

APPENDIX A-1

APPENDIX A-1

REVISIONS TO ABAG EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS ARE NOT ANTICIPATED TO SUBSTANTIALLY CHANGE EIR CONCLUSIONS FROM TRANSPORTATION MODEL ANALYSES

This response addresses the concerns raised about the effects of the recently revised ABAG employment allocations on the results of the transportation analyses in the *Uptown Mixed-use Project EIR*. The text that follows responds to those concerns and makes three main points. First, the response explains that the recently identified inaccuracies in the original ABAG employment allocations do not affect the land use data for Oakland as the allocations of Oakland employment are not based on the ABAG data. Second, the validity of the Oakland land use data supports the adequacy and validity of the EIR transportation analyses and forecasts given the importance of the Oakland land use data to those analyses and their results. Third, the response goes on to explain that possible revisions to the allocations of employment in other cities in Alameda County outside of the EIR study area are not anticipated to substantially change the EIR conclusions drawn from the recent transportation model analyses.

ACCMA REVIEW OF MODEL LAND USE DATA IS CURRENTLY UNDERWAY IN LIGHT OF RECENTLY REVISED EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS FROM ABAG

Since the transportation analysis for the *Uptown EIR* was completed, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) found problems with its allocations of *Projections 2002* employment data to Census Tracts within cities in the region, and recently issued revised employment allocations. Citywide employment totals for jurisdictions remain the same as those originally provided by ABAG.¹ The *Projections 2002* household and population totals for jurisdictions and the allocations of households and population to Census Tracts within jurisdictions remain unchanged and are not affected by the recent ABAG revisions to the allocations of employment. The Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA) is currently in the process of reviewing the employment data in the ACCMA model and revising the employment allocations in the model for those situations affected by the ABAG revisions.

¹ Per communications with ABAG staff on October 23, 2003 (Hing Wong) and November 3, 2003 (Brian Kirking). Conversations with ABAG staff indicated that the Census Tract allocations of employment were revised because of problems with the methodology originally used to allocate *Projections 2002* employment to Census Tracts within cities. ABAG staff also indicated that employment totals for cities were not affected and should remain the same as the totals in the original data. (Analyses of the revised Census Tract allocations from ABAG show only small differences in employment totals for some cities as calculated for the revised Census Tract files compared to totals calculated for the original Census Tract files and totals in the ABAG *Projections 2002* publication.)

OAKLAND LAND USE DATA FOR TRANSPORTATION MODEL ANALYSES ARE NOT AFFECTED BY REVISED EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS FROM ABAG

Oakland Land Use Data in ACCMA Model are Based on Local Allocations, Not the ABAG Allocations

The land use database for Oakland included in the ACCMA Travel Model was developed by the City of Oakland and its consultant, Hausrath Economics Group (HEG), and submitted to the ACCMA in January 2003 in response to the transmittal of preliminary land use data for city input and review prior to inclusion in the ACCMA's Travel Model 2002 (completed and released May 2003). Extensive work was done in Oakland to track and update growth assumptions and the locations of specific projects and development sites for use in the allocation of growth to traffic analysis zones (TAZs) throughout the city. Development projects, plans, and other changes were identified and updated based on input from City of Oakland and Port of Oakland staffs and on analysis of economic, demographic, and real estate market data and trends.

The land use database developed by the City of Oakland and submitted to the ACCMA for use in its Travel Model 2002 reflects the City's allocation of growth to Oakland TAZs based on extensive local information and analysis, as described above. The Oakland land use data are not based on the ABAG allocations of *Projections 2002* employment and households within the city. Although developed locally, the citywide totals for employment and households in Oakland are similar to and within one percent of the ABAG citywide totals for Oakland, as required by the ACCMA.

The recent revisions in ABAG's allocations of employment to Census Tracts within cities do not affect the Oakland employment data in the ACCMA model. That is because those data are not based on the original ABAG allocations of *Projections 2002* employment. The Oakland employment allocations are based on more extensive and in-depth local information and analysis than can be done across the region by ABAG.

Oakland Cumulative Growth Scenario Used in EIR Transportation Analyses is also Based on Local Allocations, Not the ABAG Allocations

As described in Appendix D of the EIR, much of the cumulative analysis in the *Uptown EIR* assumes Oakland's cumulative growth scenario and land use database as updated for the *Uptown EIR* instead of the land use data in the ACCMA Model 2002. The updated cumulative growth scenario for Oakland builds on the land use database in the ACCMA model. Compared to the land use in that model, the cumulative growth scenario as updated for the *Uptown EIR* includes more specificity about the Uptown project and updated assumptions (through June 2003) for other development projects, primarily those in downtown Oakland surrounding the Uptown project. In addition, the totals for Oakland's cumulative growth scenario are not constrained to fall within one percent of the ABAG totals for Oakland, if higher projections are justified by recent and expected future development projects and other anticipated changes in land use, employment, and households/housing in Oakland. As described in Appendix D, the *Uptown EIR* growth scenario for Oakland is very similar to the projections and land use database in the ACCMA Model 2002, and slightly more

conservative, as total employment in Oakland under the Uptown scenario exceeds the ACCMA/ABAG total for 2025 by more than one percent.²

The allocation of employment in Oakland's cumulative growth scenario as updated for the *Uptown EIR* builds on that developed for the ACCMA model land use database. Differences reflect updated conditions through June 2003 as well as the location of some additional growth. Like the land use data in the ACCMA model, the employment data in Oakland's growth scenario are allocated to locations within the City based on extensive local information and analyses and not on the ABAG allocations of *Projections 2002* employment. Thus, the recent ABAG revisions to the allocations of employment within cities do not affect the Oakland employment data in the *Uptown EIR* cumulative growth scenario.

Communications With ACCMA Confirm that Oakland Land Use Data are Not Affected by Revised Employment Allocations from ABAG

Communications with the ACCMA since the release of the revised ABAG employment allocations have confirmed that Oakland supplied the ACCMA with its own land use data for use in the Travel Model 2002, and that the Oakland data allocated employment and household growth within Oakland based on in-depth local information and analysis and not the ABAG *Projections 2002* allocations. Thus, the Oakland employment data in the ACCMA model are not being revised as a result of the recently revised employment allocations from ABAG.³

Validity of Oakland Land Use Data Supports Adequacy and Validity of EIR Transportation Analyses

The results of the EIR transportation analyses and model forecasts are most sensitive to the land use data for Oakland. This is because of the location of the Uptown project in Oakland and the focus of the EIR transportation analyses on the Uptown Study Area including and surrounding the project. The study area is defined to include the proposed Project site and 40 study intersections in surrounding locations in Oakland (see pps. 85-88 of the *Draft EIR*). In addition, the transportation analysis also focuses on the regional and local street networks in Oakland that serve the Project site.

As the land use data for Oakland are based on in-depth local information and analyses and not the ABAG allocations (as described above), the recently revised employment allocations from ABAG do not affect the Oakland land use data in the ACCMA Model 2002 or in Oakland's cumulative growth scenario as updated for the *Uptown EIR*. The validity of the Oakland land use data supports the adequacy and validity of the EIR transportation analyses and forecasts, given the importance of the Oakland land use data to those analyses and their results.

The allocation of growth to TAZs in the Uptown Study Area is particularly important to the EIR transportation analysis because of the intersection and other localized analyses focused on assessing the impacts of the Project. The allocation of growth to TAZs outside the study area becomes less

² Also see Response to Comment A2-2 for more explanation of the *Uptown EIR* growth scenario and of how it compares to other growth scenarios and projections.

³ Communications with ACCMA staff (Jean Hart and Diane Stark) on November 3, 2003, November 4, 2003, and during the first part of December 2003. This is further confirmed in the December 22, 2003 letter from the ACCMA (Diane Stark) to the City of Oakland regarding ACCMA review of the revised *Projections 2002* employment allocations from ABAG.

important to the EIR analysis as the distance from the study area and Project site increases. Through the workings of the travel model, traffic from activity in areas outside of Oakland is combined onto major routes and freeways that may travel through the study area and affect the EIR forecasts and impact analyses. Because of this aggregation process, the allocation of activity to specific TAZs in areas outside of Oakland is much less important to the EIR transportation analysis than the allocation of activity to TAZs within the study area and the rest of Oakland. Since the detailed land use databases for Oakland TAZs are not affected by the ABAG revisions nor are the employment and population totals for jurisdictions outside of Oakland, the EIR's forecasts and analyses of impacts appear adequate. Further, they are not likely to be substantially affected by possible future changes in the allocations of employment to TAZs in other jurisdictions outside of Oakland as may result from ACCMA's current model review process. This issue is discussed further below.

Possible Revisions to Employment Allocations Outside of Oakland are not Anticipated to Substantially Change EIR Conclusions

The ACCMA's current model review process could result in changes to the allocations of employment within other Alameda County cities outside of Oakland as a result of ABAG's recently revised employment allocations. However, such changes are not anticipated to substantially change the EIR conclusions drawn from the transportation model analyses for several reasons. First, as described above, the results of the EIR transportation analyses and model forecasts are most sensitive to the land use data for Oakland which are not affected by the changes in the ABAG data. Second, through the workings of the travel model, traffic from activity in other cities is incorporated into the EIR analyses focused on the Uptown Study Area, after having been aggregated onto streets, major routes, and freeways that may travel through the study area. Because employment totals for other cities have not been revised by ABAG, the *amount of traffic* associated with that employment also will not be affected. Possible changes in the allocation of employment in other cities, however, could affect the *allocation of associated traffic* to major routes and freeways, although such effects are moderated and can be negated by the model's aggregation process of combining traffic for numerous TAZs and Census Tracts onto a relatively limited number of major routes and freeways.⁴ Third, although not anticipated to be substantial, the potential effects of possible changes in the allocation of employment in other cities are primarily associated with nearby communities that border Oakland, particularly the central areas of Oakland, including Emeryville, Piedmont, Alameda, and possibly Berkeley and San Leandro. Possible changes in the allocation of employment in other cities are much less likely to have effects on the *Uptown EIR* transportation forecasts and analyses because of their further distances from the study area.

⁴ The transportation model's process of combining traffic for different areas onto major routes could moderate or negate the effects of possible different allocations of employment and associated traffic in several ways. One is that by combining traffic from different smaller areas onto one or more major travel routes serving the larger area, the possible effects of different employment allocations to Census Tracts and TAZs can be negated if the traffic from those Census Tracts and TAZs ends up on the same routes regardless of where the employment is allocated. (In other words, less traffic for some TAZs can be offset by more traffic in other TAZs nearby.) Another is that by combining traffic from different areas onto major travel routes, differences in the allocation of traffic for one or more cities can be small when combined with the traffic from Oakland and other cities not affected by changes. This is particularly relevant because the Project site and Uptown Study Area are located in Oakland (which is not affected by the ABAG revisions), and because of Oakland's large size relative to its neighbors (which results in over 60 percent of the TAZs in the Inner East Bay being located in Oakland).

Considerations Relevant to Nearby Cities of Emeryville, Piedmont, and Alameda

Although the ACCMA model review process is still underway, it is possible that there will be only limited or no changes in the allocations of employment in the nearby cities of Emeryville, Piedmont, and Alameda.

The City of Emeryville includes only one Census Tract within its boundaries. As a result, ABAG's revised allocations of employment to Census Tracts do not affect the allocation of employment in Emeryville. Thus, the revised ABAG employment allocations do not affect the land use data in the ACCMA model for Emeryville.

The City of Piedmont has very little employment within its borders, and includes only two Census Tracts. The City provided local inputs for the land use data currently in the ACCMA Model 2002 that substantially changed the employment allocations based on the original ABAG data. Thus, it is not anticipated that the recent ABAG revisions will affect the land use data in the ACCMA model for Piedmont.

Communication with the City of Alameda around the time that the ABAG revisions were released indicated that Alameda had provided local inputs for the land use data currently in the ACCMA Model 2002. As a result, City of Alameda staff did not anticipate that the revised ABAG data would require changes to the employment allocations in the land use database for Alameda. It also was noted by City of Alameda staff that the ABAG projections are considered to be conservative for analysis purposes by the City of Alameda, as they incorporate higher growth than anticipated locally, independent of where the employment is located.⁵

Considerations Relevant to Nearby Cities of Berkeley and San Leandro

The ABAG revisions reflect changes in the allocation of employment within the cities of Berkeley and San Leandro that could affect the allocations of employment for those cities in the land use database in the ACCMA model once the current review process is completed.⁶ Such changes in the allocation of employment could affect the allocation of traffic, resulting in more traffic in some locations and less traffic in other locations. Overall, the net effects on the results of the EIR transportation analysis are not anticipated to be substantial for all of the reasons described at the beginning of this subsection above. They include: the fact that the EIR analyses are most sensitive to the land use data for Oakland which are not affected by the changes in the ABAG data; the negating or moderating effects of the travel model's process of combining traffic for smaller areas onto major routes serving the larger area; and the fact that possible differences in the allocations of employment throughout Berkeley and San Leandro can occur in Census Tracts and TAZs that are a substantial distance from the Uptown Study Area that is the focus of the EIR impact analysis.

⁵ Communication with City of Alameda Planning Department staff (Andrew Thomas), November 5, 2003. Also see note 3 in Appendix D of the *Uptown EIR* regarding earlier communication with the City of Alameda.

⁶ Per review of revised ABAG data by Hausrath Economics Group as of December 2003, and communication with ACCMA staff (Diane Stark) in early December.

APPENDIX A-2

APPENDIX A-2 UPDATED CUMULATIVE LAND USE SCENARIO

UPTOWN EIR IS MORE UP-TO-DATE AND MORE CONSERVATIVE THAN LUTE EIR

Extensive work continues to be done in Oakland to update and refine the cumulative growth assumptions and land use database used for transportation modeling and impact analyses in Oakland EIRs. The updated cumulative growth scenario and land use database prepared for the *Uptown EIR* as of June 2003 incorporated the most current assumptions about growth and development in Oakland. The growth assumptions for the *Uptown EIR* analyses are more current and more conservative than those reflected by the ABAG projections for Oakland and included in the Alameda County CMA Travel Model. The *Uptown EIR* growth scenario and land use database also update the growth assumptions in the *Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE) EIR* and provide a more conservative scenario with higher growth and development than the *LUTE EIR*.

The following summarizes the updated cumulative growth scenario and land use database developed for the *Uptown EIR*, drawing from the more detailed description in Appendix D of the EIR. It also compares the updated growth scenario to that from the *LUTE EIR*, highlighting the more up-to-date and more conservative basis for cumulative analysis in the *Uptown EIR*.

BACKGROUND ON NEED FOR CUMULATIVE GROWTH SCENARIO AND USE OF FORECAST-BASED APPROACH

Need for the Cumulative Growth Scenario

The cumulative growth scenario for Oakland was developed and is updated primarily for use in the cumulative transportation analyses in Oakland EIRs. The growth scenario was originally prepared in 2000 after analyses indicated that the growth projections from ABAG as incorporated into the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (CMA) travel demand model did not reflect the level of growth and development occurring in Oakland. Those projections also did not reflect the locations of growth for future development projects under construction, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable for Oakland. Since the cumulative growth scenario for Oakland was originally developed, it continues to be updated and refined for EIR analyses and planning efforts, and to incorporate newly released 2000 Census data and new projections series from ABAG. The updated scenario prepared for the *Uptown Mixed-use Project EIR* represents the tenth version of the cumulative scenario.

Totals for the cumulative growth scenario for Oakland are now relatively similar to recent ABAG projections, as the Oakland data has provided input to ABAG. However, Oakland's cumulative growth scenario continues to be used in EIR analyses and planning efforts as it provides more specificity about growth and development occurring in Oakland and can be updated for specific EIR and planning purposes, as was done for the *Uptown EIR*.

Forecast-Based Approach that Incorporates Foreseeable Future Development Projects

The cumulative growth scenario and land use database for Oakland is developed using a forecast-based approach, *i.e.*, an approach based on regional forecasts of economic activity and demographic trends. The cumulative growth scenario also considers recent and anticipated future development projects in Oakland as well as other changes in land use, employment, and population. Development projects and other changes are identified and updated based on input from City of Oakland and Port of Oakland staffs and on analysis of economic, demographic, and real estate market data and trends. Anticipated future development projects are identified and updated to include approved, proposed, and potential development projects reasonably foreseeable over the next 20 to 25 years.

The growth that could be accommodated by recent and expected future development projects and other changes in land use, employment, and population is evaluated within the context of regional economic and demographic trends and projections. The ABAG projections provide the reference for citywide and county totals for future years. The list of development projects and other changes provide the ability to relate individual projects to the citywide context. The amount of growth represented by development projects and other changes is “fit” within the ABAG projections, to the extent possible. Citywide totals are increased above the ABAG projections if justified by recent and expected future development projects and other anticipated changes. The locations of specific projects and development sites are used for the allocation of growth to subareas and traffic analysis zones (TAZs) within the city. (Transportation analyses using the CMA’s travel model require inputs at the TAZ level.)

UPDATED CUMULATIVE GROWTH SCENARIO

Initial Work Leads to Decision to Update Scenario for Uptown EIR

Early work for the *Uptown EIR* included review and comparison of the land use database used for the *General Plan LUTE EIR* with the more recent cumulative growth scenarios and land use databases for Oakland. Based on that review, the decision was made to complete a new growth scenario update specifically for the *Uptown EIR* and to complete a new cumulative transportation analysis using the updated growth scenario and land use database. Additional scope of work was undertaken to update the cumulative scenario to make sure that the growth and land use assumptions used for the *Uptown EIR* analyses incorporated the most current assumptions about growth and development in Oakland and the rest of the region. The analysis included particular attention to updating assumptions for growth and development in downtown Oakland, including the areas surrounding the Uptown Project.

Cumulative Growth Scenario for Uptown Project EIR

The cumulative growth scenario for the City of Oakland, as developed and updated for the *Uptown Project EIR* is shown in Table 1. Appendix D in the EIR, “Cumulative Growth Scenario for Oakland As Prepared for Use in the *Uptown Project EIR*”, describes the scenario in more detail as well as the approach and assumptions used. The growth scenario uses a 2000 base year and future analysis years of 2010 and 2025, consistent with the analysis years in the Alameda County CMA travel model.

Table 1: Updated Cumulative Growth Scenario for Oakland, as of June 2003

	2000 ^a	2010	2025	Growth, 2000-2025
Households	150,790	158,910	169,010	+18,220
Household Population ^b	392,310	417,120	434,560	+42,250
Total Population ^b	399,480	425,550	443,200	+43,720
Employed Residents ^b	174,740	194,040	225,680	+50,940
Total Employment	185,160	215,050	247,500	+62,340
Manufacturing	17,810	18,470	20,120	+2,310
Other ^c	74,040	84,400	93,500	+19,460
Retail	23,720	27,440	30,700	+6,980
Service	69,590	84,740	103,180	+33,590

^a Households, household population, total population, and employed residents are from the 2000 Census.

^b Projections for 2010 and 2025 incorporate changes in demographic characteristics of the population in the existing housing stock in Oakland as evidenced in persons per household and employed persons per household factors from ABAG *Projections 2002*. The demographic characteristics of residents of new housing to be built in Oakland by 2010 and 2025 are based on those same ABAG factors or are estimated using special factors that better reflect the anticipated population in new housing, for TAZs with little or no housing in 2000 of the types being built (as the ABAG factors are based on the existing population in 2000).

^c Includes employment in finance, insurance, real estate (FIRE); government; construction; transportation, communications, and utilities (TCU); wholesale; and agriculture and mining.

Source: Hausrath Economics Group based on approach and methodology described in Appendix D.

Comparisons with LUTE EIR and CMA/ABAG Projections

Table 2 compares the *Uptown EIR* growth scenario for Oakland with the growth assumptions from the *LUTE EIR* and with the ABAG projections. As shown and described below, the *Uptown EIR* growth scenario provides the most up-to-date and most conservative scenario of future growth compared to the *LUTE EIR* scenario and the ABAG projections.

- **Comparison to LUTE EIR:** The growth assumptions for the *LUTE EIR* were derived from ABAG *Projections '96* and identified a base year of 1995 and growth through 2015. The *Uptown EIR* growth scenario uses a 2000 base year and extends further into the future, to 2025. In addition, the *Uptown EIR* scenario incorporates 2000 Census data released since the *LUTE EIR* was prepared, and current assumptions through June 2003 for recent and anticipated future growth and development in Oakland.

As shown in Table 2, the updated *Uptown EIR* cumulative scenario includes higher total employment (247,500 jobs compared to 208,836 jobs) and higher total households (169,010 households compared to 156,077 households) in Oakland compared to the *LUTE EIR* scenario. The *Uptown EIR* scenario also reflects higher rates of future growth in Oakland compared to the *LUTE EIR* scenario, for both employment and households.

- **Comparison to ABAG/CMA Projections:** The updated *Uptown EIR* cumulative scenario is similar to the ABAG *Projections 2002* for Oakland and the ABAG projections as incorporated into the Alameda County CMA travel model for use in EIR transportation analyses (identified as CMA/ABAG *P2002* in Table 2). As shown in Table 2, total households in Oakland are very similar under both the *Uptown EIR* scenario and the CMA/ABAG projections, while total employment for the *Uptown EIR* scenario is slightly higher than under the CMA/ABAG projections. More comparisons between the *Uptown EIR* scenario and the CMA/ABAG projections are provided in Appendix D in the *Uptown EIR*.

Table 2: Comparison of Uptown EIR Growth Scenario, Lute EIR Growth Scenario, and ABAG Projections for City of Oakland

	1990	1995	2000	2010	2015	2025
Household Projections						
ABAG Projections '96	144,520 ^a	144,030	146,400	151,080	153,110	-
General Plan/Lute EIR	-	144,031	-	-	156,077	-
ABAG Projections 2002	144,520 ^a	-	150,790 ^a	156,610	160,850	168,640
CMA/ABAG P2002 ^b	144,520 ^a	-	150,790 ^a	158,129 ^b	-	169,077 ^b
Uptown EIR Scenario	144,520 ^a	-	150,790^a	158,910^c	-	169,010^c
Employment Projections						
ABAG Projections '96	170,200	166,470	172,580	187,010	188,740	-
General Plan/LUTE EIR	-	166,490	-	-	208,836	-
ABAG Projections 2002	178,340	-	193,950	215,580	228,380	243,500
CMA/ABAG P2002 ^b	173,273	-	185,160	213,820 ^b	-	245,060 ^b
Uptown EIR Scenario	173,273	-	185,160	215,050^c	-	247,500^c

^a U.S. Census.

^b Projections in the Alameda County CMA travel model as of May 2003; future year totals are controlled to within 1 percent of citywide totals from ABAG Projections 2002, per CMA direction.

^c Developed and updated for Uptown EIR cumulative analyses as of June 2003, by Hausrath Economics Group working closely with City staff.

Source: Hausrath Economics Group

APPENDIX B-1

APPENDIX B-1



155 Grand Avenue, Suite 400
Oakland, California 94612
510-763-2929
Fax 510-834-5220

OAKLAND • LOS ANGELES • SACRAMENTO • SAN JOSE • SAN BERNARDINO • SALT LAKE CITY

TO: Adam Weinstein
FROM: Bob Toothman
Scott Arganek
DATE: December 16, 2003
SUBJECT: Oakland Uptown Project
Sanitary Sewers - Wet Weather Capacity

PROJECT NO. 803057X0

Sewage capacity within the EBMUD system, including both hydraulic capacity and treatment capacity, is allocated among the communities and agencies that deliver sewage to EBMUD. The entity delivering sewage to EBMUD can use this capacity allocation in any way that they want as long as the capacity allocation for a sub-basin is not exceeded. In the case of the Uptown Project, the sub-basin allocation is controlled by the Oakland Public Works Agency. The availability of sub-basin capacity is determined by the City within their existing agreement with EBMUD and is not based on the overall capacity of the treatment plant. I verified this information with Maura Bonarens of EBMUD by telephone on 11/17/03.

Our sewer capacity calculations for the project area are included in this transmittal. This information was transmitted to Gus Amerzheni of DPW In August. I re-sent the information to him in November. He subsequently sent me an e-mail dated November 17 indicating that adequate capacity exists within the sub-basin to accommodate wet weather flows. The e-mail is included in this transmittal. Gus indicates that adequate capacity exists within the system to handle the proposed project flows, and agrees that our on-site configuration also has adequate capacity. It is my understanding that this is the only determination that needs to be made, and is also the only determination that is relevant to our project. EBMUD does not make this determination. Adequate capacity is available for our project.

Please call me if you have questions.

From: Robert Toothman [rtoothman@Korve.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2003 9:01 AM
To: 'Adam Weinstein'; Scott Arganek
Subject: FW: Oakland Uptown

Gus's response confirming the availability of sanitary sewer capacity is attached. We have adequate capacity. There is an existing manhole at our proposed point of connection. This should resolve sanitary sewer questions.

-----Original Message-----

From: Amirzehni, Gus [mailto:gamirzehni@oaklandnet.com]
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2003 4:42 PM
To: 'Robert Toothman'
Cc: Sweiss, Fuad; Uzegbu, Marcel
Subject: RE: Oakland Uptown

Bob,

Here are my comments re sewer capacity for the Oakland Uptown project.

1. The existing sewer in 20th Street between Telegraph and San Pablo is a 5' brick sewer, lined with PVC lining system. Any connection to this system should be made via an existing manhole. No direct connection to this line will be allowed.
2. Based on your attached SS loads and proposed connection configuration to the existing sewer in 20th Street, there is enough capacity in the system to handle the proposed project.
3. This email pertains only to sewer capacity, as you requested over the phone, and is not a complete EIR review comments.

Gus Amirzehni, P.E.

Engineering Division
Public Works Agency
510.238.6601 (Tel) 510.238-7227 (Fax)
250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 4314
Oakland, CA 94612-2033

-----Original Message-----

From: Robert Toothman [mailto:rtoothman@Korve.com]
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2003 10:48 AM
To: 'gamirzehni@oaklandnet.com'
Cc: Scott Arganek
Subject: FW: Oakland Uptown

Gus,

A copy of my email from last August with the loads and hydraulic calculations for the Oakland Uptown Project are attached. These are the most recent calculations. The point of connection to the DPW system will be to an existing 5 foot diameter brick sewer in 20th Street between Telegraph and San Pablo. This sewer runs down 20th and turns north on San Pablo.

We appreciate your help completing our EIR response. Please call me if you need any additional information, or if we need a meeting to resolve this matter.

Thanks,

Bob Toothman
(510) 622-6607

-----Original Message-----

From: Robert Toothman
Sent: Monday, August 18, 2003 2:31 PM
To: 'gamirzehni@oaklandnet.com'

Cc: Scott Arganek; Brandon Whitehurst

Subject: Oakland Uptown

Gus,

The revised sewage and hydraulic calculations for the Oakland Uptown Project are attached. Please note that there are two spreadsheets, the demands are on sheet one and the hydraulics are on sheet two. My apologies for not getting this to you last week - we had some internal confusion about who was going to send it. I will call you tomorrow to set up a time when we can meet and discuss.

Thanks,

Bob Toothman

APPENDIX B-2

APPENDIX B-2

Appendix B-2 Oakland Uptown Project

Sanitary Sewage Loads

August 14, 2003

Parcel	Land Use	Density		Units	Sq. Ft	Persons	Wastewater Demand	Average Sanitary Discharge	Peak Factor	Peak Sanitary Discharge	Maximum Discharge - Includes Inflow and Infiltration	Maximum Discharge
				#			gpd/Person	gpd		gpd	cfs	
1	Apartments	2.25	persons/du	190	-	428	100	42,750	1.80	76,950	307,800	0.48
2	Apartments	2.25	persons/du	190	-	428	100	42,750	1.80	76,950	307,800	0.48
3	Apartments	2.25	persons/du	250	-	563	100	56,250	1.80	101,250	405,000	0.63
4	Apartments	2.25	persons/du	225	-	506	100	50,625	1.80	91,125	364,500	0.56
5	Condominiums	2.25	persons/du	270		608	100	60,750	1.80	109,350	437,400	0.68
6	Apartments	2.25	persons/du	145	-	326	100	32,625	1.80	58,725	260,000	0.40
7	Student Beds	1	person/du	1000	-	1000	100	100,000	1.80	180,000	720,000	1.11
	Faculty Units	1	person/du	50	-	50	100	5,000	1.80	9,000	36,000	0.06
8	Commercial	450	sf/employee	-	5000	11	100	1,111	1.80	2,000	8,000	0.01
9	Commercial	450	sf/employee	-	10000	22	100	2,222	1.80	4,000	16,000	0.02
Total Project				2320	15000	3941	1000	394083		709,350	2,862,500	4.43

Notes:

- 1 Land use, number of dwelling units, and floor areas from draft EIR
- 2 2.25 average persons per dwelling unit and 450 square feet per employee based on current City and County of San Francisco assumptions for Hunters Point Redevelopment project
- 3 100 gpd/person based on current City and County of San Francisco assumptions for Hunters Point Redevelopment project
- 4 Discharge including inflow/infiltration is four times peak sanitary discharge

APPENDIX B-3

APPENDIX B-3

Appendix B-3 Oakland Uptown Project Water Demands December 17, 2003	
Domestic Water Demand	
Demand Rate (Gallons per Capita per Day):	125
Persons per Dwelling Unit:	2.35
Dwelling Units:	1120
Average Daily Demand (Gallons per Day):	329,000
Average Daily demand (GPM):	228
Average Daily demand (CFS):	0.51
Peaking Flow Factor:	1.6
Peak Domestic Water Demand (GPM)	366
Peak Domestic Water Demand (CFS)	0.81
Required Fire Flows	
Minimum Fire Flow, Residential, (GPM)	TBD
Minimum Fire Flow, Commercial, (GPM)	TBD
Minimum Fire Flow, Commercial, (CFS)	TBD
Maximum Water Demand (GPM)	TBD
Maximum Water Demand (CFS)	TBD

Notes:

1. Maximum water demand is the sum of peak domestic demand and fire flow requirements.
2. Average Daily Sewage Flow = 85% Average Daily Water Demand.
3. Fire flows are subject to negotiations with the Fire Department and are To Be Determined

4. The adequacy of the existing system to meet maximum demands will be determined by EBMUD based on the peak domestic demand indicated and the fire flow demand.

5. The proposed development will be served by existing off-site 8 inch water mains in San Pablo Avenue and Telegraph Avenue. New 8 inch water mains are proposed in 19th Street and William Street.
6. The existing off-site water system supplying the development appears to have adequate capacity to meet the indicated demands. Some improvements to the existing off-site system may be required due to the age and condition of the existing system. Preliminary discussions with EBMUD indicate that adequate water will be made available for the development (Brandon whitehurst communication with EBMUD).