each of the significant and unavoidable traffic impacts identified for the project. Less-than-significant traffic effects (identified as significant and reduced to less than significant with mitigation measures and/or standard conditions of approval, or as less than significant requiring no mitigation measure or standard condition), identified for the project would be the same or reduced with Alternative 3.

Similarly, Alternative 3 would implement standard conditions identified in this EIR to address existing and potential hazardous conditions on the project site and potentially in existing buildings – activities that would occur with each of the other alternatives and the project, but not with the continuation of existing conditions (i.e., Alternative 1a).

Because Alternative 3 would not include residential uses and would develop buildings up to three-stories tall (compared to up to twelve and sixteen stories tall with the project), all other environmental effects associated with construction and operations would be the same or less than identified for the project - specifically land use compatibility; shadow and scenic vistas; public services and recreation facilities and utilities; exposure to seismic hazards, and interior noise and vibration (associated with trains).

---

**Table V-7**, starting on the following page, summarizes the relative environmental effects of the project compared to those resulting with each alternative discussed in this chapter.

**TABLE V-7  
SUMMARY OF RELATIVE IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>1a: No Project Existing Conditions</b>	<b>1b: Existing General Plan</b>	<b>2: Partial Site</b>	<b>3: Light Industrial / Live-Work</b>
	<b>810 units; 31,000 sf commercial/ educational</b>	<b>158,000 sf commercial/ storage</b>	<b>390 units; 72,000 sf commercial / light industrial / educational</b>	<b>538 units; 38,000 sf commercial/ educational</b>	<b>18 live-work; 145,000 sf light industrial</b>

**A. Land Use, Plans, and Policies**

**Impact LU-1:** The project would not physically divide an existing community or fundamentally conflict with existing adjacent land uses.

LS                      N                      LS                      LS↑                      LS↓

**Impact LU-2:** The project would not result in a fundamental conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

LS                      N                      LS                      LS                      N

**Impact LU-3:** The project, combined with other foreseeable development included in the Oakland cumulative growth scenario, would not result in cumulative land use impacts.

LS                      N                      LS                      LS                      LS

**B. Visual Quality and Shadow**

**Impact AES-1:** The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially damage scenic resources.

LS                      N                      LS↓                      LS↓                      LS↓

**Impact AES-2:** The proposed project would alter the existing visual conditions on the project site, but would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

LS                      N                      LS                      LS                      LS

**Impact AES-3:** The proposed project would create a new source light or glare, but would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

LS\*                      N                      LS\*                      LS\*↓                      LS\*

**Impact AES-4:** The proposed project would result in additional shadow on adjacent areas, however, the project would not cast shadow on historic resources; would not introduce landscaping conflicting with the California Public Resource Code, would not cast shadow on buildings using passive solar heat, solar collectors for hot water heating, or photovoltaic solar collectors; and would not cast shadow that impairs the use of any public or quasi-public park, lawn, garden, or open space.

LS                      N                      LS                      LS↓                      LS↓

**NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.**

**Legend**

- LS    Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required (\*Standard condition identified, but not required for significant impact)
- LSM    Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- LSC    Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
- S/SU    Significant or Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- N    No impact
- B    Beneficial
- ↑↓    Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation

**TABLE V-6 (continued)**  
**SUMMARY OF RELATIVE IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>1a: No Project Existing Conditions</b>	<b>1b: Existing General Plan</b>	<b>2: Partial Site</b>	<b>3: Light Industrial / Live-Work</b>
	810 units; 31,000 sf commercial/ educational	158,000 sf commercial/ storage	390 units; 72,000 sf commercial / light industrial / educational	538 units; 38,000 sf commercial/ educational	18 live-work; 145,000 sf light industrial
<b>Impact AES-5:</b> The proposed project may require an exception (variance) to applicable policies and regulations addressing the provision of adequate light related to appropriate uses.	LS	N	LS	LS↓	LS↓
<b>Impact AES-6:</b> The proposed project, when combined with other foreseeable development in the vicinity, as identified in the Oakland cumulative growth scenario, could result in cumulative impacts related to visual character views, aesthetics, shadow, light and glare.	LS	N	LS	LS	LS
<b>C. Transportation, Circulation, and Parking</b>					
<b>Impact TRANS-1:</b> Traffic generated by the proposed project would affect project driveways	LS	N	LS	LS	LS
<b>Impact TRANS-2:</b> Traffic generated by the project would affect traffic levels of service at the study intersection under Baseline plus Project Conditions.	SU	SU↓	SU↓	SU	LSM
<b>Impact TRANS-3:</b> Traffic generated by the proposed project would affect traffic levels of service at the study intersection under near term 2010 Conditions.	SU	SU↓	SU↓	SU	LSM
<b>Impact TRANS-4:</b> Traffic generated by the proposed project in combination with cumulative growth would affect traffic levels of service at local intersections under Cumulative (2025) Conditions	SU	SU↓	SU↓	SU	LSM
<b>Impact TRANS-5:</b> Traffic generated by the project would affect baseline traffic levels on freeway segments in the project area.	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>Impact TRANS-6:</b> Traffic generated by the project would affect traffic levels on freeway segments in the project area under future (2010) Conditions.	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>Impact TRANS-7:</b> Traffic generated by the proposed project would affect traffic levels on freeway segments in the project area under Cumulative (2025) Conditions.	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>Impact TRANS-8:</b> The proposed project would increase ridership on public transit providers serving the area.	LS	N	LS	LS	LS

**NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.**

Legend:

LS	Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required (*Standard condition identified, but not required for significant impact)
LSM	Less than significant impact, after mitigation
LSC	Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
S/SU	Significant or Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
N	No impact
B	Beneficial
↑↓	Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation

**TABLE V-7 (continued)  
SUMMARY OF RELATIVE IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>1a: No Project Existing Conditions</b>	<b>1b: Existing General Plan</b>	<b>2: Partial Site</b>	<b>3: Light Industrial / Live-Work</b>
	<b>810 units; 31,000 sf commercial/ educational</b>	<b>158,000 sf commercial/ storage</b>	<b>390 units; 72,000 sf commercial / light industrial / educational</b>	<b>538 units; 38,000 sf commercial/ educational</b>	<b>18 live-work; 145,000 sf light industrial</b>
<b>Impact TRANS-9:</b> Development of the proposed project would conflict with existing pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities.	LS	N	LS	LS	LS
<b>Impact TRANS-10:</b> Development of the proposed project would require improvements to pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities.	LS	N	LS	LS	LS
<b>Impact TRANS-11:</b> Construction of the proposed project would affect traffic flow and circulation, parking, and pedestrian safety.	LSM	N	LSM	LSM	LSM
<b>Impact TRANS-12:</b> Development of the proposed project would have a cumulative impact on roadway segments in the regional traffic network.	LS	N	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>D. Air Quality</b>					
<b>Impact AIR-1:</b> Activities associated with demolition, site preparation, and construction throughout development of the project would generate suspended and inhalable particulate matter.	LSC	N	LSC	LSC↓	LSC↓
<b>Impact AIR-2:</b> Activities associated with demolition, site preparation and construction throughout development of the project would generate emissions of criteria pollutants, including equipment exhaust emissions.	LS*	N	LS*	LS*↓	LS*↓
<b>Impact AIR-3:</b> The project would result in increased emissions of criteria pollutants and their precursors from vehicular traffic to and from the project site, however, the emission increases from the project would not exceed Bay Area Air Quality Management District significance criteria.	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>Impact AIR-4:</b> Mobile emissions generated by project traffic would increase carbon monoxide concentrations at intersections in the project vicinity.	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>Impact AIR-5:</b> The proposed project could result in exposure of persons to substantial levels of Toxic Air Contaminants such that the probability of contracting cancer for the Maximally Exposed Individual exceeds 10 in one million.	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓

**NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.**

**Legend:**

- LS Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required (\*Standard condition identified, but not required for significant impact)
- LSM Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- LSC Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
- S / SU Significant or Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- N No impact
- B Beneficial
- ↑↓ Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation

**TABLE V-6 (continued)**  
**SUMMARY OF RELATIVE IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

	Proposed Project	1a: No Project Existing Conditions	1b: Existing General Plan	2: Partial Site	3: Light Industrial / Live-Work
	810 units; 31,000 sf commercial/ educational	158,000 sf commercial/ storage	390 units; 72,000 sf commercial / light industrial / educational	538 units; 38,000 sf commercial/ educational	18 live-work; 145,000 sf light industrial
<b>Impact AIR-6:</b> The proposed project is fundamentally consistent with the growth assumptions of the Bay Area Clean Air Plan.	LS	N	LS	LS	LS
<b>E. Noise</b>					
<b>Impact NOI-1:</b> Construction activities would intermittently and temporarily generate noise levels above existing ambient levels in the project vicinity.	LSC	N	LSC	LSC↓	LSC↓
<b>Impact NOI-2:</b> Noise from project-generated traffic and other operational noise sources, such as mechanical equipment, truck loading/unloading, etc., would not exceed the Oakland Noise Ordinance standards and impact nearby sensitive receptors.	LS	N	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>Impact NOI-3:</b> The project would place noise-sensitive multifamily residential uses in a noise environment characterized as "clearly unacceptable" for such uses by the City of Oakland.	LSC	N	LSC	LSC	LSC
<b>Impact NOI-4:</b> The project would place noise-sensitive publicly-accessible outdoor uses in a noise environment characterized as "clearly unacceptable" for such uses, as established by the Noise Element of the Oakland General Plan.	LSC	N	LSC	LSC	LS
<b>Impact NOI-5:</b> The project would expose sensitive residential uses to groundborne vibration from trains passing by on the UPRR tracks.	LSC	N	LSC	LSC	LSC
<b>Impact NOI-6:</b> The proposed project, together with anticipated future development included in the Oakland cumulative growth scenario, could result in long-term traffic increases that could cumulatively increase noise levels.	LS	N	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>F. Hazardous Materials</b>					
<b>Impact HAZ-1:</b> Historical uses at and in the vicinity of the project site have impacted soil and groundwater at the project site. Contaminated soil and groundwater could pose risks to human health and the environment.	LSC	S	LSC /B	LSC /B	LSC /B

**NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.**

Legend:

LS	Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required (*Standard condition identified, but not required for significant impact)
LSM	Less than significant impact, after mitigation
LSC	Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
S/SU	Significant or Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
N	No impact
B	Beneficial
↑↓	Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation

**TABLE V-7 (continued)  
SUMMARY OF RELATIVE IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>1a: No Project Existing Conditions</b>	<b>1b: Existing General Plan</b>	<b>2: Partial Site</b>	<b>3: Light Industrial / Live-Work</b>
	810 units; 31,000 sf commercial/ educational	158,000 sf commercial/ storage	390 units; 72,000 sf commercial / light industrial / educational	538 units; 38,000 sf commercial/ educational	18 live-work; 145,000 sf light industrial
<b>Impact HAZ-2:</b> Disturbance and release of hazardous structural and building components (i.e. asbestos, lead, PCBs, and USTs) during demolition and construction phases of the project or transport of these materials could expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to adverse conditions related to hazardous materials handling.	LSC	LS↓	LSC	LSC	LSC
<b>Impact HAZ-3:</b> Hazardous materials used onsite during construction activities (i.e. solvents, paints, fuels, and glues) could be released to the environment through improper handling or storage.	LSC	N	LSC	LSC	LSC
<b>Impact HAZ-4:</b> Accidental rupture of the petroleum pipeline located along the southern boundary of the site could result in adverse impacts to workers, the public, and the environment.	LSC	N	LSC	LSC↓	LSC
<b>Impact HAZ-5:</b> Project operations would generate and involve the handling of general commercial and household hazardous waste in small quantities, and therefore would not cause an adverse effect on the environment.	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
<b>Impact HAZ-6:</b> Development proposed as part of the project, when combined with other foreseeable development in the vicinity, would not result in cumulative hazardous materials impacts.	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
<b>G. Public Services, Parks, and Recreation Facilities</b>					
<b>Impact PS-1:</b> The increased population and density resulting from the project would not involve or require new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response time, or other performance objectives for police protection services.	LS	N	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓

**NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.**

Legend:

- LS Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required (\*Standard condition identified, but not required for significant impact)
- LSM Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- LSC Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
- S / SU Significant or Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- N No impact
- B Beneficial
- ↑↓ Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation

**TABLE V-6 (continued)**  
**SUMMARY OF RELATIVE IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>1a: No Project Existing Conditions</b>	<b>1b: Existing General Plan</b>	<b>2: Partial Site</b>	<b>3: Light Industrial / Live-Work</b>
	<b>810 units; 31,000 sf commercial/ educational</b>	<b>158,000 sf commercial/ storage</b>	<b>390 units; 72,000 sf commercial / light industrial / educational</b>	<b>538 units; 38,000 sf commercial/ educational</b>	<b>18 live-work; 145,000 sf light industrial</b>
<b>Impact PS-2:</b> The increased population and density resulting from the project would not involve or require new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response time, or other performance objectives for fire protection and emergency medical services and facilities.	LS	N	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>Impact PS-3:</b> The students generated by the project would not require new or physically altered school facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives at local public schools.	LS	N	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>Impact PS-4:</b> The proposed project has the potential to increase the onsite resident population, and would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, resulting in substantial new or accelerated physical deterioration.	LS	N	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>Impact PS-5:</b> Increased population resulting from the proposed project, in conjunction with that generated by other foreseeable development in the city and the project vicinity, would increase the cumulative demand for public services, parks, and other recreational facilities such that new facilities could be needed in order to maintain acceptable citywide service ratios.	LS	N	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>H. Utilities and Service Systems</b>					
<b>Impact UTIL-1:</b> The project would not exceed water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, nor require or result in construction of water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	LS	N	LS	LS↓	LS

**NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.**

Legend:

LS	Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required (*Standard condition identified, but not required for significant impact)
LSM	Less than significant impact, after mitigation
LSC	Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
S/SU	Significant or Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
N	No impact
B	Beneficial
↑↓	Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation

**TABLE V-7 (continued)  
SUMMARY OF RELATIVE IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>1a: No Project Existing Conditions</b>	<b>1b: Existing General Plan</b>	<b>2: Partial Site</b>	<b>3: Light Industrial / Live-Work</b>
	810 units; 31,000 sf commercial/ educational	158,000 sf commercial/ storage	390 units; 72,000 sf commercial / light industrial / educational	538 units; 38,000 sf commercial/ educational	18 live-work; 145,000 sf light industrial
<b>Impact UTIL-2:</b> The project's projected wastewater demand would not result in the City of Oakland exceeding its citywide projected base flow allocation, however, it would exceed base flow allocation for Subbasins 60-04 and 62-01, which may require construction of new or expanded facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	LSC	N	LSC	LSC↓	LSC
<b>Impact UTIL-3:</b> The project would not require or result in construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	LS	N	LS	LS↓	LS
<b>Impact UTIL-4:</b> The project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs, and would not require or result in construction of landfill facilities or expansion of existing facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Additionally, the project would not impede the ability of the City to meet the waste diversion requirements of the California Integrated Waste Management Act or the Alameda County Waste Reduction and Recycling Initiative or cause the City to violate other applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	LS*	N	LS*↓	LS*↓	LS*↓
<b>Impact UTIL-5:</b> The project would not violate applicable federal, state and local statutes and regulations relating to energy standards; nor would the proposed project result in a determination by the energy provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the providers' existing commitments and require or result in construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	LS	N	LS ↓	LS ↓	LS

**NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.**

Legend:

- LS Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required (\*Standard condition identified, but not required for significant impact)
- LSM Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- LSC Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
- S / SU Significant or Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- N No impact
- B Beneficial
- ↑↓ Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation

**TABLE V-6 (continued)**  
**SUMMARY OF RELATIVE IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>1a: No Project Existing Conditions</b>	<b>1b: Existing General Plan</b>	<b>2: Partial Site</b>	<b>3: Light Industrial / Live-Work</b>
	810 units; 31,000 sf commercial/ educational	158,000 sf commercial/ storage	390 units; 72,000 sf commercial / light industrial / educational	538 units; 38,000 sf commercial/ educational	18 live-work; 145,000 sf light industrial
<b>Impact UTIL-6:</b> The increased development resulting from the proposed project, in conjunction with population and density of other foreseeable development in the city, would not result in cumulative impacts on utilities and service systems.	LS	N	LS ↓	LS ↓	LS
<b>I. Hydrology and Water Quality</b>					
<b>Impact HYD-1:</b> Construction-related erosion during project development could result in adverse impacts to the water quality of the Oakland Inner Harbor and San Francisco Bay.	LSC	N	LSC	LSC	LSC
<b>Impact HYD-2:</b> Project excavation activities would not deplete groundwater supplies nor substantially interfere with groundwater recharge or cause contaminated groundwater discharge to contaminate surface water	LSC	N	LSC	LSC	LSC
<b>Impact HYD-3:</b> Implementation of the proposed project could result in development and uses that contribute to Non-Point Source (NPS) pollution levels in the Oakland Estuary and San Francisco Bay.	LSC	LS↑	LSC	LSC	LSC
<b>Impact HYD-4:</b> Implementation of the proposed project could alter drainage patterns on the project site, potentially having adverse effects on the volume and/or timing of peak runoff in the municipal storm drain system.	LSC	N	LSC	LSC	LSC
<b>Impact HYD-5:</b> The project would not result in flooding due to its proximity to a 100-year flood hazard area, or expose people or structures to other substantial risk related to flooding, seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	LS	N	LS	LS	LS
<b>Impact HYD-6:</b> The increased construction activity and new development resulting from the project, in conjunction with other foreseeable development in the city, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts on hydrology and water quality conditions.	LS	N	LS	LS	LS
<b>J. Geology, Soils, Seismicity</b>					

**NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.**

Legend:

LS	Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required (*Standard condition identified, but not required for significant impact)
LSM	Less than significant impact, after mitigation
LSC	Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
S/SU	Significant or Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
N	No impact
B	Beneficial
↑↓	Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation

**TABLE V-7 (continued)  
SUMMARY OF RELATIVE IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>1a: No Project Existing Conditions</b>	<b>1b: Existing General Plan</b>	<b>2: Partial Site</b>	<b>3: Light Industrial / Live-Work</b>
	<b>810 units; 31,000 sf commercial/ educational</b>	<b>158,000 sf commercial/ storage</b>	<b>390 units; 72,000 sf commercial / light industrial / educational</b>	<b>538 units; 38,000 sf commercial/ educational</b>	<b>18 live-work; 145,000 sf light industrial</b>
<b>Impact GEO-1:</b> Redevelopment in the project area could expose people or structures to seismic hazards such as groundshaking or liquefaction	LS*	LS*↓	LS*↓	LS*↓	LS*↓
<b>Impact GEO-2:</b> Redevelopment in the project area could expose people or structures to surface fault rupture.	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
<b>Impact GEO-3:</b> Redevelopment in the project area could be subjected to geologic hazards, including expansive soils, differential settlement, and erosion.	LS	LS↓	LS	LS	LS
<b>Impact GEO-4:</b> The development proposed as part of the project, when combined with other reasonably foreseeable development in the vicinity, would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to geology, soils or seismicity.	LS	N	LS	LS	LS
<b>K. Population, Housing, Employment</b>					
<b>Impact POP-1:</b> The project would not induce substantial population growth, directly, by proposing new housing or businesses, or indirectly, through infrastructure improvements, such that additional infrastructure is required that was not previously considered or analyzed.	LS	N	LS	LS↓	LS↓
<b>L. Biological Resources</b>					
<b>Impact BIO-1:</b> Implementation of the proposed project could result in the removal of, pruning of, and potential damage to protected trees.	LSC	N	LSC	LSC	LSC
<b>Impact BIO-2:</b> Activities associated with the construction of the proposed project could result in adverse impacts on special-status bird species.	LSC	N	LSC	LSC	LSC
<b>Impact BIO-3:</b> Tree removal, building demolition, pile driving, and other proposed construction activities during the breeding season could result in impacts to special-status bat species.	LS	N	LS	LS↓	LS

**NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.**

Legend:

- LS Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required (\*Standard condition identified, but not required for significant impact)
- LSM Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- LSC Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
- S / SU Significant or Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- N No impact
- B Beneficial
- ↑↓ Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation

**TABLE V-6 (continued)**  
**SUMMARY OF RELATIVE IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>1a: No Project Existing Conditions</b>	<b>1b: Existing General Plan</b>	<b>2: Partial Site</b>	<b>3: Light Industrial / Live-Work</b>
	810 units; 31,000 sf commercial/ educational	158,000 sf commercial/ storage	390 units; 72,000 sf commercial / light industrial / educational	538 units; 38,000 sf commercial/ educational	18 live-work; 145,000 sf light industrial
<b>Impact BIO-4:</b> Construction activity resulting from the project, in conjunction with other foreseeable infill development in already heavily urbanized portions of the city, could result in impacts on special-status birds and bats	LS	N	LS	LS↓	LS
M. Cultural Resources					
<b>Impact CUL-1:</b> The project could adversely affect unknown or undocumented historical resources or unique archaeological resources.	LSC	N	LSC	LSC	LSC
<b>Impact CUL-2:</b> The project would adversely affect paleontological resources	LSC	N	LSC	LSC↓	LSC
<b>Impact CUL-3:</b> The project would have an adverse impact to architectural resources or built historical resources.	LS	N	LS	LS	LS
<b>Impact CUL-4:</b> The proposed project could contribute to cumulative impacts on cultural resources.	LS	N	LS	LS	LS
Agricultural Resources: The project would not result in impacts to agricultural resources. (No Impact)	N	N	N	N	N
Mineral Resources: The project would not result in impacts on mineral resources. (No Impact)	N	N	N	N	N

**NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.**

Legend:

LS	Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required (*Standard condition identified, but not required for significant impact)
LSM	Less than significant impact, after mitigation
LSC	Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
S/SU	Significant or Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
N	No impact
B	Beneficial
↑↓	Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation

