CITY OF ALAMEDA RESOLUTION NO. 14891

CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AND ADOPTING FINDINGS AND A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE ALAMEDA POINT PROJECT.

Approved as to Form
Janet C. Kern, City Attorney

WHEREAS, Naval Air Station Alameda ("NAS Alameda"), which encompasses the Naval facilities and grounds comprising the western end of the City of Alameda and consists of 1,546 acres of real property, together with the buildings, improvements and related and other tangible personal property located thereon and all rights, easements and appurtenances thereto, was decommissioned by the United States Department of the Navy in 1993 and closed in 1997; and

WHEREAS, in 1996 the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority, which included the City of Alameda, the Local Reuse Authority under federal base closure law, approved the NAS Alameda Community Reuse Plan ("Reuse Plan"), as amended in 1997, to establish a plan for the reuse and redevelopment of the property at the former NAS Alameda, a portion of which (west of Main Street) is commonly referred to as Alameda Point; and

WHEREAS, on March 21, 2000, the City Council certified the Final Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") for the Reuse of Naval Air Station Alameda and the Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Alameda Annex and Facility; and

WHEREAS, in 2003 the City Council certified the Final EIR for a General Plan Amendment for Alameda Point (GPA-01-01) to implement the community's vision for the reuse of Alameda Point in a manner that implemented the goals of the Reuse Plan and other City of Alameda policy documents; and

WHEREAS, to facilitate redevelopment and reuse consistent with the Reuse Plan and the Alameda General Plan, the City of Alameda has proposed to adopt and implement a general plan amendment, a comprehensive zoning amendment, a Master Infrastructure Plan, and a Town Center and Waterfront Precise Plan ("Precise Plan"), together known as the "Alameda Point Project"; and

WHEREAS, the Alameda Point Project consists of a Master Infrastructure Plan for the replacement, reconstruction, construction, and rehabilitation of deteriorated and substandard infrastructure, buildings, and shoreline protections; rehabilitation and new construction of open space, parks and trails for public enjoyment; rehabilitation, reuse and new construction of approximately 5.5 million square feet of commercial and workplace facilities for approximately 8,900 jobs; maritime and water related recreation uses in and adjacent to the Seaplane Lagoon; rehabilitation and

new construction of 1,425 residential units for a wide variety of household types for approximately 3,240 residents; and a General Plan Amendment and a Zoning Ordinance Amendment that would create planning sub-districts within Alameda Point to facilitate a seamless and integrated mixed-use, transit-oriented community consistent with the existing General Plan and Reuse Plan; and a Precise Plan that would create development standards and design guidelines for public and private improvements in the Town Center and Waterfront sub-district; and

WHEREAS, on January 10, 2013, the City issued a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") of the Draft EIR for the Alameda Point Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2013012043); and

WHEREAS, the NOP was circulated for comment by responsible and trustee agencies and the public for a total of 50 days from January 10, 2013 through March 1, 2013, during which time the City held public scoping meetings on January 29, 2013 and February 25, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Draft EIR, consisting of one volume plus the Draft EIR Appendices provided on CD, was issued on September 3, 2013, and was circulated for public review through October 21, 2013, for a total of 48 days, during which time the City held public hearings on the Draft EIR on September 9, 2013 and September 25, 2013; and

WHEREAS, following the close of the public review period, the Final EIR was prepared, which responds to the written and oral comments received during the public review period and makes revisions to the Draft EIR; and

WHEREAS, the City provided written responses to public agencies that commented on the Draft EIR on December 19, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR, which consists of the Draft EIR and the Draft EIR Appendices, and a Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR volume that contains comments on the Draft EIR, responses to those comments, and revisions and supplemental revisions to the Draft EIR, which were published on December 19, 2013 and January 16, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board held a duly noticed public hearing to receive public testimony on the Final EIR on January 13, 2014, examined pertinent maps and documents, and considered the testimony and written comments received and recommended that the City Council certify the Final EIR; and

WHEREAS, the changes to the mitigation measures and tables recommended by the Planning Board merely clarify, amplify or make insignificant modifications, and recirculation of the EIR is not required; and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR has been presented to and independently reviewed and considered by the City Council.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council takes the following actions:

1. Certifying that the Final EIR for the Alameda Point Project has been completed in compliance with CEQA, Public Resources Code section 21000 *et seq.*, the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 15000 *et seq.*, and all applicable state and local guidelines, and reflects the independent judgment of the City.

2. Adopt Findings for the Project, including a Statement of Overriding Considerations, attached hereto as Exhibit A, and adopt and incorporate into the Project all of the mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Alameda which are identified in the Findings.

3. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, attached hereto as Exhibit B.

EXHIBIT A

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE ALAMEDA POINT PROJECT

I. INTRODUCTION

The City of Alameda ("City"), as lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), Public Resources Code Section 21000 *et seq.*, has prepared the Final Environmental Impact report for the Alameda Point Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2013012043) ("Final EIR"). The Final EIR is a project-level EIR pursuant to Section 15161 of the Guidelines for implementation of CEQA ("State CEQA Guidelines").[1] The Final EIR consists of the September 2013 Public Review Draft Alameda Point Project Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR"), the December 2013 Response to Comments on the Draft EIR ("Response to Comments document"), and revisions to the Draft EIR contained in the Response to Comments document and the January 16, 2014 supplemental revisions to the Final EIR (Exhibit C).

In determining to approve the Alameda Point Project ("Project"), which is described in more detail in Section II, below, the City makes and adopts the following findings of fact and statement of overriding considerations, and adopts and incorporates into the Project all of the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR, all based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding ("administrative record"). Pursuant to Section 15090(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Final EIR was presented to the City, and the City reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to making the findings in Sections IV through XIV, below. The conclusions presented in these findings are based on the Final EIR and other evidence in the administrative record.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project, as fully described in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR, involves the redevelopment and reuse of the 878 acres of uplands and approximately 1,229 acres of submerged lands (total of 2,107 acres) at the former Naval Air Station Alameda ("NAS Alameda") located west of Main Street at the western end of Alameda ("project site"). The property is currently occupied by over five million square feet of existing former Navy buildings, former airplane runways, taxiways, staging areas, and water and maritime uses within what is referred to as the Seaplane Lagoon.

---

[1] The State CEQA Guidelines are found at California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 *et seq.*

In 1993, the United States Navy decommissioned the former NAS Alameda, which encompasses the Naval facilities and grounds comprising the western end of the City of Alameda and consists of 1,546 acres of real property, together with the buildings, improvements and related and other tangible personal property located thereon and all rights, easements and appurtenances thereto. In 1996, the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority, the designated Local Reuse Authority for NAS Alameda, of which the City of Alameda was a member agency, approved the NAS Alameda Community Reuse Plan ("Reuse Plan") to establish a plan for the reuse and redevelopment of the property at the former NAS Alameda (Alameda Point). The Reuse Plan was thereafter amended in 1997. Also in 1997, the NAS Alameda was closed, resulting in the loss of approximately 18,000 jobs in Alameda. On March 21, 2000, the City Council certified the Final Environmental Impact Report pursuant to CEQA for the Reuse of Naval Air Station Alameda and the Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Alameda Annex and Facility. In 2003 the City Council certified the Final Environmental Impact Report for a General Plan Amendment for Alameda Point to implement the community's vision for the reuse of Alameda Point in a manner that implemented the goals of the Reuse Plan and other City of Alameda policy documents.

The Project, involving the redevelopment and reuse of the project site, includes:

- Adopting a Master Infrastructure Plan ("MIP") for the replacement, reconstruction, construction and rehabilitation of deteriorated and substandard infrastructure, buildings, and shoreline protections.
- Rehabilitation and new construction of open space, parks and trails for public enjoyment.
- Rehabilitation, reuse, and new construction of approximately 5.5 million square feet of commercial and workplace facilities for approximately 8,900 jobs.
- Maritime and water related recreation uses in and adjacent to the Seaplane Lagoon.
- Rehabilitation and new construction of 1,425 residential units for a wide variety of household types for approximately 3,240 residents.
- Adopting a General Plan Amendment, a Zoning Ordinance Amendment, and a Town Center and Waterfront Precise Plan that would create planning sub-districts within Alameda Point to facilitate a seamless and integrated mixed-use, transit-oriented community consistent with the existing General Plan and Reuse Plan.

The project site is located in the City of Alameda in Alameda County, California and is bounded by the Oakland-Alameda Estuary on the north, Main Street on the east,

and the San Francisco Bay on the south and by the federal property ("Federal Property") to the west.[2]

For purposes of infrastructure planning, the MIP defines the project site as two main areas: Development Areas and Reuse Areas. The infrastructure needs and requirements for each of these areas are distinct. The Development Areas are those areas within the project site that are anticipated to consist of primarily new construction. Most of the existing structures, streets and utilities within these areas would be demolished. New infrastructure would be installed to support the proposed uses within the Development Areas. It is anticipated that development within the Development Areas would occur in cohesive areas and would be implemented in orderly phases.

The Reuse Areas include areas that overlap with the NAS Alameda Historic District that are intended to be primarily preserved and adaptively reused. The preservation of the historic buildings, landscapes and streetscapes require specific infrastructure considerations and requirements. It is anticipated that development within Reuse Areas would be incremental and determined by market demand for existing buildings and the highest priority maintenance and repair needs. The sequenced implementation of rehabilitation and incremental replacement of the existing street and utility systems are discussed in the draft MIP.

As set forth in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR, the project objectives are as follows:

Property Rehabilitation and Reinvestment Objectives:

The project should eliminate the blighted conditions on the property, and correct geotechnical and flood hazards and infrastructure deficiencies in the area by:

- Ensuring orderly and systematic reinvestment and development of the project site into an integrated mixed use community with an integrated network of public open spaces, trails, and streets.
- Facilitating reinvestment in substandard infrastructure systems and buildings, including reinvestment in contributing structures and cultural landscapes within the NAS Alameda Historic District, where feasible.
- Ensuring orderly and timely clean-up and conveyance of the remaining property under Navy ownership consistent with the Economic Development Conveyance Memorandum of Agreement (EDC MOA), and the Navy's other conveyance obligations.

Environmental Protection and Sustainability Objectives:

The project should protect the local, regional, and global environment and facilitate sustainable reuse and redevelopment of Alameda Point by:

---

[2] The area referred to as "project site" in this EIR is the same as "Plan Area" in the MIP and the Reuse Plan.

- Creating opportunities for transit-oriented development consistent with Regional Sustainable Communities Strategies for greenhouse gas emission reductions as required by SB 375.

- Reinvesting in the replacement and rehabilitation of substandard infrastructure systems that may contribute to regional water quality impacts due to infiltration, inflow, storm water run-off, and substandard storm water treatment facilities.

- Investing in improvements to adapt to sea-level rise and climate change over time.

- Applying sustainability principles in the design and development of open spaces, recreation facilities, buildings, and infrastructure, including wastewater, storm water, electrical and transportation systems, including promotion of alternative modes of transportation through preparation and implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program.

Public Benefit Objectives:

The project should produce tangible community benefits for the Alameda community as a whole by:

- Creating an open space network that incorporates preservation, restoration and enhancement of wetlands and other natural habitats and provides for both passive and active recreational uses.

- Enhancing views of water and public access to the waterfront in all development and creatively encouraging the usage of the waterfront, by providing a waterfront promenade, public art, open space, and other public amenities.

Economic Development and Employment Objectives:

The project should strengthen and diversify the economic base of the community by:

- Emphasizing employment and a mix of economic development opportunities that complement economic development strategies in other parts of Alameda; and provide a range of employment opportunities and quality jobs, through adaptive reuse of existing buildings and new construction to replace up to 9,000 of the 14,000 jobs lost to Alameda and the region by the closure of NAS Alameda.

- Reoccupying existing buildings and constructing new buildings to create 5.5 million square feet of business, commercial, industrial, maritime and retail uses that will provide jobs, services, tax revenue, and new amenities for Alameda residents.

- Actively marketing to new retail land uses that will complement and provide synergies with existing retail development at Webster Street, Park Street and other locations within Alameda.

- Provide for clear and orderly phasing, sizing, and financing of site infrastructure for both the circulation and utility network and provide for a predictable development process.

- Address the impact of the site development on the City's operating budget to comply with City Council Policies adopted by Resolution 13643 related to fiscal neutrality.

Transit Oriented Mixed Use Development Objectives:

The project should provide transit oriented mixed use development opportunities, by:

- Ensuring that the project site design is in concert with the established transit-oriented and mixed-use goals, policies, and objectives of the NAS Alameda Community Reuse Plan as incorporated into the Alameda General Plan.

- Balancing development objectives with transportation constraints and opportunities.

- Providing for mixed use development opportunities and sites within close proximity to existing and planned transit and encouraging the types of non-residential uses that provide for the everyday needs of Alameda Point residents and employees and reduce the need to use an automobile to obtain goods and services.

- Creating human-scale, tree-lined walkable streets and bicycle routes throughout the project site and extending the street grid street pattern that is characteristic of the existing city neighborhoods and districts throughout Alameda Point.

- Increasing the City's supply of land available for residential development and increasing the supply of affordable housing sites for Alameda and the region to balance the jobs proposed for the project site and attract potential riders for proposed transit.

- Including a mix of single-family homes, attached townhomes, a mix of stacked flats and low and midrise multifamily housing with higher-density housing concentrated around transit nodes, where possible.

- Including a diversity of housing types and pricing that attract the market segments most likely to use alternatives to the automobile, such as self-selective transit commuters and households with zero to low-automobile ownership.

- Facilitating the relocation and consolidation of existing supportive housing providers in new facilities at Alameda Point to help ensure a mix of incomes and populations are represented at the project site.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

A. PREPARATION OF THE EIR

On January 10, 2013, the City issued a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") of the Draft EIR. The NOP requested that agencies with regulatory authority over any aspect of the project describe that authority and identify the relevant environmental issues that should be addressed in the EIR. Interested members of the public were also invited to comment. The NOP was circulated for comment by responsible and trustee agencies and the public for a total of 50 days from January 10, 2013 through March 1, 2013, during which time the City held public scoping meetings on January 29, 2013 and February 25, 2013. Comments on the NOP were received by the City and considered during preparation of the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR was made available for public review on September 3, 2013, and distributed to responsible and trustee agencies and the public. It was circulated for public review through October 21, 2013, for a total of 48 days, during which time the City held public hearings on the Draft EIR on September 9, 2013 and September 25, 2013.

The Response to Comments document was issued on December 19, 2013. On January 13, 2014, at a duly noticed public hearing, the Planning Board recommended that the City Council certify the Final EIR.

The Planning Board recommended that the findings, recommendations, and statement of overriding considerations set forth below (the "Findings") be made and adopted by the City Council regarding the Project's significant environmental effects ("significant impacts"), mitigation measures, alternatives to the Project, and the overriding considerations that support approval of the Project despite any remaining significant impacts it may have.

IV. FINDINGS

These findings summarize the environmental determinations of the Final EIR about project impacts before and after mitigation, and do not attempt to repeat the full analysis of each significant impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, these findings provide a summary description of and basis for each impact conclusion identified in the Final EIR, describe the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR, and state the City's findings and rationale about the significance of each significant impact following the adoption and incorporation of mitigation measures into the Project. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Final EIR, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in

the Final EIR supporting the Final EIR's determinations regarding mitigation measures and the Project's impacts.

In adopting mitigation measures below, the City intends to adopt each of the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure identified in the Final EIR has been inadvertently omitted from these findings, such mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language of a mitigation measure set forth below fails to accurately reflect the mitigation measure in the Final EIR due to a clerical error, the language of the mitigation measure as set forth in the Final EIR shall control unless the language of the mitigation measure has been specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

Sections V through VIII, below, provide brief descriptions of the impacts that the Final EIR identifies as either significant and unavoidable, less than significant with adopted mitigation, or less than significant without mitigation. These descriptions also reproduce the full text of the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR for each significant impact.

V. SIGNIFICANT OR POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED OR MITIGATED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

The Final EIR identifies the following significant and unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the approval of the Project, some of which can be reduced, although not to a less-than-significant level, through implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR. In addition, the City cannot require adoption or implementation of mitigation measures for some impacts because they are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies. Pub. Resources Code § 21081(a)(2). Therefore, as explained below, some impacts will remain significant and unavoidable notwithstanding adoption of feasible mitigation measures. To the extent that these mitigation measures will not mitigate or avoid all significant effects on the environment, and because the City cannot require mitigation measures that are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of other public agencies to be adopted or implemented by those agencies, it is hereby determined that any remaining significant and unavoidable adverse impacts are acceptable for the reasons specified in Section XIII, below. Pub. Resources Code § 21081(a)(3). As explained in Section X, below, the findings in this Section V are based on the Final EIR, the discussion and analysis in which is hereby incorporated in full by this reference.

A. Impact 4.C-2: Development facilitated by the Project would potentially result in a transportation impact at study locations under Existing plus Project conditions.

1. Jackson/Sixth, Oakland:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase in traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of Jackson Street and Sixth Street (Intersection #34) would cause the overall volume-to-capacity ("V/C") ratio to increase by 0.06 during the p.m. peak hour.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2d, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a (TDM Program) could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips. As documented in the City of Oakland's November 2012 Central Estuary Implementation Guide Supplemental EIR,[3] this intersection was previously identified by the City of Oakland as having a significant and unavoidable impact under existing conditions in the Kaiser Center Redevelopment Project EIR.[4] An improvement identified as part of the Broadway-Jackson Interchange project to provide direct access to Sixth Street from the Posey Tube would reduce traffic through Oakland Chinatown. With the assistance of the Alameda County Transportation Commission ("ACTC"), the cities of Alameda and Oakland are working to develop consensus on this improvement. To date, Oakland and Caltrans, which have jurisdiction over the freeway and its ramps, have not agreed upon a solution. Because any such mitigation is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Oakland and Caltrans, which can and should adopt feasible mitigation, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2d (Jackson/Sixth):

The City of Alameda shall implement Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a (TDM Program).

1. Brush and 11th Street, Oakland:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase in traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of Brush Street and 11th Street (Intersection #55), almost all of which would be exiting westbound I-980 at 12th Street and approaching this intersection from the north, would cause the overall volume-to-capacity ("V/C") ratio to increase by 0.05.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2e, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program) could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips. As documented in the Central Estuary Implementation Guide Supplemental EIR, this intersection was previously identified as having a significant and unavoidable impact (LOS E) under future conditions during the a.m. peak hour in the Kaiser Center Redevelopment Project

---

[3] State Clearinghouse No. 2011112055.

[4] The 2010 Oakland EIR for a project at 325 Seventh Street in Oakland (State Clearinghouse No. 200712205) identified signal optimization as potentially feasible mitigation for a lesser impact. However, because that measure would require Caltrans approval, the project impact was conservatively considered by the City of Oakland to be significant and unavoidable. No feasible mitigation measure was identified by the City of Oakland for the cumulative impact at this intersection.

DEIR. The City of Oakland has not required any mitigation for this location to mitigate the impacts of the Central Estuary Implementation Guide or Kaiser Center development. Because further mitigation is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Oakland, which can and should adopt feasible mitigation, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2e (Brush/11th):

The City of Alameda shall implement Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a (TDM Program).

2. 23rd Avenue and Seventh Street, Oakland:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase in traffic at the signalized intersection of 23rd Avenue and Seventh Street (Intersection #56) would cause the overall volume-to-capacity ("V/C") ratio to increase by 0.11.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2f, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program) could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips.. This intersection was studied as part of the I-880 Operational improvements. The incremental traffic due to the project as identified in the travel demand model indicates an increase in the northbound left-turn movements which would allow for access to the I-880 southbound on-ramp. Even with the future reconfiguration of the 23rd Avenue and 29th Avenue overpasses and ramps as part of the I-880 Operational improvements, this intersection would continue to operate at a level of service in excess of Oakland's standard for significance. Because this mitigation is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Oakland, which can and should adopt feasible mitigation, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2f (23rd/Seventh):

The City of Alameda shall implement Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a (TDM Program).

3. Stargell Avenue Bike:

The Final EIR finds that the increase in motorized vehicle volume due to project-related traffic along Willie Stargell Avenue between Main Street and Webster Street would be substantial in the eastbound and westbound directions during both peak hours, and it would cause bicycle LOS to degrade in both directions during both peak hours.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2m, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce transit, pedestrian, and auto travel secondary impacts to a less-than-significant level, but would not reduce bicycle travel impacts to a less-than-significant level. If Class II bicycle lanes are installed they will improve bicycle LOS for the eastbound and westbound directions during both peak hours. However, due to the limitation of the methodology, bicycle LOS for Class I

bicycle paths cannot be stated with certainty. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2m (Stargell Avenue Bike):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall construct a Class I bicycle facility between Main Street and Webster Street.

4. Main Street Bike:

The Final EIR finds that the increase in motorized vehicle volume due to project-related traffic along Main Street between Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway and Pacific Avenue would cause bicycle LOS to degrade in both directions during both peak hours.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2n, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce transit, pedestrian, and auto travel secondary impacts to a less-than-significant level, but would not reduce bicycle travel impacts to a less-than-significant level. If Class II bicycle lanes are installed, they will improve bicycle LOS for the northbound and southbound directions during both peak hours. A Class I bike path would further improve the bicycle LOS to less than significant level. This measure would not degrade the transit LOS or auto LOS along the corridor.[5] However, due to the limitation of the methodology, bicycle LOS for Class I bicycle paths cannot be stated with certainty. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2n (Main Street Bike):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall implement the following physical improvements:

- *improve the existing Class I bicycle path on the west side of the street between Appezzato Parkway and Pacific Avenue to current City standards;*
- *provide connectivity to existing Class I bicycle path on the east and west sides of the street north of Appezzato Parkway. Appropriate intersection treatments for connectivity may include striping, signage, and/or bicycle boxes at the intersection of Main Street and Appezzato Parkway; and*
    - *if Mitigation Measure 4.C-2o is implemented, provide connectivity to that bicycle facilities on west side of the street north of the Main Street-Pacific Street intersection.*

[5] The discussion of Transportation and Circulation impacts in Section 4.C of the EIR follows the travel mode preferences established in the City's Transportation Element policies and Street Classifications.

5. Central Avenue Bike:

The Final EIR finds that the increase in motorized vehicle volume due to project-related traffic along Central Avenue between the Main Street-Pacific Street intersection and Fourth Street would cause bicycle LOS to degrade in both directions during both peak hours.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2o, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce transit, pedestrian, and auto travel secondary impacts to a less-than-significant level, but would not reduce bicycle travel impacts to a less-than-significant level. If Class II bicycle lanes are installed, they will improve bicycle LOS for the northbound and southbound directions during both peak hours. However, as previously described, the limits of the methodology used to evaluate bicycle LOS for this study do not include Class I bicycle paths, so bicycle LOS for Mitigation Measure 4.C-2o cannot be stated with certainty. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2o (Central Avenue Bike):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall use its best efforts to implement the following physical improvements:

- *improve the existing Class I bicycle path on the west (south) side of the street between the Main Street-Pacific Street intersection and Lincoln Avenue to current City standards;*
- *extend a Class I bicycle path to Third Street; and*
- *restripe and sign the street segment between Third Street and Fourth Street to provide Class II bicycle lanes between Lincoln Avenue and Fourth Street.*

B. Impact 4.C-5: Cumulative development, including the Project, would potentially result in transportation impacts at local study locations under Cumulative plus project conditions.

1. Park/Clement:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase in traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of Park Street and Clement Avenue (Intersection #12) would contribute more than 3 percent (approximately 9 percent) to the growth of intersection traffic volume from Existing to Cumulative plus Project conditions during the p.m. peak hour; therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Although physical improvements could be implemented to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels, such improvements would be infeasible because they would require removal of approximately six on-street parking spaces, utility relocation, roadway widening, and property acquisition from adjacent property owners. Moreover,

these improvements would be infeasible because they would not be consistent with Policy 4.4.2.b of the General Plan Transportation Element. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5a, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce auto travel impacts to a less-than-significant level. The northbound left-turn pocket on Park Street could be added within the existing right-of-way. With this mitigation, the intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS E in the a.m. peak hour and LOS F in the p.m. peak hour. Thus, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5a (Park/Clement):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following physical improvements:

- *Add northbound left turn pocket along Park Street;*
- *Optimize the signal offsets and splits; and*
- *Complete the Clement Avenue extension, which would reduce the demand for left turn movements onto Park Street from eastbound traffic on Clement Avenue.*

2. Park/Encinal:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase in traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of Park Street and Encinal Avenue (Intersection #14) would contribute more than 3 percent (8 percent) to the growth in intersection traffic volume from Existing to Cumulative Plus Project conditions from during the p.m. peak hour; therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Widening the intersection could improve the LOS for autos, but would not be consistent with General Plan policies 4.4.2.a and 4.4.2.b, and is hereby rejected as infeasible. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5b, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce auto travel impacts from LOS F to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program) and 4.C-2b (Monitoring), could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips, although, to be conservative, the analysis in the EIR did not rely on this improvement. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5b (Park/Encinal):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following physical improvements:

- *Optimize offsets and splits.*

3. Broadway/Otis:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase in traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of Broadway and Otis Drive (Intersection #18) would contribute more than 3 percent to the growth in intersection traffic volumes (9 percent during the a.m. peak and 8 percent during the p.m. peak) from Existing to Cumulative plus Project conditions; therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5c, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce auto travel impacts to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program) and 4.C-2b (Monitoring), could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5c: (Broadway/Otis):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement, the following physical improvements:

- *Optimize the signal timing during both peak hours.*

4. High/Fernside:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase in traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of High Street and Fernside Boulevard (Intersection #20) would contribute more than 3 percent to the growth in intersection traffic volumes (12 percent during the a.m. peak and 30 percent during the p.m. peak) from Existing to Cumulative plus Project conditions. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Although physical improvements could be implemented to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels, such improvements would conflict with the City's travel mode preferences in the General Plan, and would therefore be infeasible because they would result in a significant secondary impact on pedestrian LOS. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5e, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce auto travel impacts to a less-than-significant level. To maintain consistency with the General Plan, the adopted mitigation

should give priority to pedestrians over automobiles. Therefore, auto travel impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5e (High/Fernside):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvements:

- *Adjust the signal cycle phasing during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours such that the southbound left turn from High Street is a permitted rather than protected movement; and*
- *Optimize signal timing.*

5. High/Otis:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase in traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of High Street and Otis Drive (Intersection #21) would contribute more than 3 percent to the growth in intersection traffic volumes (12 percent during the a.m. peak and 14 percent during the p.m. peak) from Existing to Cumulative plus Project conditions. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Although physical improvements could be implemented to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels, such improvements would conflict with the City's travel mode preferences in the General Plan, and would therefore be infeasible because they would result in a significant secondary impact on pedestrian LOS. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5f, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce auto travel impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5f (High/Otis):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvements:

- *Optimize the signal timing for both peak hours; and*
- *Install traffic calming strategies on Bayview Drive to include improvements such as: restriping Bayview Drive to create narrower driving lanes to reduce speeding, installing a cross walk and caution sign at the location of the public coastal access easement, and/or construction of sidewalk bulb-outs to improve pedestrian safety at the intersections of Bayview/Court Street and Bayview/Broadway.*

6. Island/Otis/Doolittle:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase in traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of Island Drive/Otis Drive and Doolittle Drive (Intersection #22) would contribute more than 3 percent to the growth in intersection traffic volumes (7 percent) from Existing to Cumulative plus Project conditions during the a.m. peak hour. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5g, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce auto travel impacts to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program) and 4.C-2b (Monitoring) could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips. Although improvements could be implemented to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels, these improvements would require additional right-of-way and street widening and are therefore rejected as infeasible because they would conflict with General Plan policies 4.4.2.a and 4.4.2.b. Mitigation Measure 4.C-5g would decrease auto travel delays but maintain LOS F. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5g (Island Drive/Otis Drive and Doolittle Drive):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvements:

- *Optimize signal timing during both peak hours.*

7. Park/Blanding:

The signalized intersection of Park Street and Blanding Avenue (Intersection #26) would operate at an unacceptable LOS E during the a.m. peak hour and LOS F during the p.m. peak hour under Cumulative No Project conditions. The increase in traffic volumes due to the project would contribute more than 3 percent to the growth in intersection traffic volumes (12 percent) to the growth of intersection traffic volume from Existing to Cumulative plus Project conditions during both peak hours. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Although physical improvements could be implemented to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels, such improvements would result in a significant secondary impact on pedestrian LOS and thus conflict with the City's travel mode preferences in the General Plan; therefore, these improvements would be infeasible. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5i, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce auto travel impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, auto travel impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5i (Park/Blanding):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvements:

- *Change east-west signal phasing to protected phasing; and*
- *Optimize signal timing during both peak hours.*

8. Challenger/Atlantic:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase in traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of Challenger Drive and Atlantic Avenue (Intersection #27) would contribute more than 3 percent to the growth in intersection traffic volumes (4 percent) to the growth of intersection traffic volume from Existing to Cumulative plus Project conditions during the p.m. peak hour, and therefore would be significant. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Although physical improvements could be implemented to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels, such improvements would conflict with the City's travel mode preferences in the General Plan because they would result in a significant secondary impact on pedestrian LOS; therefore, these improvements would be infeasible. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5j, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce auto travel impacts to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program) and 4.C-2b (Monitoring) could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips. Thus, auto travel impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5j (Challenger/Atlantic):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, a fair-share to contribution optimize signal timing during the p.m. peak hour.

9. Jackson/Sixth, Oakland:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's impacts on traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of Jackson Street and Sixth Street (Intersection #34) would increase delay and cause the overall volume-to-capacity ("V/C") ratio to increase by 0.13 during the a.m. peak hour under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5l, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a (TDM Program) could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips. As documented in the City of

Oakland's Central Estuary Implementation Guide Supplemental EIR, this intersection was previously identified by the City of Oakland as having a significant and unavoidable impact under existing conditions in the Kaiser Center Redevelopment Project EIR. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a (TDM Program) could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips. An improvement identified as part of the Broadway-Jackson Interchange project to provide direct access to Sixth Street from the Posey Tube would reduce traffic through Oakland Chinatown. With the assistance of the ACTC, the cities of Alameda and Oakland are working to develop consensus on this improvement. To date, Oakland and Caltrans, which has jurisdiction over the freeway and its ramps, have not agreed upon a solution. Because this mitigation is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Oakland and Caltrans, which can and should adopt feasible mitigation, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5l (Jackson/Sixth):

The City of Alameda shall implement TDM (Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a).

10. Webster/Eighth, Oakland:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase on traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of Webster Street and Eighth Street (Intersection #39) would degrade the LOS to LOS F with increased delay in excess of 120 seconds under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions. The project traffic would cause the overall volume-to-capacity ("V/C") ratio to increase by 0.04. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5m, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a (TDM Program) could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips. As documented in the City of Oakland's Central Estuary Implementation Guide Supplemental EIR, this intersection was previously identified as having a significant and unavoidable impact under existing and future conditions during the p.m. peak hour in the Oak to Ninth Avenue EIR. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a (TDM Program) could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips. An improvement identified as part of the Broadway-Jackson Interchange project to provide direct access to Sixth Street from the Posey Tube would reduce traffic through Oakland Chinatown. With the assistance of the ACTC, the cities of Alameda and Oakland are working to develop consensus on this improvement. To date, Oakland and Caltrans, which has jurisdiction over the freeway and its ramps, have not agreed upon a solution. Because this mitigation is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Oakland and Caltrans, which can and should adopt feasible mitigation, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5m (Webster/Eighth):

The City of Alameda shall implement TDM (Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a).

11. Broadway/Fifth, Oakland:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase in traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of Broadway and Fifth Street (Intersection #43) would degrade the LOS to LOS F with 119 seconds of delay under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions. The project traffic would cause the overall volume-to-capacity ("V/C") ratio to increase by more than 0.04. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5n (implement Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a), set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a (TDM Program) could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips.. As documented in the Central Estuary Implementation Guide Supplemental EIR, this intersection was previously identified as having a significant and unavoidable impact under existing and future conditions during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours in the Oak to Ninth Avenue EIR and the Oakland Army Base Auto Mall Project SEIR. Because further mitigation is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Oakland, which can and should adopt feasible mitigation, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5n (Broadway/Fifth):

The City of Alameda shall implement TDM (Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a).

12. Brush/12th, Oakland:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase in traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of Brush Street and 12th Street (Intersection #44) would degrade LOS to LOS F with delay in excess of 120 seconds under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions. The project traffic would cause the critical volume-to-capacity ("V/C") ratio to increase by 0.05. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. This increase in project-related traffic is due primarily to the increase in traffic from I-980 ramps combined with the background growth in the westbound traffic on 12th Street heading towards West Oakland.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5o (implement Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a), set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program) could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips. Because further mitigation is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Oakland, which can and should adopt feasible mitigation, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5o (Brush/12th):

The City of Alameda shall implement TDM (Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a).

13. High/Oakport, Oakland:

The Final EIR finds that project-related vehicle traffic at the signalized intersection of High Street and Oakport Street (Intersection #45) would operate at LOS E under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions. The project traffic would cause an increase in the average delay of the northbound critical movement by 17 seconds. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5p (implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program) and 4.C-2b (Monitoring), set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program) and 4.C-2b (Monitoring) could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips. The City of Oakland's Central Estuary Implementation Guide Supplemental EIR identified an impact at this location during the p.m. peak hour under 2035 conditions. The project-related vehicle traffic resulted in LOS E in a.m. and p.m. peak hours. A third travel lane along High Street would be required to fully mitigate. However, widening of High Street under I-880 was found to be infeasible due to existing structural columns and existing land use. Therefore, the Central Estuary Implementation Guide EIR found this impact to be significant and unavoidable. Because further mitigation is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Oakland, which can and should adopt feasible mitigation, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5p (High/Oakport):

The City of Alameda shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and work with the City of Oakland to optimize the signal timing to allow for more green time for northbound traffic.

14. High/Coliseum, Oakland:

The Final EIR finds that under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions, project-related vehicle traffic would degrade the LOS to LOS F with 82 seconds of delay. The Project traffic would degrade the LOS from E to F and increase delay by 8 seconds. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5q (implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program) and 4.C-2b (Monitoring)), which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program) and 4.C-2b (Monitoring) could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips. The City of Oakland's Central Estuary Implementation Guide Supplemental EIR identified a significant impact at this location during the p.m. peak hour under existing-plus-project conditions with LOS E conditions. That SEIR found that the 42nd Avenue / High Street Access Improvements, a separate project, which would widen High Street to accommodate additional travel and left-turn lanes, would reduce the impact to less-than-significant levels under existing-plus-project conditions. Because this mitigation is

the responsibility of the City of Oakland, and not the City of Alameda, the Project's contribution to cumulative auto travel impacts at the High Street/Coliseum Way intersection is considered significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5q (High/Coliseum):

The City of Alameda shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and work with the City of Oakland to optimize the signal timing.

15. 29th/Ford, Oakland:

The Final EIR finds that under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions, project-related vehicle traffic at the signalized intersection of 29th Avenue and Ford Street (Intersection #51) would cause the p.m. peak hour overall volume-to-capacity ("V/C") ratio to increase by 0.04. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5r (implement Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a (TDM Program)), set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a (TDM Program) could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips. The City of Oakland's Central Estuary Implementation Guide Supplemental EIR identified an impact at this location during the p.m. peak hour under 2035 conditions. The heavy southbound right from the 29th Avenue overpass and the heavy northbound double-left turn coming from Alameda result in LOS E during the p.m. peak hour. Although the 29th/23rd Overcrossing project was assumed to be completed, the improvements were not sufficient to maintain acceptable LOS. The Central Estuary Implementation Guide EIR concluded that mitigation was not feasible and the impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, because no feasible mitigation has been identified to improve the intersection, and because further mitigation is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Oakland, which can and should adopt feasible mitigation, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5r (29th/Ford):

The City of Alameda shall implement TDM (Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a).

16. 23rd Ave./Seventh St:

The Final EIR finds that under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions, project-related vehicle traffic at the signalized intersection of 23rd Avenue and Seventh Street (Intersection #56) would degrade the LOS to LOS E with 60.4 seconds of delay during the p.m. peak hour. During the a.m. peak hour, this intersection would operate at LOS D with and without the project. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5s, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program) and 4.C-2b (Monitoring), could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips. Because further mitigation is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Oakland, which can and should adopt feasible mitigation, this impact is significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5s (23rd Ave./Seventh St.):

The City of Alameda shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and work with the City of Oakland to modify the northbound to provide a separate left-turn lane and a shared through-right-turn lane, and optimize the signal.

17. Webster/Appezzato Pedestrian:

The Final EIR find that at the actuated signal at Webster Street and Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway (Intersection #7), the increase in volumes due to project-related traffic during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours would cause increases in pedestrian delay for several legs of the intersection. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5u, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce pedestrian travel impacts and bicycle and transit travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce auto travel secondary impacts to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program) and 4.C-2b (Monitoring), could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips. Therefore, under Mitigation Measure 4.C-5u, auto travel secondary impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5u (Webster/Appezzato Pedestrian):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to optimize signal timing.

18. Appezzato/Constitution Pedestrian:

The Final EIR finds that at the actuated signal at Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway and Constitution Way (Intersection #24), the increase in volumes due to project-related traffic during the a.m. peak hour would cause increases in pedestrian delay for several legs of the intersection. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5w, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce transit, bicycle, and auto travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce pedestrian travel impacts to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program) and 4.C-2b (Monitoring), could improve intersection LOS by reducing vehicle trips. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5w would reduce projected pedestrian delay during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours and would reduce delay for all but one leg. The west leg during the p.m. peak hour would experience a 0.5 seconds (2 percent) increase in delay. Due to the need to accommodate elderly pedestrians crossing at this intersection, it is not feasible to reduce the cycle length sufficiently to fully mitigate to less-than-significant. This impact would therefore be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5w (Appezzato/Constitution Pedestrian):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvements:

- *Modify the phasing sequence; and*
- *Optimize the signal timing.*

19. Park Street Transit:

The Final EIR finds that Project-related vehicle traffic would degrade transit LOS during the a.m. peak hour in the southbound direction along the corridor of Park Street between Blanding Avenue and Otis Drive to LOS E with a decrease in average speed of 13% in the southbound direction during the a.m. peak hour. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5x, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce transit, bicycle, and auto travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce pedestrian travel

impacts to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of the mitigation would degrade pedestrian LOS at an intersection along the corridor only when a bus is present and transit signal prioritization is engaged at that intersection. At other times, it would not degrade pedestrian LOS. Nevertheless, the pedestrian impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5x (Park Street Transit):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvements:

- *Provide transit signal priority at intersections along this corridor;*
- *Optimize splits at the Park Street and Blanding Avenue intersection during a.m. and p.m. peak hours.*

20. Appezzato Parkway Transit:

The Final EIR finds that Project-related vehicle traffic would degrade transit LOS during the p.m. peak hour in the westbound direction along the corridor of Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway between Main Street and Webster Street to LOS D with a decrease in average speed of 10 percent. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5y, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce transit travel impacts and bicycle travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce and auto and pedestrian travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of the mitigation would maintain transit LOS D and would reduce the change in average travel speed through the corridor to a change of less than 10 percent. It would degrade pedestrian LOS at an intersection along the corridor only when a bus is present and transit signal prioritization is engaged at that intersection, however. At other times, it would not degrade pedestrian LOS. Mitigation Measure 4.C-5y would degrade auto LOS at the intersection to LOS E, which is a significant impact. Therefore, these impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5y (Appezzato Parkway Transit):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvements:

- *Install transit signal priority at intersections along this corridor;*
- *Optimize cycle length at the Appezzato Parkway and Webster Street intersection during a.m. and p.m. peak hours and provide signal priority; and*

- *Establish exclusive transit lanes or queue jump lanes from Alameda Point to Webster Street.*

21. Stargell Avenue Transit:

The Final EIR finds that Project-related vehicle traffic would degrade transit LOS during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours in the westbound direction along the corridor of Willie Stargell Avenue between Main Street and Webster Street to LOS C. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5z, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce transit travel impacts and bicycle and auto travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce pedestrian travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of the mitigation would maintain transit LOS B. The addition of queue jump lanes at Main Street and Willie Stargell Avenue and at Fifth Street and Willie Stargell Avenue would require widening those intersections and providing receiving lanes of adequate length for buses. It would degrade pedestrian LOS at an intersection along the corridor only when a bus is present and transit signal prioritization is engaged at that intersection, however. At other times, it would not degrade pedestrian LOS or auto LOS at the intersection. Nevertheless, the pedestrian impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5z (Stargell Avenue Transit):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, implement the following improvements:

- *Provide westbound queue jump lanes on Willie Stargell Avenue at Main Street or construct exclusive transit lanes on Willie Stargell Avenue;*
- *Install transit signal priority at intersections along this corridor; and*
- *Optimize cycle length at the Main Street and Willie Stargell Avenue intersection during a.m. and p.m. peak hours.*

22. Stargell Avenue Bike:

The Final EIR finds that the increase in motorized vehicle volume due to project-related traffic along Willie Stargell Avenue between Main Street and Webster Street would cause bicycle LOS to degrade to LOS D in the westbound direction during the a.m. peak hour and in the eastbound direction during the p.m. peak. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5zi, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce transit, pedestrian, and auto travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce bicycle

travel impacts to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5zi would enhance the cyclist experience along Willie Stargell Avenue. However, due to the limitation of the methodology, bicycle LOS for Class I bicycle paths cannot be stated with certainty. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5zi (Stargell Avenue Bike):

The City shall implement Mitigation Measure 4.C-2m (Stargell Avenue bike path).

23. Main Street Bike:

The Final EIR finds that the increase in motorized vehicle volume due to project-related traffic along Main Street between Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway (Appezzato Parkway) and Pacific Avenue would cause bicycle LOS to degrade in both directions during both peak hours. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5zii, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce transit, pedestrian, and auto travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce bicycle travel impacts to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5zii would enhance the cyclist experience along Main Street and would likely improve bicycle LOS to LOS B or better. However, due to the limitation of the methodology, bicycle LOS for Class I bicycle paths cannot be stated with certainty. A Class II bicycle lane would improve bicycle LOS to LOS C, a less-than-significant level. Nevertheless, because it remains uncertain which Class of bicycle lane would be implemented under Mitigation Measure 4.C-2n, set forth above in Finding V.A.5, this impact is conservatively considered cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5zii:

The City shall implement Mitigation Measure 4.C-2n (Main Street bicycle improvements).

24. Central Avenue Bike:

The Final EIR finds that the increase in motorized vehicle volume due to project-related traffic along Central Avenue between the Main Street-Pacific Street intersection and Fourth Street would cause bicycle LOS to degrade in both directions during both peak hours. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5ziii, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce transit, pedestrian, and auto travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce bicycle travel impacts to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5ziii would enhance the cyclist experience along Central Avenue. As previously described, the limits of the methodology used to evaluate bicycle LOS for this study do not include Class I bicycle paths, so bicycle LOS cannot be stated with certainty. This

measure would not degrade the transit LOS or auto LOS along the corridor. Nevertheless, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5ziii (Central Avenue Bike):

The City shall implement Mitigation Measure 4.C-2o (Central Avenue bicycle improvements).

25. Oak Street Bike:

The Final EIR finds that the increase in motorized vehicle volume due to project-related traffic along Oak Street between Santa Clara Avenue and Central Avenue would cause bicycle LOS to degrade to LOS C in the southbound direction during the a.m. peak. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5ziv, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce transit, pedestrian, and auto travel secondary impacts to less-than-significant levels, but would not reduce bicycle travel impacts to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5ziv would not reduce the impact to bicyclists to less than significant; thus, the impact is significant and unavoidable. While additional mitigation could be provided by removing on-street parking along the street and installing bike lanes, it would adversely affect local residents, businesses, and civic uses (City Hall, Library, Police Department) who use the existing on-street parking regularly, and would therefore be infeasible. Therefore, the impact on bicycle travel would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5ziv (Oak Street Bike):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the completion of a bicycle boulevard with appropriate signage and striping along Oak Street from Blanding Avenue to Encinal Avenue to advise motorists and bicyclists to share the street.

C. Impact 4.C-9: Development facilitated by the Project could potentially increase traffic safety hazards for vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians on public roadways due to roadway design features or incompatible uses.

The Final EIR finds that the Project would not construct new streets or upgrade existing streets in a manner that would result in unsafe design features, such as sharp turns or blind intersections. Accordingly, potential traffic safety impacts in Alameda would be less than significant. Project traffic would cause an increase in peak-hour traffic volumes in the core area of Chinatown compared to existing conditions. Daily volumes would increase as well. Because more than one-half of the reported collisions involving pedestrians in the 2009 – 2012 period occurred as vehicles were making left-turns, the project impact on pedestrian safety could be particularly pronounced at the Eighth/Harrison Streets intersection, where project traffic would more than double the

northbound left-turn volume from Harrison Street to Eighth Street in the p.m. peak hour. Although the collision rate at the Chinatown intersections closest to the tunnel portals (Seventh Street and Eight Street at Webster and Harrison Streets) would not be expected to increase in a linear fashion with the increase in traffic generated by the Project, the relatively large increases in peak-hour traffic volume at the these intersections could potentially result in additional collisions involving pedestrians. Therefore, the impact to pedestrian safety at these intersections is significant.

Under 2035 cumulative conditions, the countywide traffic model predicts some redistribution of peak-hour project traffic to routes other than the Webster and Posey Tubes (i.e., to the bridges at Park Street/29th Avenue, Tilden Way/Fruitvale Avenue, and High Street). Because of this, and because other growth would increase volumes at Chinatown intersections, the project contribution to 2035 traffic volumes would be substantially less than under Existing plus Project conditions, and no additional significant effects to pedestrians at Chinatown intersections would be anticipated. Mitigation Measure 4.C-9, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, could potentially reduce the number of collisions involving pedestrians. However, because the effectiveness of TDM at reducing project vehicle trips cannot be quantified, and because the potential access improvements are uncertain, it cannot be stated with certainty that the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Because mitigation other than implementation of the Project TDM Program and Monitoring is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Oakland, the impact at four intersections in Oakland Chinatown would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-9 (Chinatown Pedestrians):

The City of Alameda shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and shall continue to work with the City of Oakland, the ACTC, and Caltrans, to evaluate and implement measures to reduce or divert the volume of traffic that travels through Oakland Chinatown to and from Alameda Point and other City of Alameda destinations.

D. Impact 4.D-1: Development facilitated by the Project could potentially have a significant, adverse impact on Historic Resources within the Alameda Historic District.

The Final EIR finds that new development, infrastructure improvements, flood control measures and other actions that may occur under buildout of the Project could cause the demolition or substantial alteration of buildings, structures, and landscape elements which contribute to the NAS Alameda Historic District; may introduce new structures which are considered visually or architecturally incompatible with the Historic District, thereby affecting the overall character of the Historic District; or adversely impact a contributor to the district. Therefore, this impact would be significant.

Mitigation Measures 4.D-1a through -1c, set forth below, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce, but not eliminate, potential significant adverse impacts to the NAS Alameda Historic District and historic resources.

Therefore, even with implementation of the Mitigation Measure 4.D-1a through -1c, demolition and/or substantial alteration of NAs Alameda Historic District contributors and could result in significant and unavoidable impacts.

Mitigation Measure 4.D-1a:

The City shall implement the requirements of the Historic Preservation Ordinance, which requires a certificate of approval by the HAB for modifications to contributors and resources within the Historic District. As part of the certificate of approval process, project sponsors shall provide:

> *1. An analysis of the proposal's conformity with the Guide to Preserving the Character of the Naval Air Station Alameda Historic District as adopted and amended by the City Council;*
>
> *2. An analysis of the proposal's conformity with general management and design guidelines contained within the NAS Alameda Cultural Landscape Report (JRP, 2012), including application of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes. These include special treatments organized by functional area for such topics as spatial organization, topography, vegetation, views and vistas, circulation, as well as structures, furnishings and objects; and*
>
> *3. An analysis of impacts to the integrity of the Historic District, as a whole, and an analysis of alternatives to avoid potential impacts on the Historic District as a whole, and on an individual resource.*

Mitigation Measure 4.D-1b:

Prior to approval of new buildings within the Historic District the City shall complete and adopt Guidelines for New Infill Development within the NAS Alameda Historic District. All new building will be reviewed for conformance with the guidelines.

Mitigation Measure 4.D-1c:

As a condition of approval for demolition or removal of a contributor to the Historic District, the City shall require that the project applicant:

> *1. Document any Historic District contributor contemplated for demolition under the Project in accordance with the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II documentation standards of the National Park Service[6] including the following:*

---

[6] *It shall be noted that pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(b)(2), "In some circumstances, documentation of an historical resource, by way of historic narrative, photographs or architectural drawings, as mitigation for the effects of demolition of the*

a. Photographs. Large-format (4 x 5-inch negatives or greater), black and white photographs will be taken of all elevations of the building(s), plus limited context and detail shots. A limited number of historical photos of buildings, where available, should also be photographically reproduced. All photographs should be printed on acid-free archival bond paper on 8 x 10 enlargements. Digital photography may be substituted for large-format photographs where necessary.

b. Written History. Prepare a written history of the resource using the HABS standard outline format. Building-specific historical and architectural information from the National Register Nominations and prior inventories and technical reports can be utilized for this effort. If available, reproduce original building drawings on mylar or through photographic means.

c. Archiving. The completed HABS documentation package (photos, report, and drawings) shall be archived at the City of Alameda, the City of Alameda Public Library, the Alameda Naval Air Station Museum, and the Northwest Information Center of Sonoma State University.

2. Prepare and implement a public interpretation plan to describe and convey the historic significance of the NAS Alameda Historic District or resource to the general public. The plan will contain recommendations for the location and design of interpretive elements, such as plaques, markers, exhibits, expansion of the existing Alameda Point self-guided tour, and/or other methods for interpreting the history of the former NAS Alameda. Information generated from the HABS documentation effort, described above, as well as historical information from the National Register Nomination and other technical background reports may be utilized. The interpretive plan will be designed by a professional architectural historian meeting the qualifications of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

3. Prepare and implement an architectural salvage plan for any Historic District contributor contemplated for demolition under the Project. The plan will identify architectural components that are worthy of salvage and reuse either as part of the design of the replacement structures, or elsewhere on the project site. The salvage plan will be prepared by a professional architectural historian meeting the qualifications of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

---

resource will not mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur."

E. Impact 4.D-5: Development facilitated by the Project, in conjunction with past, present, and future development, could potentially adversely affect historic architectural resources in the project vicinity.

The Final EIR finds that impacts to cultural resources from other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity could combine with those of the Project to form a cumulatively considerable impact. A review of the conclusions of the draft and final CEQA documents for these cumulative projects indicate that, with the exception of the Boatworks residential project, none of the other reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity would have a significant, unavoidable impact on historic architectural resources. Construction of the proposed Boatworks residential project, however, would have a significant, adverse impact on historic resources through demolition of the circa 1910 Steel Fabrication Shop/Warehouse and Compressor Room/Storage Building located on that project site (City of Alameda, 2008). Demolition of these historic buildings on the Boatworks site, in combination with the potential demolition of contributors to the NAS Alameda Historic District over the lifetime of the Project, could have a significant cumulative impact on historic resources under CEQA. While implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.D-5 (Mitigation Measure 4.D-1, described above in Finding V.D), set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce impacts to historic architectural resources, it would not reduce them to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, it is conservatively assumed that the Project would have a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact on historic architectural resources.

Mitigation Measure 4.D-5:

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.D-1.

F. Impact 4.F-1: Development facilitated by the Project could potentially result in air quality impacts due to construction activities.

The Final EIR finds that project related demolition, soil transport, remediation, grading and other construction activities at the project site may cause wind-blown dust that could release particulate matter into the atmosphere. Project-related construction would generate air emissions through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, from vehicle trips hauling materials, and from construction workers traveling to and from the project site. Therefore, this impact would be significant. Because construction schedule and phasing have not been determined and development may overlap, there is the potential for project construction emissions to exceed the BAAQMD thresholds. This impact would be significant and unavoidable. However, unlike regional ozone, localized emissions of fugitive dust and TACs would be less than significant with mitigation based on the substantial emission reductions due to applied controls, even if additional development overlap were to occur. Mitigation Measures 4.F-1a through -1e, set forth below, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.F-1a: Fugitive Dust.

The following BAAQMD Best Management Practices for fugitive dust control will be required for all construction activities within the project area. These measures will reduce fugitive dust emissions primarily during soil movement, grading and demolition activities, but also during vehicle and equipment movement on unpaved project sites:

Basic Controls that Apply to All Construction Sites

- *All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.*
- *All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.*
- *All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
- *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
- *All streets, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.*
- *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of CCR). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
- *All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.*
- *A publicly visible sign shall be posted with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.*

Mitigation Measure 4.F-1.b: Construction Exhaust.

The following control measures for construction emissions will be required for all construction activities within the project area:

- *All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be*

checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.

- *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to two minutes. Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*

- *The Project shall develop a plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment (more than 50 horsepower) to be used in the construction project (i.e., owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles) would achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent PM reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on devices such as particulate filters, and/or other options as such become available. (The Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control [VDEC] required under Mitigation Measure 4.F-1d would also comply with this measure.)*

- *Require that all construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NOx and PM.*

- *Require all contractors to use equipment that meets CARB's most recent certification standard for off-road heavy duty diesel engines.*

Mitigation Measure 4.F-1c: Demolition Controls.

Demolition and disposal of any asbestos containing building material shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures specified by Regulation 11, Rule 2 (Asbestos Demolition, Renovation and Manufacturing) of BAAQMD's regulations.

Mitigation Measure 4.F-1d: Toxic Air Contaminants and PM2.5.

The project sponsors shall ensure that construction contract specifications include a requirement that all off-road construction equipment used for project improvements be equipped with a Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control (VDEC), which would reduce diesel particulate emissions by at least 85 percent.

Mitigation Measure 4.F-1.e: Delayed Occupancy.

Health risks from construction-related emissions to new residences proposed under the project shall be minimized by delaying issuance of occupancy permits for new residential until after the completion of construction activities at adjacent buildings upwind in prevailing west and northwest winds during individual development phases of the project.

G. Impact 4.F-2: Development facilitated by the Project could potentially generate operational emissions that would result in a considerable net increase of criteria pollutants and precursors for which the air basin is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

The Final EIR finds that project site development would result in an increase in criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions, including ROG, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5 from a variety of emissions sources, including onsite area and energy sources (e.g., natural gas combustion for space and water heating, landscape maintenance, use of consumer products such as hairsprays, deodorants, cleaning products, etc.) and mobile on-road sources. Therefore, this impact would be significant. Mitigation Measure 4.F-2, set forth below, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce this impact but not to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable for emissions of ROG and PM10, and potentially for PM2.5.

Mitigation Measure 4.F-2:

The following measures shall be incorporated into the project design for properties within the project area:

- *Implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program, as described in detail in Mitigation Measure 4.C-1a in Section 4.C, Transportation.*
- *Require only natural gas hearths in residential units as a condition of final building permit;*
- *Consider smart meters and programmable thermostats;*
- *Meet State and Local Green Building Code standards in all new construction;*
- *Install solar water heaters for all uses as feasible;*
- *Use recycled water when available;*
- *Install low-flow fixtures (faucets, toilets, showers);*
- *Use water efficient irrigation systems; and*
- *Institute recycling and composting services.*

H. Impact 4.F-8: Development facilitated by the proposed, when combined with past, present and other reasonably foreseeable development in the vicinity, could potentially result in cumulative criteria air pollutant air quality impacts.

According to the BAAQMD, no single project is sufficient in size, by itself, to result in nonattainment of ambient air quality standards for regional criteria pollutants. Instead, a project's individual emissions contribute to existing cumulatively significant adverse air quality impacts. There are many projects throughout San Francisco Bay area that have been identified as having significant and unavoidable operational and construction-related regional pollutant impacts. Consequently, for assessment of cumulative regional pollutant impacts, BAAQMD has developed a methodology of

assessing whether a project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution. According to the BAAQMD *Justification Report*, if a project exceeds the identified significance thresholds, its emissions would be cumulatively considerable, resulting in significant adverse air quality impacts to the region's existing air quality conditions (BAAQMD, 2009).

Mitigation Measure 4.F-8 (Mitigation Measures 4.F-2 and 4.F-7b), set forth below, is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. As described in Impact 4.F-2, project operational emissions of ROG and PM10, and potentially PM2.5, would exceed the significance thresholds even with mitigation. Project impacts would therefore be significant. Because operational emissions from project emissions would be significant and unavoidable, project emissions would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to emissions from other projects, which would result in cumulatively significant air quality operational impacts.

Mitigation Measure 4.F-8:

Implement Mitigation Measures 4.F-2 and 4.F-7b.

I. Impact 4.G-1: Construction facilitated by the Project could potentially expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of the City noise standards.

The Final EIR finds that construction noise would be substantially greater than existing noise levels at nearby sensitive receptor locations. However, construction at any particular area of the project site would be short-term and the noise levels would attenuate as development moved further from the sensitive receptors. Noise from pile driving in particular is not constant, but intermittent, and there is an interval between the completion of driving one pile and commencement of driving another while equipment is repositioned. In addition, buildings to be constructed under the project could reduce noise exposure if they block the line of sight from construction activities to sensitive receptors.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.G-1a through 1d, set forth below, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would ensure that construction of the Project would comply with the City of Alameda Noise Ordinance and would reduce the construction noise levels from the project to the extent feasible. However, certain construction activities may need to occur outside of the allowable hours, such as for infrastructure projects. Some components, such as levees, may require continuous concrete pours that could span an entire work day into the off hours. Because such activities may occur during project construction and could result in substantial noise in the more sensitive evening and nighttime hours, construction noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.G-1a:

The City will require construction contractors to limit standard construction activities hours to be in compliance with the Noise Ordinance. Pile driving activities greater than 90 dBA limited to between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. No pile driving shall be allowed on weekends and National holidays.

Mitigation Measure 4.G-1b:

To reduce daytime noise impacts due to construction, the City will require construction contractors to implement the following measures:

- *Equipment and trucks used for project construction will utilize the best available noise control techniques, such as improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible.*

- *Impact tools (i.e., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust will be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves will be used where feasible, and this could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures will be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever feasible.*

- *Stationary noise sources will be located as far from adjacent receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or other measures to the extent feasible.*

- *Haul routes that affect the fewest number of people will be selected.*

Mitigation Measure 4.G-1c:

Pile driving activities within 300 feet of sensitive receptors will require additional noise attenuation measures. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures will be submitted for review and approval by the City to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures will include as many of the following control strategies as feasible:

- *Erect temporary plywood noise barriers if they would block the line of sight between sensitive receptors and construction activities, particularly for existing residences in the northern area of the project site and for residences across Main Street;*

- *Implement "quiet" pile driving technology (such as pre-drilling of piles or use of sonic pile drivers), where feasible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions; and*

- *Utilize noise control blankets on the building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site.*

Mitigation Measure 4.G-1d:

Prior to the issuance of each building permit, along with the submission of construction documents, the project applicant will submit to the City a list of measures to respond to and track complaints pertaining to construction noise. These measures will include:

- *Signs will be posted at the construction site that include permitted construction days and hours, a day and evening contact number for the job site, and a contact number with the City of Alameda in the event of noise complaints. The project applicant will designate an onsite complaint and enforcement manager to track and respond to noise complaints; and*

- *Notification of neighbors within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 day in advance of pile-driving activities about the estimated duration of the activity.*

J. Impact 4.G-3: Transportation-related operations facilitated by the Project could potentially result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity or above levels existing without the Project.

The Final EIR finds that most of the noise generated by the development facilitated by the Project would be traffic-generated noise. Noise increases associated with project traffic along street segments of Main Street, Atlantic Avenue, and Willie Stargell Avenue (specifically segments 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, and 15) would exceed the significance criterion (4 dBA or greater increase) without mitigation. Due to the uncertainty pertaining to quantifying the effectiveness of implementing TDM strategies, the travel demand analysis used as a basis for calculating traffic noise does not assume additional trip reduction due to specific TDM strategies at this time. Therefore, because it cannot be stated with certainty how much traffic and associated traffic noise will be reduced by implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.G-3, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, increases in noise caused by project traffic would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure 4.G-3:

To reduce automobile trips and associated automobile noise impacts, implement Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a (TDM Program).

K. Impact 4.G-6: Increases in traffic from development facilitated by the Project in combination with other development could potentially result in cumulatively considerable noise increases.

The Final EIR finds that the major source of noise associated with project development would be from traffic on the street network, which would result in cumulative noise increases created by the Project together with existing traffic and traffic from the development of other projects in the area through the year 2035. The project would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact with respect to traffic noise in Oakland. However, in Alameda, impacts associated with long-term operational traffic would be cumulatively significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.G-6 (Mitigation Measures 4.G-3, above in Finding V.J, and 4.G-5, set below in Finding VI.S), set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce the project's cumulatively considerable impact, but not to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.G-6:

Implement Mitigation Measures 4.G-3 and 4.G-5.

VI. SIGNIFICANT OR POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS THAT CAN BE AVOIDED OR MITIGATED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL BY MITIGATION MEASURES INCORPORATED INTO THE PROJECT

The Final EIR identifies the following significant or potentially significant impacts associated with the Project. These impacts are eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR. It is hereby determined that the impacts addressed by these mitigation measures will be mitigated to a less-than-significant level or avoided by incorporation of these mitigation measures into the Project. Pub. Resources Code § 21081(a)(1). As explained in Section X, below, the findings in this Section are based on the Final EIR, the discussion and analysis in which is hereby incorporated in full by this reference.

A. Impact 4.C-1: Development facilitated by the Project would generate temporary increases in traffic volumes on area roadways during construction.

The Final EIR finds that Project construction activities would generate off-site traffic. Construction-generated traffic would be temporary and, therefore, would not result in any long-term degradation in operating conditions on roadways in the project site vicinity. The impact of construction-related traffic would be a temporary and intermittent lessening of the capacities of streets in the project site vicinity because of the slower movements and larger turning radii of construction trucks compared to passenger vehicles. Most construction traffic would be dispersed throughout the day. Thus, the temporary increase would not significantly disrupt daily traffic flow on roadways in the project site vicinity in the long term. Although the impact would be

temporary, truck movements could have an adverse effect on traffic flow in the project site vicinity. Therefore, the impact is potentially significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-1, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-1:

The City shall require that project applicant(s) and construction contractor(s) develop a Construction Management Plan for review and approval by the Public Works Department prior to issuance of any permits. The Plan shall include at least the following items and requirements to reduce traffic congestion during construction:

1. A set of comprehensive traffic control measures shall be developed, including scheduling of major truck trips and deliveries to avoid peak traffic hours, detour signs if required, lane closure procedures, signs, cones for drivers, and designated construction access routes.

2. The Construction Management Plan shall identify haul routes for movement of construction vehicles that would minimize impacts on motor vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic, circulation, and safety, and specifically to minimize impacts, to the greatest extent possible, to streets in and around the Alameda Point Project site. The haul routes shall be approved by the City.

3. The Construction Management Plan shall provide for notification procedures for adjacent property owners and public safety personnel regarding when major deliveries, detours, and lane closures would occur.

4. The Construction Management Plan shall provide for monitoring surface streets used for haul routes so that any damage and debris attributable to the truck hauling can be identified and corrected by the project applicant.

B. Impact 4.C-2: Development facilitated by the Project would potentially result in a transportation impact at study locations under Existing plus Project conditions.

1. Fernside/Otis:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase in traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of Fernside Boulevard and Otis Drive (Intersection #25) would contribute more than three percent to the intersection traffic volume under existing conditions during a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Therefore, this impact would be significant. This change in traffic volume can be attributed in part to some project trips directly as well as diverted trips.

The degree to which implementation of the TDM Program and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4C-2b) would reduce peak-hour travel cannot be

accurately determined at this time, particularly given that effectiveness would be anticipated to improve over time as an increasing number of residential and non-residential tenants and residents of Alameda Point begin to contribute to, and participate in, program implementation.. Therefore, if determined by the Monitoring and Improvement Program to be needed, Mitigation Measure 4.C-2c, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would be implemented. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a, 4.C-2b, and 4.C-2c, set forth below, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce these impacts, as well as transit, bicycle, and pedestrian travel secondary impacts, to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a (TDM Program):

Prior to issuance of building permits for each development project at Alameda Point, the City of Alameda shall prepare, and shall require that the sponsor of the development project participate in implementation of, a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program/plan for Alameda Point aimed at meeting the General Plan peak-hour trip reduction goals of 10 percent for residential development and 30 percent for commercial development.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2b (Monitoring):

Prior to issuance of the first building permits for any development project at Alameda Point, the City of Alameda shall adopt a Transportation Network Monitoring and Improvement Program to: 1) determine the cost of the transportation network improvements identified in this EIR; 2) identify appropriate means and formulas to collect fair share financial contributions from Alameda Point development; 3) monitor conditions at the locations that will be impacted by the redevelopment of Alameda Point; 4) monitor traffic generated by Alameda Point; and 5) annually report to the Planning Board to determine the appropriate time to implement any necessary secondary physical improvements required in this EIR to minimize or eliminate significant transportation impacts prior to the impacts occurring at affected locations where a secondary impact mitigation is recommended.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2c (Otis/Fernside):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when and if required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall implement the following improvements:

- *Remove the right turn island for the westbound approach on Otis Drive, add a dedicated right turn lane with approximately 50 feet of storage length, and move the westbound stop-bar upstream approximately 20 feet to accommodate the right turn lane storage length. Restripe Fernside Boulevard with two receiving lanes.*

- *Optimize signal timing.*

2. Main/Pacific Pedestrian:

The Final EIR finds that, at the actuated signal at Main Street and Pacific Avenue (Intersection #6), the increase in volumes due to Project-related traffic during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours would cause increases in pedestrian delay for several legs of the intersection. Therefore, this impact would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2g, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce these impacts, as well as transit, bicycle, and auto travel secondary impacts, to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2g (Main/Pacific Pedestrian):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall implement the following physical improvements:

- *change the signal timing to a two-phase timing plan (i.e., northbound and southbound move concurrently; then eastbound and westbound move concurrently); and*
- *optimize cycle length.*

3. Webster/Appezzato Parkway Pedestrian:

The Final EIR finds that, at the actuated signal at Webster Street and Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway (Intersection #7), the increase in volumes due to project-related traffic during the p.m. peak hour would cause increases in pedestrian delay for several legs of the intersection. Therefore, this impact would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2h, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce these impacts, as well as transit, bicycle, and auto travel secondary impacts, to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2h (Webster/Appezzato Parkway Pedestrian):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall optimize the signal timing during the p.m. peak hour.

4. Park/Otis Pedestrian:

The Final EIR finds that, at the actuated signal at Park Street and Otis Drive (Intersection #15), the increase in volumes due to project-related traffic during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours would cause increases in pedestrian delay for several legs of the intersection. Therefore, this impact would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2i, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce these impacts, as well as transit, bicycle, and auto travel secondary impacts, to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2i (Park/Otis Pedestrian):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall optimize the signal timing during the a.m. and p.m. and peak hours.

5. Broadway/Tilden Pedestrian:

The Final EIR finds that, at the actuated signal at Broadway and Tilden Way (Intersection #16), the increase in volumes due to project-related traffic during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours would cause increases in pedestrian delay for several legs of the intersection. Therefore, this impact would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2j, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce these impacts, as well as transit, bicycle, and auto travel secondary impacts, to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2j (Broadway/Tilden Pedestrian):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall optimize the signal timing during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

6. High/Fernside Pedestrian:

The Final EIR finds that, at the actuated signal at High Street and Fernside Boulevard (Intersection #20), the increase in volumes due to project-related traffic during the p.m. peak hour would cause increases in pedestrian delay for several legs of the intersection. Therefore, this impact would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2k, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce these impacts, as well as transit, bicycle, and auto travel secondary impacts, to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2k (High/Fernside Pedestrian):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall optimize the signal timing during the p.m. peak hour.

7. Atlantic Avenue/Constitution Pedestrian:

The Final EIR finds that, at the actuated signal at Atlantic Avenue and Constitution Way (Intersection #24), the increase in volumes due to project-related traffic during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours would cause increases in pedestrian delay for several legs of the intersection. Therefore, this impact would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-2l, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce these impacts, as well as transit, bicycle, and auto travel secondary impacts, to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2l (Atlantic/Constitution Pedestrian):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall implement the following physical improvements:

- *modify the phasing sequence; and*
- *optimize the signal timing.*

C. Impact 4.C-5: Cumulative development, including the Project, would potentially result in transportation impacts at local study locations under Cumulative plus project conditions.

1. Tilden/Blanding/Fernside:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase in traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of Tilden Way/Blanding Avenue/Fernside Boulevard (Intersection #19) would contribute more than 3 percent to the growth in intersection traffic volumes (4 percent during the a.m. peak and 5 percent during the p.m. peak) from Existing to Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would exceed the 3 percent criterion for a significant impact by 1 percent during the a.m. peak condition and 2 percent during the p.m. peak. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5d, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce these impacts, as well as transit, bicycle, and auto travel secondary impacts, to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of the TDM Program (Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a) would reduce peak-hour travel by at least 3% at this location. Therefore, this impact would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5d: (Tilden/Blanding/Fernside):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvements:

- *Optimize the offsets and splits.*

2. Fernside/Otis:

The Final EIR finds that the Project's increase in traffic volumes at the signalized intersection of Fernside Boulevard and Otis Drive (Intersection #25) would contribute more than 3 percent to the growth in intersection traffic volumes (10 percent during the a.m. peak and 5 percent during the p.m. peak) from Existing to Cumulative plus Project conditions, and therefore would be cumulatively significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5h (4.C-2c), set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce these impacts, as well as transit, bicycle, and pedestrian travel secondary impacts, to less-than-significant levels. This mitigation would require geometric modifications, such as removal of the existing concrete island and the Otis Drive median, and reconstruction of the southeast curb along Fernside Boulevard. These improvements would occur within the existing right-of-way by shifting the centerline to allow for the northbound right turn from Otis Drive to Fernside Boulevard.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5h (Fernside Boulevard and Otis Drive):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and implement Mitigation Measure 4.C-2c (Otis/Fernside), and fund a fair share contribution to add a westbound right-turn overlap phase from Fernside Boulevard.

3. Park/Lincoln:

The Final EIR finds that the signalized intersection of Park Street and Lincoln Avenue (Intersection #32) would operate at an unacceptable LOS E under Cumulative plus Project conditions. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5k, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce these impacts, as well as transit, bicycle, and pedestrian travel secondary impacts, to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5k (Park/Lincoln):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, the City shall fund a fair-share to optimize signal timing during the p.m. peak hour.

4. Main/Pacific Pedestrian:

The Final EIR finds that at the actuated signal at Main Street and Pacific Avenue (Intersection #6), the increase in volumes due to project-related traffic during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours would cause increases in pedestrian delay for several legs of the intersection. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5t, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce these impacts, as well as transit, bicycle, and auto travel secondary impacts, to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5t (Main/Pacific Pedestrian):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair-share contribution to change signal timing to two-phase timing plan (i.e., northbound and southbound move concurrently; then eastbound and westbound move concurrently) and optimize cycle length.

5. High/Fernside Pedestrian:

The Final EIR finds that at the actuated signal at High Street and Fernside Boulevard (#20), the increase in volumes due to project-related traffic during the a.m. peak hour would cause increases in pedestrian delay for several legs of the intersection. Therefore, the Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.C-5v, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid or reduce these impacts, as well as transit, bicycle, and auto travel secondary impacts, to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-5v (High/Fernside Pedestrian):

The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and Mitigation Measure 4.C-5e (optimize signal timing during the p.m. peak hour).

D. Impact 4.D-2: Development facilitated by the Project could potentially result in the inadvertent discovery of unique archaeological resources.

No archaeological resources have been recorded in the project area. The Final EIR finds that, based on the geologic conditions and site history, the project area has a low potential to contain buried prehistoric or historic-era sites. However, the possibility of encountering archaeological resources cannot be entirely discounted. Therefore, this impact would be significant. Implementation of the Mitigation Measure 4.D-2, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.D-2:

If cultural resources are encountered, all activity within 100 feet of the find shall halt until it can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American representative. Prehistoric archaeological materials might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil ("midden") containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-era materials might include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. If the archaeologist and Native American representative determine that the resources may be significant, they shall notify the City of Alameda and shall develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. The archaeologist shall consult with Native American monitors or other appropriate Native American representatives in determining appropriate treatment for unearthed cultural resources if the resources are prehistoric or Native American in nature.

In considering any suggested measures proposed by the archaeologist and Native American representative in order to mitigate impacts to cultural resources, the project applicant shall determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, project design, costs, and other considerations. If avoidance is infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) shall be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the project area while mitigation for cultural resources is being carried out.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(b), Mitigation Measures Related to Impacts on Historical Resources, the City of Alameda will, whenever feasible, seek to avoid damaging effects on any historical resource of an archaeological nature. The following factors shall be considered for a project involving an archaeological site:

A. Preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to archaeological sites. Preservation in place maintains the relationship between artifacts and the archaeological context. Preservation may also avoid conflict with religious or cultural values of groups associated with the site.

B. Preservation in place may be accomplished by, but is not limited to, the following:

1. *Planning construction to avoid archaeological sites;*
2. *Incorporation of sites within parks, greenspace, or other open space;*
3. *Covering the archaeological sites with a layer of chemically stable soil before building tennis courts, parking lots, or similar facilities on the site.*
4. *Deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement.*

C. When data recovery through excavation is the only feasible mitigation, a data recovery plan, which makes provisions for adequately recovering the scientifically consequential information from and about the historical resource, shall be prepared and adopted prior to any excavation being undertaken. Such studies shall be deposited with the California Historical Resources Regional Information Center. Archeological sites known to contain human remains shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 7050.5 Health and Safety Code. If an artifact must be removed during project excavation or testing, curation may be an appropriate mitigation.

D. Data recovery shall not be required for an historical resource if the lead agency determines that testing or studies already completed have adequately recovered the scientifically consequential information from and about the archaeological or historical resource, provided that the determination is documented in the EIR and that the studies are deposited with the California Historical Resources Regional Information Center.

E. Impact 4.D-3: Development facilitated by the Project could potentially result in the discovery of unidentified unique paleontological resources.

The Final EIR finds that there are no known fossil sites in the project area, and the underlying geologic units have a low potential to yield significant paleontological resources. Due to the imported fill and Bay Mud deposits which comprise the site, there are no unique geological features at Alameda Point that could be affected by the Project. Ground disturbance for the project would excavate or otherwise disturb previous fills, relict dune sands, and Bay Mud deposits – all of which are unlikely to yield fossil resources. However, because it has not been proven that fossil resources do not occur within the subsurface geology of the site, disturbance or destruction of a paleontological resource is a potentially significant impact of the Project. Therefore, this impact would be significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.D-3, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would avoid disturbance or destruction of accidentally discovered fossil resources by halting work and salvaging the find, if appropriate. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.D-3 would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.D-3:

If paleontological resources, such as fossilized bone, teeth, shell, tracks, trails, casts, molds, or impressions are discovered during ground-disturbing construction activities, all such activities within 100 feet of the find shall be halted until a qualified paleontologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate salvage measures in consultation with the City of Alameda and in conformance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology Guidelines (SVP, 1995; SVP, 1996).

F. Impact 4.D-4: Development facilitated by the Project could potentially result in the inadvertent discovery of human remains.

The Final EIR finds that there is no indication that the project site or area has been used for burial purposes in the recent or distant past. It is unlikely that human remains would be encountered in the project area or on the project site. However, in the event of the discovery of any human remains during project construction activities, work would be halted. Damage to human remains would be a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.D-4, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.D-4:

In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during construction activities, such activities within 100 feet of the find shall cease. The Alameda County Coroner shall be contacted immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, and no investigation of the cause of death is required, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) will be contacted within 24 hours. The NAHC will identify and contact the person or persons it believes to be the "most likely descendant (MLD)" of the deceased Native American, who in turn would make recommendations for the appropriate means of treating the human remains and any grave goods.

G. Impact 4.D-6: Development facilitated by the Project, in conjunction with cumulative development, would have a less-than-significant impact on unique archaeological and paleontological resources, as well as human remains, in the project vicinity.

The Final EIR finds that no impacts to known or recorded prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources, paleontological resources, or human remains have been identified in any of the cumulative projects described above. Similar to the Project, impacts to unknown or unrecorded archaeological or paleontological resources, including human remains, are potentially significant, but can be reduced to a less-than-significant level by the application of standard accidental discovery mitigation measures, which are identified in each of the CEQA documents prepared for all cumulative projects. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.D-6 (Mitigation Measures 4.D-2 through -4, above at Findings VI.D-F), set forth below and hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would also reduce potentially significant cumulative impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources, as well as human remains.

Mitigation Measure 4.D-6:

Implement Mitigation Measures 4.D-2, -3, and -4.

H. Impact 4.E-1: Development facilitated by the Project would have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

The Final EIR finds that the Project would potentially affect sensitive marine species in their general use of project area waters for foraging and resting. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.E-1a, 4.E-1b, and 4.E-1c, set forth below, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce construction impacts to less-than-significant levels by ensuring that noise levels would not exceed noise level thresholds. Installed dock lighting would cause increased nighttime illumination of Bay waters that may alter normal fish behavior and would be a potentially

significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.E-1d, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce this impact to less than significant.

The Project could potentially impact foraging and roosting birds through loss or degradation of foraging and roosting habitat due to dredging, increases in human activity throughout Alameda Point and development of the Northwest Territories as open space. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.E-1e, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels. The Project could have potential impacts on roosting or breeding bats through mortality resulting from tree removal, building removal, or roost destruction by any other means. Increases in noise or increased human activity could cause bats to alter behavior, potentially resulting in lost fitness or impaired reproductive success. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.E-1f and 4.E-1g, set forth below, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

The Project could have potential impacts on the Monarch butterfly through tree removal that could destroy or impact autumnal roosts or overwintering sites, potentially resulting in butterfly mortality and/or loss of seasonal habitat. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.E-1h, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce potential impacts on this species to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.E-1a:

Prior to the start of marina or ferry terminal construction, the City shall require a NMFS-approved sound attenuation monitoring plan to protect fish and marine mammals, if pile driving is planned for the Seaplane Lagoon. This plan shall provide detail on the sound attenuation system, detail methods used to monitor and verify sound levels during pile driving activities, and describe management practices to be taken to reduce impact hammer pile-driving sound in the marine environment to an intensity level of less than 183 dB. The sound monitoring results shall be made available to the NMFS. The plan shall incorporate, but not be limited, to the following best management practices (BMPs):

- *To the extent feasible, all pilings shall be installed and removed with vibratory pile drivers only. Vibratory pile driving will be conducted following the Corps' "Proposed Procedures for Permitting Projects that will Not Adversely Affect Selected Listed Species in California". USFWS and NOAA completed Section 7 consultation on this document, which establishes general procedures for minimizing impacts to natural resources associated with projects in or adjacent to jurisdictional waters.*

- *An impact pile driver may only be used where necessary to complete installation of larger steel pilings in accordance with seismic safety or other engineering criteria*

- *The hammer shall be cushioned using a 12-inch thick wood cushion block during all impact hammer pile driving operations*

- *All piling installation using impact hammers shall be conducted between June 1 and November 30, when the likelihood of sensitive fish species being present in the work area is minimal*

- *If pile installation using impact hammers must occur at times other than the approved work window, the project applicant shall obtain incidental take authorization from NMFS and CDFW, as necessary, to address potential impacts on steelhead trout, chinook salmon, and Pacific herring and implement all requested actions to avoid impacts*

- *The project applicant shall monitor and verify sound levels during pile driving activities. The sound monitoring results will be made available to NMFS and the City*

- *In the event that exceedance of noise thresholds established and approved by NMFS occurs, a contingency plan involving the use of bubble curtains or air barrier shall be implemented to attenuate sound levels to below thresholds*

Mitigation Measure 4.E-1b:

During the project permitting phase, the City will ensure that any projects requiring in-water work include consultation with NMFS to determine if the work can be covered under one of the programmatic consultations for federally listed species described above or if a project-level BO would be required and whether an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) for marine mammals would be needed for dredging or pile driving activities. The project applicant shall also consult with CDFW regarding State special-status fish and the potential need for an incidental take permit (ITP). The project applicant shall submit to the City copies of any IHA and/or ITP received or, alternatively, copies of correspondence confirming that an IHA and/or ITP is not required for the project in question.

Mitigation Measure 4.E-1c:

As part of the NMFS-approved sound attenuation monitoring plan required for pile driving in the Seaplane Lagoon in Mitigation Measure 4.E-1a, the City shall ensure that the project applicant implements the following actions in addition to those listed in Mitigation Measure 4.E-1a to reduce the effect of underwater noise transmission on marine mammals. These actions shall include at a minimum:

- *Establishment of a 1,600-foot (500-meter) safety zone that shall be maintained around the sound source, for the protection of marine mammals in the event that sound levels are unknown or cannot be adequately predicted*

- *Work activities shall be halted when a marine mammal enters the 1,600-feet (500-meter) safety zone and resume only after the animal has been gone from the area for a minimum of 15 minutes*

- *A "soft start" technique shall be employed in all pile driving to marine mammals an opportunity to vacate the area*

- *Maintain sound levels below 90 dBA in air when pinnipeds (seals and sea lions) are present*

- *A NMFS-approved biological monitor will conduct daily surveys before and during impact hammer pile driving to inspect the work zone and adjacent Bay waters for marine mammals. The monitor will be present as specified by NMFS during the impact pile-driving phases of construction*

Mitigation Measure 4.E-1d:

Prior to occupancy, the City shall ensure that the project applicant installs dock lighting on all floating docks that minimizes artificial lighting of Bay waters by using shielded, low-mounted, and low light-intensity fixtures and bulbs.

Mitigation Measure 4.E-1e:

Prior to opening the proposed regional park in the Northwest Territories and the proposed Bay Trail in the Northwest Territories and on the Federal Property, the City shall ensure that measures are taken to identify sensitive resources in these areas and to restrict access of humans and dogs to those resources. Measures to be implemented could include, but are not limited to, the following:

- *Surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to identify sensitive resources locations throughout the City's portion of the Northwest Territories and on the Federal Property along the proposed Bay trail alignment*

- *Additional seasonal access restrictions, as appropriate*

- *Educational signage and brochures regarding sensitive resources and the need to avoid them*

- *Fencing trails where they run proximate to sensitive biological resources (e.g. wetlands, known breeding grounds)*

- *On-leash restrictions on dogs throughout or prohibition of dogs altogether in certain areas based on the results of the sensitive resources surveys (e.g., on the Bay Trail in the Federal Property)*

Mitigation Measure 4.E-1f:

Potential direct and indirect disturbances to bats shall be identified by locating colonies, and instituting protective measures prior to construction. No more than two weeks in advance of tree removal, demolition of buildings onsite, or initiation of construction within 100 feet of trees or structures providing potential bat roosting sites, a qualified bat biologist (e.g., a biologist holding a CDFW collection permit and a Memorandum of Understanding with CDFW allowing the biologist to handle and collect bats) shall conduct pre-construction surveys for bat roosts. No activities that could disturb active roosts shall proceed prior to the completed surveys.

Mitigation Measure 4.E-1g:

If a maternity colony is located within the project site during pre-construction surveys, the project shall be redesigned to avoid impacts if feasible, and a no-disturbance buffer acceptable in size to the CDFW shall be created around the roost. Bat roosts (maternity or otherwise) initiated during construction are generally presumed to be unaffected by increased noise, vibration, or human activity, and no buffer is necessary as long as roost sites are not directly altered or destroyed. However, the "take" of individuals is still prohibited at any time.

- *If there is a maternity colony present and the project cannot be redesigned to avoid removal of the tree or structure inhabited by the bats, demolition of that tree or structure shall not commence until after young are flying (i.e., after July 31, confirmed by a qualified bat biologist) or before maternity colonies form the following year (i.e. prior to March 1).*

- *If a non-maternity roost must be removed as part of the project, the non-maternity roost shall be evicted prior to building/tree removal by a qualified biologist, using methods such as making holes in the roost to alter the air-flow or creating one-way funnel exits for the bats.*

- *If significant (e.g., maternity roosts or large non-maternity roost sites) bat roosting habitat is destroyed during building/tree removal, artificial bat roosts shall be constructed in an undisturbed area in the project site vicinity away from human activity and at least 200 feet from project demolition/construction activities. The design and location of the artificial bat roost(s) shall be determined by a qualified bat biologist.*

Mitigation Measure 4.E-1h:

The City shall ensure that the project applicant for development facilitated by the Project protects active autumnal/overwintering roost sites used by monarch butterflies by conducting construction activities in and around identified butterfly autumnal roost/overwintering sites outside of the autumnal migratory/overwintering season (October to March), to the greatest extent feasible, to avoid potential impacts on monarch butterfly.

- *The project applicant shall retain a biologist familiar with monarch butterfly life history and habitat requirements to conduct surveys for active monarch butterfly roost sites anywhere groves (greater than 3 trees planted together) of mature conifers (e.g. Italian stone pine, Monterey cypress) and/or eucalyptus occur in the Main Street Neighborhood Sub-area and in open space to the south of Main Street as it skirts the northern edge of the project area between November and January and prior to start of construction.*

- *All active roost sites encountered during the survey shall be identified and mapped for future reference. The previously active roost site identified in 2002 shall be considered active until proven otherwise. Active sites shall be monitored annually to inform future development. Once identified, such sites shall be considered active until such time as monarchs have not returned to the site for a period of ten years. Once ten years have passed with no significant butterfly use (as determined by the qualified biologist) of a site the restrictions below would no longer apply.*

- *No tree removal shall be conducted at any time in or around active roost sites to the extent that such removal would: a) result in the loss of an active roost tree; b) result in changes to the amount of wind affecting an active roost; or c) result in changes of the thermal environment surrounding an active roost tree.*

If active roost sites are identified and it is not feasible to avoid the overwintering season and construction activities take place during this time (October through March), the following measures shall apply:

- *Mapped autumnal roost/overwintering roosts within 100 feet of construction areas shall be surveyed not more than two weeks prior to construction to determine whether they are actively being used by butterflies.*

- *If a mapped autumnal roost/overwintering site is supporting butterflies, work activities shall be delayed within 100 feet of the site location until avoidance measures have been implemented. Appropriate avoidance measures shall include the following measures (which may be modified as a result of consultation with CDFW to provide equally effective measures):*

    - *If the qualified wildlife biologist determines that construction activities shall not affect an active autumnal roost/overwintering site, activities may proceed without restriction.*

    - *A no-disturbance buffer may be established around the autumnal roost/overwintering site to avoid disturbance or destruction until butterflies resume their migration.*

    - *The extent of the no-disturbance buffers is typically 100 feet but shall be determined by a qualified wildlife biologist in consultation with the CDFW.*

I. Impact 4.E-2: Development facilitated by the Project would have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The Final EIR finds that dredging and pile removal associated with renovation or demolition of existing piers could potentially affect submerged aquatic vegetation on the Bay floor or attached to pier pilings, as well as native oysters. An increase in the number of recreational boats could also affect eelgrass beds or native oyster beds when anchoring in Bay waters off the shores of Alameda Point. Potential effects from dredging as well as pile driving could range from short-term to permanent, depending on the extent and degree of disturbance, and would be expected to result in possible mortality, physical injury, or physiological stress resulting from reduction in habitat suitability, and physical disturbance/removal. Dredging and pile removal and installation could result in direct mortality of native oysters and eelgrass. Any such impacts resulting in significant damage to eelgrass beds or native oyster beds would be potentially significant because eelgrass beds are considered to be of critical importance to Bay marine life and native oysters are still generally quite rare throughout the Bay. This potentially significant impact would be reduced to less-than-significant levels through implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.E-2a, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project.

The greatest potential threat to the sensitive aquatic communities off Alameda Point could be from boaters unfamiliar with San Francisco Bay's sensitive habitats, their locations, and the importance of protecting these habitats. In addition, in-water work and increases in recreational boaters could result in the introduction and/or spread of invasive marine species. These potentially significant impacts on eelgrass and oyster beds by in-water work and recreational boaters would be reduced to less than significant through the implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.E-2b and 4.E-2c, set forth below, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project.

Mitigation Measure 4.E-2a:

Prior to marina or ferry terminal construction, the City shall ensure that the project applicant conducts a pre-construction survey to determine if native oysters and eelgrass are present in Seaplane Lagoon.

- *The eelgrass survey shall be conducted according to the methods contained in the California Draft Eelgrass Mitigation Policy (CDEMP) (NMFS 2011), with the exception that the survey shall be conducted within 120 days (rather than 60 days, as recommended in the CDEMP) prior to the desired construction start date, to allow sufficient time for modification of project plans (if feasible) and agency consultation.*

- *If found within or immediately adjacent to the construction footprint, the project applicant shall first determine whether avoidance of the beds is*

feasible. If feasible, impacts to the oyster or eelgrass bed shall be avoided. If complete avoidance is not feasible, the applicant shall request guidance from the National Marine Fisheries Service (or other applicable agency) as to the need and/or feasibility to move affected beds. Any translocation of eelgrass beds shall be conducted consistent with the methods described in the CDEMP and/or those described in Eelgrass Conservation in San Francisco Bay: Opportunities and Constraints (Boyer and Wyllie-Echeverria, 2010). Translocation of oyster beds shall be consistent with methods and recommendations presented in Shellfish Conservation and Restoration in San Francisco Bay: Opportunities and Constraints (Zabin et al., 2010)

- *If it is not possible to translocate oyster or eelgrass beds then the City shall ensure that the project applicant provides compensatory mitigation consistent with the CDEMP for eelgrass (a ratio of 3.01:1 [transplant area to impact area]) and a minimum 1:1 ratio for oyster beds.*

- *The relocation or compensatory mitigation site for eelgrass or oyster beds shall be located within San Francisco Bay.*

Mitigation Measure 4.E-2b:

Prior to occupancy the City shall ensure that the marina project applicant prepares educational information regarding sensitive biological resources at Alameda Point, the adjacent Federal Property, and within Bay waters. This information shall be disseminated to all boaters using the marina and shall include, but not be limited to, information educating boat owner/operators about sensitive habitats and species in the Bay and actions they are required to implement to avoid impacts to marine resources.

The educational information will be disseminated to visiting boaters through multiple methods including, but not limited to, brochures or pamphlets; marina and/or City websites; boating, cruising, and newspaper periodicals; and social media. The information shall be prepared soliciting input from, and in cooperation with, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), United States Coast Guard (USCG), California State Lands Commission, National Park Service (NPS), California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR), Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), and local organizations active in protecting Bay marine resources, as appropriate.

Educational information shall clearly address in multiple languages, but not be limited to, the following topics:

- *Information on the location of eelgrass beds in the vicinity of Alameda Island, as well as the greater central Bay and the importance of protecting and avoiding these sensitive habitats (e.g., by not anchoring in or boating through them)*

- *Marinas and safe anchoring locations in the Bay where boaters may dock or anchor their vessels*

- *Common sources of pollution from boats and marinas and outline relevant regulations and clean boating policies*

- *Information on proper and legal waste handling in the Bay and facilities for onshore disposal*

- *Information on invasive species and their impact on Bay marine ecosystems and preventative steps that boaters should take to prevent the introduction or spread of invasive species into the Bay*

- *Federal and state regulations prohibiting the harassment of marine mammals*

- *Information on the watercraft exclusion zones and no wake zones in effect for the waters off Alameda Island and any other buffer zones established in other Bay locations to protect sensitive biological resources (e.g., Breakwater Island, other bird nesting sites, harbor seal haul outs)*

- *Information about onsite and nearby environmental services that support clean boating practices (such as the locations of sewage pumpouts, oil change facilities, used oil recycling centers, bilge pumpouts, absorbent pad distribution and spent pad collection, and boat-to-boat environmental services)*

- *Information regarding the importance of keeping plastic and other trash out of Bay waters*

- *Signage regarding locations of waste collection containers posted at the marina*

Mitigation Measure 4.E-2c:

The City shall require that the project applicant develop and implement a Marine Invasive Species Control Plan prior to commencement of any in-water work including, but not limited to, construction of piers and seawalls, dredging, pile driving, and construction of new stormwater outfalls. The plan shall be prepared in consultation with the United States Coast Guard (USCG), RWQCB, and other relevant state agencies. Provisions of the plan shall include but not be limited to the following:

- *Environmental training of construction personnel involved in in-water work*

- *Actions to be taken to prevent the release and spread of marine invasive species, especially algal species such as Undaria and Sargasso*

- *Procedures for the safe removal and disposal of any invasive taxa observed on the removed structures prior to disposal or reuse of pilings, docks, wave attenuators, and other features*

- *The onsite presence of qualified marine biologists to assist the contractor in the identification and proper handling of any invasive species on removed Port equipment or materials*

- *A post-construction report identifying which, if any, invasive species were discovered attached to equipment and materials following removal from the water, and describing the treatment/handling of identified invasive species. Reports shall be submitted to the City, as well as the USCG and the RWQCB if requested by the agencies.*

J. Impact 4.E-3: Development facilitated by the Project would have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, 'other water', and navigable waters as defined by Sections 404 and 10 of the Clean Water ACt and waters of the State through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruptions, or other means.

The Final EIR finds that a number of activities, including remediation by the Navy, construction of open space and recreational components, and other development facilitated under the Project could result in substantial adverse effects on wetlands and waters of the United States, waters of the State,[7] and waters and land under BCDC jurisdiction. Permanent fill or temporary disturbance of jurisdictional waters, degradation of water quality and aquatic habitat, degradation of tidal marsh habitat, and accidental discharge of sediment or toxic materials into jurisdictional waters would be potentially significant impacts.

As discussed under Impact 4.E-2, there are eelgrass beds and native oyster beds in the waters offshore from Alameda Point that could be affected by in-water work facilitated by the Project. These eelgrass and oyster beds, which are "Special Aquatic Sites," and are regulated under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, could be subject to potentially significant impacts as discussed above. However, these potential impacts on eelgrass beds would be reduced to less-than-significant levels through compliance with regulatory requirements, the implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.E-2a and 4.E-2b as discussed above in Finding VI.I, and the implementation of which would avoid and minimize disturbance of local eelgrass and oyster beds and provide compensatory mitigation where avoidance is not feasible. Mitigation Measures 4.E-3a, 4.E-3b, and 4.E-3c, set forth below, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Compliance with wetland permitting requirements and implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.E-3a, 4.E-3b, and 4.E-3c, all of which are designed to avoid and minimize adverse impacts on jurisdictional waters, would reduce potential impacts on jurisdictional waters by minimizing potential temporary construction impacts and ensuring that there is no net loss of function or extent of jurisdictional waters within or adjacent to the project area.

---

[7] Waters and wetlands under the jurisdiction of California Department of Fish and Wildlife and/or the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Mitigation Measure 4.E-3a:

Prior to issuance of final grading or building permits that include work within or in the vicinity of jurisdictional waters, the City shall confirm that the project applicant has obtained all necessary wetland permits and shall further ensure that the project applicant implements measures to avoid or minimize adverse effects on jurisdictional waters and sensitive natural communities. Specifically:

- *The existing wetlands in the Northwest Territories shall be preserved and incorporated into compatible open space uses to the maximum extent feasible.*

- *Wetlands to be avoided shall be protected by setbacks throughout project construction. Based on recommendations in the Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals (Goals Project, 1999) a minimum 300-foot wetland buffer shall be incorporated into project design wherever possible to protect water quality and the wildlife that use the wetlands. Where existing uses preclude the establishment of a 300 foot or larger buffer-, the largest buffer possible shall be established. Buffer width should be determined by considering the quality of the wetlands, actual or potential wildlife use, existing and proposed future uses, amount and type of vegetation within the buffer, and angle and direction of slope in proximity to the wetland (McElfish et al. 2008). Open space uses shall incorporate these buffers in the siting of recreational trails and development of facilities to ensure the wetlands and the wildlife that use them are adequately buffered from recreational uses.*

- *During project construction, areas to be avoided and provided with setbacks pursuant to the provisions described above shall be further protected by best management practices (BMPs), as described in Mitigation Measure 4.E-3b, below. Such measures shall include the installation of silt fencing, straw wattles, or other appropriate erosion and sediment control methods or devices along roads and at the 100-foot setback limits. To minimize impacts on wetlands and other waters, equipment such as backhoes and cranes used for installation of rip-rap or other shore stabilization measures along the Bay shoreline shall operate from dry land where possible. Any construction operations within Bay waters shall be barge-mounted or use other waterbased equipment such as scows, derrick barges, and tugs.*

Mitigation Measure 4.E-3b:

Standard BMPs shall be employed to avoid degradation of aquatic habitat and wetlands by maintaining water quality and controlling erosion and sedimentation during construction as required by compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Construction Activities.

BMPs shall include, but not be limited to, the following: (1) installing silt fencing between wetlands and aquatic habitat and construction-related activities, (2) locating

fueling stations away from potentially jurisdictional features, and (3) otherwise isolating construction work areas from any identified jurisdictional features. In addition, BMPs to avoid impacts on water quality resulting from dredging or other activities within open waters that are identified in the Long-term Management Strategy for the Placement of Dredged Material in the San Francisco Bay Region (LTMS) (Corps, 2001) shall be implemented. These BMPs include silt fencing and gunderbooms or other appropriate methods for keeping dredged materials or other sediments from leaving a project site.

Mitigation Measure 4.E-3c:

Where disturbance to jurisdictional waters cannot be avoided, compensation shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio for temporary impacts and permanent loss. Actual compensatory mitigation ratios will be specified in project permits issued by the Corps, RWQCB, and BCDC. Where applicable, compensation shall be detailed on a project specific basis and shall include development of an onsite wetland mitigation and monitoring plan, which shall be developed prior to the start of the first phase of development or in coordination with permit applications and/or conditions. Alternatively, off-site mitigation may be pursued through an approved mitigation bank, although this option may result in a higher mitigation ratio. At a minimum, such plans shall include:

- *Baseline information, including a summary of findings for the most recent wetland delineation applicable to the project site;*
- *Anticipated habitat enhancements to be achieved through compensatory actions, including mitigation site location (onsite enhancement or offsite habitat creation) and hydrology;*
- *Performance and success criteria for wetland creation or enhancement including, but not limited to, the following[8]:*
    - *At least 70 percent survival of installed plants for each of the first three years following planting.*
    - *Performance criteria for vegetation percent cover in Years 1-4 as follows: at least 10 percent cover of installed plants in Year 1; at least 20 percent cover in Year 2; at least 30 percent cover in Year 3; at least 40 percent cover in Year 4.*
    - *Performance criteria for hydrology in Years 1-5 as follows: Fourteen or more consecutive days of flooding, ponding, or a water table 12 inches or less below the soil surface during the growing season at a minimum frequency of three of the five monitoring years; OR establishment of a prevalence of wetland obligate plant species.*

[8] *Vegetation-related criteria listed here apply only mitigation required for impacts to vegetated wetlands and would not be required for mitigation required for impacts to unvegetated wetlands.*

- *Invasive plant species that threaten the success of created or enhanced wetlands should not contribute relative cover greater than 35 percent in Year 1, 20 percent in Years 2 and 3, 15 percent in Year 4, and 10 percent in Year 5.*

- *If necessary, supplemental water shall be provided by a water truck for the first two years following installation. Any supplemental water must be removed or turned off for a minimum of two consecutive years prior to the end of the monitoring period, and the wetland must meet all other criteria during this period. At the end of the five-year monitoring period, the wetland must be self-sufficient and capable of persistence without supplemental water.*

- *At least 75 percent cover by hydrophytic vegetation at the end of the five-year monitoring period. In addition, wetland hydrology and hydric soils must be present and defined as follows:*

    - *Hydrophytic vegetation – A plant community occurring in areas where the frequency and duration of inundation or soil saturation produce permanently or periodically saturated soils of sufficient duration to exert a controlling influence on the plant species present.*

    - *Wetland hydrology – Identified by indicators such as sediment deposits, water stains on vegetation, and oxidized rhizospheres along living roots in the upper 12 inches of the soil, or satisfaction of the hydrology performance criteria listed above.*

    - *Hydric soils – Soils that are saturated, flooded, or ponded long enough during the growing season to develop anaerobic conditions, which are often characterized by features such as redox concentrations, which form by the reduction, translocation, and/or oxidation of iron and manganese oxides. Hydric soils may lack hydric indicators for a number of reasons. In such cases, the same standard used to determine wetland hydrology when indicators are lacking can be used.*

- *Five years after any wetland creation, a wetland delineation shall be performed to determine whether created wetlands are developing according to the success criteria outlined in the project permits. If they are not, remedial measures such as re-planting and or re-design and construction of the created wetland shall be taken to ensure that the Project's mitigation obligations are met.*

- *If permanent and temporary impacts on jurisdictional waters cannot be compensated onsite through the restoration or enhancement of wetland features incorporated within proposed open space areas, the specific project applicant shall provide additional compensatory mitigation for these habitat losses. Potential options include the creation of additional wetland acreage onsite or the purchase of offsite mitigation. Offsite compensatory mitigation would be required to fulfill the performance standards described above.*

K. Impact 4.E-4: Development facilitated by the Project would interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

The Final EIR finds that development facilitated by the Project has the potential to interfere with the movement or migratory corridors of waterbirds and marine wildlife species due to increased noise from dredging, pile driving and increased Bay vessel traffic; increased resuspension of sediments; and potential for collisions and harassment of mobile marine mammals by vessels. Potential increases in noise and marine mammal collisions from vessel traffic would be minimized by implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.E-4a, set forth below and hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, which imposes a year-round wake exclusion zone, forcing vessels to operate at slow speeds, which generally produce less noise.

Development facilitated by the Project has the potential to impact migratory and resident birds through new building construction and increases in night lighting, which could lead to increases in bird strikes and potential disorientation of night migrating birds. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.E-4a through -4f, set forth below, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.E-4b would serve to reduce any such impacts to less-than-significant levels. Direct impacts on breeding birds would be avoided and minimized through the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.E-4c, which requires pre-construction nesting bird surveys. In addition, Mitigation Measure 4.E-4d requires protocol surveys for burrowing owl. Indirect impacts on breeding birds resulting from increases in ambient noise would be minimized to less than significant in part through Mitigation Measure 4.E-4e, which requires seasonal construction to avoid the breeding bird season and/or installation of noise attenuation barriers between construction sites and sensitive wildlife habitat supporting breeding birds.

Potential increases in predators of nesting birds, their eggs, and their young due to increased development and human activities would be minimized to less than significant in part through implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.E-4f, which would prohibit open refuse containers throughout the project area.

Mitigation Measure 4.E-4a:

The City shall deploy buoys between Breakwater Island and the shoreline to create a 500-foot access corridor for all marine craft, including pleasure crafts and ferries, under non-emergency situation, in order to minimize disturbance to biological habitat on the shoreline and on the breakwater. Signs shall be posted that include a speed limit of 10 mph on the harbor side of Breakwater Island.

Mitigation Measure 4.E-4b:

Prior to the issuance of the first building permit for each new building, or for any exterior renovation that would increase the surface area of glazing by 50 percent or more or that would replace 50 percent or more of existing glazing, the City shall require that the project applicant retain a qualified biologist experienced with bird strike issues to review and approve the design of the building to ensure that it sufficiently minimizes the potential for bird strikes. The City may also consult with resource agencies such as the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or others, as it determines to be appropriate during this review.

The project applicant shall provide to the City a written description of the measures and features of the building design that are intended to address potential impacts on birds. The design shall include some of the following measures or measures that are equivalent to, but not necessarily identical to, those listed below, as new, more effective technology for addressing bird strikes may become available in the future:

- *Employ design techniques that create "visual noise" via cladding or other design features that make it easy for birds to identify buildings as such and not mistake buildings for open sky or trees;*
- *Decrease continuity of reflective surfaces using "visual marker" design techniques, which techniques may include:*
    - *Patterned or fritted glass, with patterns at most 28 centimeters apart,*
    - *One-way films installed on glass, with any picture or pattern or arrangement that can be seen from the outside by birds but appear transparent from the inside,*
    - *Geometric fenestration patterns that effectively divide a window into smaller panes of at most 28 centimeters, and/or*
    - *Decals with patterned or abstract designs, with the maximum clear spaces at most 28 centimeters square.*
- *Up to 60 feet high on building facades facing the shoreline, decrease reflectivity of glass, using design techniques such as plastic or metal screens,*

light-colored blinds or curtains, frosting of glass, angling glass towards the ground, UV-A glass, or awnings and overhangs;

- *Eliminate the use of clear glass on opposing or immediately adjacent faces of the building without intervening interior obstacles such that a bird could perceive its flight path through the glass to be unobstructed;*
- *Mute reflections in glass using strategies such as angled glass, shades, internal screens, and overhangs; and*
- *Place new vegetation sufficiently away from glazed building facades so that no reflection occurs. Alternatively, if planting of landscapes near a glazed building façade is desirable, situate trees and shrubs immediately adjacent to the exterior glass walls, at a distance of less than 3 feet from the glass. Such close proximity will obscure habitat reflections and will minimize fatal collisions by reducing birds' flight momentum.*

Lighting. *In addition to implementation of the City/VA Lighting MOA, the project applicant shall similarly ensure that the design and specifications for buildings implement design elements to reduce lighting usage, change light direction, and contain light. These include, but are not limited to, the following general considerations that should be applied wherever feasible throughout Alameda Point to reduce night lighting impacts on species other than least terns:*

- *Avoid installation of lighting in areas where not required for public safety*
- *Examine and adopt alternatives to bright, all-night, floor-wide lighting when interior lights would be visible from the exterior or exterior lights must be left on at night, including:*
    - *Installing motion-sensitive lighting*
    - *Installing task lighting*
    - *Installing programmable timers*
    - *Installing fixtures that use lower-wattage, sodium, and yellow-red spectrum lighting.*
- *Install strobe or flashing lights in place of continuously burning lights for any obstruction lighting.*
- *Where exterior lights are to be left on at night, install fully shielded lights to contain and direct light away from the sky.*

Antennae, Monopole Structures, and Rooftop Elements. *The City shall ensure, as a condition of approval for every building permit, that buildings minimize the number of and co-locate rooftop-antennas and other rooftop equipment, and that*

monopole structures or antennas on buildings, in open areas, and at sports and playing fields and facilities do not include guy wires.

Educating Residents and Occupants. *The City shall ensure, as a condition of approval for every building permit, that the project applicant agrees to provide educational materials to building tenants and occupants, hotel guests, and residents encouraging them to minimize light transmission from windows, especially during peak spring and fall migratory periods, by turning off unnecessary lighting and/or closing window coverings at night. The City shall review and approve the educational materials prior to building occupancy.*

Documentation. *The project applicant and/or City shall document undertaking the activities described in this mitigation measure and maintain records that include, among others, the written descriptions provided by the building developer of the measures and features of the design for each building that are intended to address potential impacts on birds, and the recommendations and memoranda prepared by the qualified biologist experienced with bird strikes who reviews and approves the design of any Projects to ensure that they sufficiently minimize the potential for bird strikes.*

Mitigation Measure 4.E-4c:

The City shall require project applicants to conduct preconstruction breeding bird surveys for projects proposed in areas containing, or likely to contain, habitat for nesting birds as a condition of approval for any development-related permit. Specific measures to avoid and minimize impacts on nesting birds include, but are not limited to, those described below.

- *To avoid and minimize potential impacts on nesting raptors and other birds, preconstruction surveys shall be performed not more than one week prior to initiating vegetation removal and/or construction activities during the breeding season (i.e., February 1 through August 31)*
- *To avoid and minimize potential impacts on nesting raptors and other birds, a no-disturbance buffer zone shall be established around active nests during the breeding season until the young have fledged and are self-sufficient, when no further mitigation would be required*
- *Typically, the size of individual buffers ranges from a minimum of 250 feet for raptors to a minimum of 50 feet for other birds but can be adjusted based on an evaluation of the site by a qualified biologist in cooperation with the USFWS and/or CDFW*
- *Birds that establish nests after construction starts are assumed to be habituated to and tolerant of the indirect impacts resulting from construction noise and human activity. However, direct take of nests, eggs, and nestlings is still prohibited and a buffer must be established to avoid nest destruction.*

- *If construction ceases for a period of more than two weeks, or vegetation removal is required after a period of more than two weeks has elapsed from the preconstruction surveys, then new nesting bird surveys must be conducted.*

Mitigation Measure 4.E-4d:

The City shall ensure that any project applicant for work on City property in the Northwest Territories or on Bay Trail construction through the Federal Property implements the following measures to avoid and minimize impacts on burrowing owl:

a) Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits, protocol surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. The survey methodology shall be consistent with the methods outlined in the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG March 2012) and shall consist of walking parallel transects 7 to 20 meters apart, adjusting for vegetation height and density as needed, and noting any potential burrows with fresh burrowing owl sign or presence of burrowing owls. A copy of the survey results shall be submitted to the City and CDFW.

b) In areas positive for burrowing owl presence the Lead Biologist or biological monitor shall be onsite during all construction activities in potential burrowing owl habitat.

c) A qualified wildlife biologist (i.e., a wildlife biologist with previous burrowing owl survey experience) shall conduct pre-construction surveys of the permanent and temporary impact areas to locate active breeding or wintering burrowing owl burrows not more than 14 days prior to construction and/or prior to exclusion fencing installation. The survey methodology shall be consistent with the methods outlined in the Staff Report.

d) If no burrowing owls are detected, no further mitigation is necessary. If burrowing owls are detected, no ground-disturbing activities, such as road construction or installation of solar arrays or ancillary facilities, shall be permitted within the distances specified in Table 4.E-3 from an active burrow during the nesting and fledging seasons (April 1 to August 15 and August 16 to October 15, respectively), unless otherwise authorized by CDFW. The specified buffer distance ranges from 656 feet to 1,640 feet, according to the time of year and the level of disturbance. Buffers shall be established in accordance with Table 4.E-3 and occupied burrows shall not be disturbed during the nesting season unless a qualified biologist approved by CDFW, verifies through noninvasive methods that either: (1) the birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation; or (2) juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of

independent survival. Burrowing owls shall not be moved or excluded from burrows during the breeding season (April 1 to October 15).

e) During the nonbreeding (winter) season (October 16 to March 31), consistent with Table 4.E-3, ground-disturbing work shall maintain a distance ranging from 164 feet to 1,640 feet from any active burrows depending on the level of disturbance. If active winter burrows are found that would be directly affected by ground-disturbing activities, owls can be displaced from winter burrows according to recommendations made in the Staff Report. If activ winter burrows are found that would not be directly affected and it is not possible to establish a buffer in accordance with Table 4.E-3 then owls shall not be evicted and the largest buffer possible shall be established in consultation with CDFW.

f) Burrowing owls should not be excluded from burrows unless or until a Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan is developed by the project applicant approved by CDFW, and submitted to the City. The plan shall include, at a minimum:

> *i. Confirmation by site surveillance that the burrow(s) is empty of burrowing owls and other species preceding burrow scoping;*
>
> *ii. Type of scope to be used and appropriate timing of scoping to avoid impacts;*
>
> *iii. Occupancy factors to look for and what shall guide determination of vacancy and excavation timing (e.g., one-way doors should be left in place 48 hours to ensure burrowing owls have left the burrow before excavation, visited twice daily and monitored for evidence that owls are inside and can't escape).*
>
> *iv. Methods for burrow excavation. Excavation using hand tools with refilling to prevent reoccupation is preferable whenever possible (may include using piping to stabilize the burrow to prevent collapsing until the entire burrow has been excavated and it can be determined that no owls reside inside it);*
>
> *v. Removal of other potential owl burrow surrogates or refugia onsite;*
>
> *vi. Photographing the excavation and closure of the burrow to demonstrate success and sufficiency;*
>
> *vii. Monitoring of the site to evaluate success and, if needed, to implement remedial measures to prevent subsequent owl use and to avoid take;*

viii. Methods to ensure the impacted site shall continually be made inhospitable to burrowing owls and fossorial mammals (e.g., by allowing vegetation to grow tall, heavy disking, or immediate and continuous grading) until development is complete.

g) Site monitoring shall be conducted prior to, during, and after exclusion of burrowing owls from their burrows sufficient to ensure take is avoided. Daily monitoring shall be conducted for one week to confirm young of the year have fledged if the exclusion occurs immediately after the end of the breeding season.

h) In accordance with the Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan a qualified wildlife biologist shall excavate burrows using hand tools. Sections of flexible plastic pipe or burlap bag shall be inserted into the tunnels during excavation to maintain an escape route the active burrow and other potentially active burrows within 160 feet of the active burrow. Forty-eight hours after the installation of the one-way doors, the doors can be removed, and ground-disturbing activities can proceed. Alternatively, burrows can be filled to prevent reoccupation. Excluded burrowing owls shall be documented if observed using artificial or natural burrows on an adjoining mitigation site (if able to confirm by band re-sight).

i) During construction activities, monthly and final compliance reports shall be provided to CDFW, and the City documenting the effectiveness of mitigation measures and the level of burrowing owl take associated with the propose project.

j) Should burrowing owls be found onsite, compensatory mitigation for lost breeding and/or wintering habitat shall be implemented on-site or off-site in accordance with burrowing owl Staff Report guidance and in consultation with CDFW. The project applicant or its contractor shall prepare a Burrowing Owl Habitat Mitigation Plan and, at a minimum, the following recommendations shall be implemented:

i. Temporarily disturbed habitat shall be restored, if feasible, to pre-project conditions, including decompacting soil and revegetation.

ii. Permanent impacts to nesting, occupied and satellite burrows and/or burrowing owl habitat shall be mitigated such that the habitat acreage, number of burrows and burrowing owl impacted are replaced based on a site-specific analysis and shall include:

a. Permanent conservation of similar grassland habitat to provide for burrowing owl nesting, foraging, wintering, and dispersal (i.e., during breeding and non-breeding seasons) comparable to or better than that of the impact area, and

with sufficiently large acreage, and presence of fossorial mammals.

1. Mitigation lands should be on, adjacent or proximate to the impact site where possible and where habitat is sufficient to support the number of burrowing owls present.

2. The CDFW shall be consulted when determining off-site mitigation acreages.

b. Permanent protection of mitigation land through a conservation easement deeded to a nonprofit conservation organization or public agency with a conservation mission. If the project is located within the service area of a CDFW approved burrowing owl conservation bank, burrowing owl conservation bank credits may be purchased.

c. Development and implementation of a mitigation land management plan in accordance with burrowing owl Staff Report guidelines to address long-term ecological sustainability and maintenance of the site for burrowing owls.

d. Funding the maintenance and management of mitigation land through the establishment of a long-term funding mechanism such as an endowment.

k) Habitat shall not be altered or destroyed, and burrowing owls shall not be excluded from burrows, until mitigation lands have been secured, are managed for the benefit of burrowing owls according to CDFW-approved management, monitoring and reporting plans, and the endowment or other long-term funding mechanism is in place or security is provided until these measures are completed.

l) Copies of all completed survey reports and plans shall be submitted to the City and the CDFW.

Mitigation Measure 4.E-4e:

The City shall ensure that project construction activities on City property that would result in noise levels exceeding existing maximum ambient noise levels in the Northwest Territories or as measured on the Federal Property by more than 10 dBA and/or generally exceeding 60 dBA will avoid and minimize adverse effects on California least tern and other breeding bird reproductive success through one or more of the following measures:

a) Demolition and construction on City owned property in the Northwest Territories directly adjacent to the Federal Property, and construction of

the Bay Trail on Federal Property shall take place in September-January, outside the general bird breeding season of February through August, to the extent feasible. When such work is unavoidable, solid plywood fences shall be constructed between the project site and sensitive wildlife habitat prior to initiation of construction to serve as noise attenuation barriers. The fencing shall be a minimum of 8 feet in height. The fences shall shield the breeding birds from major noise generating phases of demolition and;

b) In all other areas, major noise generating phases of demolition and construction that would exceed ambient noise levels as measured in the Federal Property by more than 10 dBA shall take place in September-January, outside the general bird breeding season of February through August; OR solid plywood fences shall be constructed a described above.

Mitigation Measure 4.E-4f:

The City shall prohibit open refuse containers that contain food waste throughout the project area. This prohibition shall be incorporated into the term and conditions of all City approvals for future development at Alameda Point.

L. Impact 4.E-5: Development facilitated by the Project would conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

The Final EIR finds that development facilitated by the Project could result in potentially significant impacts on biological resources, which could conflict with applicable local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. However, with implementation of the USFWS Biological Opinion for Alameda Point, as embodied in the Navy's Declaration of Restrictions, which place restrictions on Alameda Point development protective of biological resources in general and California least tern specifically, as well as implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.E-1a through 4.E-1h (avoid and minimize impacts on special-status wildlife), above in Finding VI.H; Mitigation Measures 4.E-2a through 4.E-2c (avoid and minimize impacts to sensitive natural communities), above in Finding VI.I; Mitigation Measures 4.E-3a through 4.E-3c (avoid and minimize impacts to jurisdictional waters), above in Finding VI.J; and Mitigation Measures 4.E-4a through 4.E-4f (avoid and minimize impacts to migratory and breeding wildlife), above in Finding VI.K, development facilitated by the Project would be implemented in a manner intended to:

- Maintain and improve the quality of the bay, ocean, and shoreline areas;
- Promote the use and development of shoreline areas consistent with the City of Alameda General Plan and the San Francisco Bay Plan;
- Cooperate with and otherwise support regulatory programs of existing regional, state, and federal agencies concerned with San Francisco Bay Area biological resources; and

- Protect rare and endangered species as well as the habitats of known plant and animal species that require a relatively natural environment. Therefore, with implementation of the measures described above, the potential for the project to conflict with applicable local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources at Alameda Point is low and would represent a less-than-significant impact.

Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.E-5, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, the potential for the Project to conflict with applicable local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources at Alameda Point is low and would present a less-than-significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 4.E-5:

The City of Alameda shall implement Mitigation Measures 4.E-1a through 4.E-1h (avoid and minimize impacts on special-status wildlife), Mitigation Measures 4.E-2a through 4.E-2c (avoid and minimize impacts to sensitive natural communities), Mitigation Measures 4.E-3a through 4.E-3c (avoid and minimize impacts to jurisdictional waters), and Mitigation Measures 4.E-4a through 4.E-4f (avoid and minimize impacts to migratory and breeding wildlife).

M. Impact 4.E-6: Development facilitated by the Project would conflict with an adopted local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan.

The Final EIR finds that development facilitated by the Project could result in potentially significant impacts on biological resources, which could conflict with applicable policies of the CCMP and the Goals Project. However, with implementation of the USFWS Biological Opinion for Alameda Point, as embodied in the Navy's Declaration of Restrictions, which place restrictions on Alameda Point development protective of biological resources in general and California least tern specifically, as well as implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.E-1a through 4.E-1h (avoid and minimize impacts on special-status wildlife), above in Finding VI.H; Mitigation Measures 4.E-2a through 4.E-2c (avoid and minimize impacts to sensitive natural communities), above in Finding VI.I; Mitigation Measures 4.E-3a through 4.E-3c (avoid and minimize impacts to jurisdictional waters), above in Finding VI.J; and Mitigation Measures 4.E-4a through 4.E-4f (avoid and minimize impacts to migratory and breeding wildlife), above in Finding VI.K, development facilitated by the Project would be implemented in a manner intended to maintain consistency with the CCMP. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.E-6, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, the potential for the project to conflict with the SFEP CCMP is low and would represent a less-than-significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 4.E-6:

The City of Alameda shall implement Mitigation Measures 4.E-1a through 4.E-1h (avoid and minimize impacts on special-status wildlife), Mitigation Measures 4.E-2a through 4.E-2c (avoid and minimize impacts to sensitive natural communities),

Mitigation Measures 4.E-3a through 4.E-3c (avoid and minimize impacts to jurisdictional waters), and Mitigation Measures 4.E-4a through 4.E-4f (avoid and minimize impacts to migratory and breeding wildlife).

N. Impact 4.E-7: The Project, in conjunction with other past, current, or foreseeable development in Alameda, could result in cumulative impacts on special-status species, habitats, wetlands and other waters of the U.S.

The Final EIR finds that other past, current, or foreseeable development in Alameda would include many of the same activities as the proposed Project and can be assumed to have similar effects on biological resources, resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.E-1a through 4.E-1h (avoid and minimize impacts on special-status wildlife), above in Finding VI.H; Mitigation Measures 4.E-2a through 4.E-2c (avoid and minimize impacts to sensitive natural communities), above in Finding VI.I; Mitigation Measures 4.E-3a through 4.E- 3c (avoid and minimize impacts to jurisdictional waters), above in Finding VI.J; and Mitigation Measures 4.E-4a through 4.E-4f (avoid and minimize impacts to migratory and breeding wildlife), above in Finding VI.K, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts on biological resources within and in the vicinity of the project site. When considered within the existing condition of biological resources in the project area and Central Bay in the context of past, present and reasonably foreseeable similar projects, the project would add only a minor, incremental contribution to habitat loss, degradation, and direct and indirect impacts to special- status species. The project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.E-7, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, the Project's cumulative effects on biological resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.E-7:

The City of Alameda shall implement Mitigation Measures 4.E-1a through 4.E-1h (avoid and minimize impacts on special-status wildlife), Mitigation Measures 4.E-2a through 4.E-2c (avoid and minimize impacts to sensitive natural communities), Mitigation Measures 4.E-3a through 4.E-3c (avoid and minimize impacts to jurisdictional waters), and Mitigation Measures 4.E-4a through 4.E-4f (avoid and minimize impacts to migratory and breeding wildlife).

O. Impact 4.F-4: Development facilitated by the Project could potentially expose persons (new receptors) to substantial levels of TACs, which may lead to adverse health.

BAAQMD has developed a geo-referenced database of permitted emissions sources throughout San Francisco Bay Area, and has developed the Stationary Source Risk & Hazard Analysis Tool (dated May 2012) for estimating health risks to new sensitive receptors (in this case, primarily residences and also potentially schools and child care facilities) from existing permitted sources. The Final EIR finds that nine

permitted sources are located within 1,000 feet of the project, which is the radius that BAAQMD recommends be evaluated for sources of TACs. BAAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* also recommend the inclusion of surface streets with annual average daily traffic (AADT) of 10,000 or greater within 1,000 feet of a given project (BAAQMD, 2012b).

The highest hazard index from nearby sources would be 0.008, which is well below the significance threshold of 1.0, and the impact of the proposed residences within the project area would be less than significant. The highest annual PM2.5 concentrations would be 0.15 $\mu g/m^3$ at new residences, which would be below the significance threshold of 0.3 $\mu g/m^3$ and hence is less than significant. Mitigation Measure 4.F-4 (implement Mitigation Measures 4.F-1a, 1b, and 1e), set forth below, are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project.

Mitigation Measure 4.F-4:

Implement Mitigation Measures 4.F-1a, 4.F-1b, and 4.F-1e.

P. Impact 4.F-7: Development facilitated by the Project could potentially conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

The Final EIR finds that the Project could result in significant and unavoidable emissions of criteria pollutants during operations. *See* Impact 4.F-2, above in Finding V.G. Therefore, the Project could potentially conflict with or obstruct implementation of the most recently adopted air quality plan in the SFBAAB, the *2010 Clean Air Plan*. Therefore, this impact would be potentially significant.

Assuming implementation of the Project's aggressive TDM program and long-term monitoring of the program (see Mitigation Measure 4.C-1a, above in Finding VI.A), the Final EIR finds that the Project would be anticipated to result in a substantial reduction in vehicle trip generation and, therefore, in criteria pollutant emissions. This measure, along with site-wide emissions reductions that would occur with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.F-4, above in Finding VI.O, would likewise result in a reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, compared to "business as usual" development. Moreover, as described in Impact 4.F-10 in the Draft EIR, project emissions of GHGs would be less than significant. With respect to reduction of population exposure to hazardous emissions (second goal), the project would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to exposure to TACs.

With Mitigation Measures 4.F-7a and 4.F-7b, set forth below, which are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, the Project would not substantially conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2010 Clean Air Plan, and the impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.F-7a:

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.F-2.

Mitigation Measure 4.F-7b:

The City shall promote use of clean fuel-efficient vehicles through preferential parking, installation of charging stations, and low emission electric vehicle carsharing programs to reduce the need to have a car or second car vehicles in the TDM Program.

Q. Impact 4.G-2: Construction facilitated by the Project could potentially result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

The Final EIR finds that groundborne vibration from pile driving activities at the Project could produce substantial vibration at nearby sensitive receptors. This would be a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.G-2 (implement Mitigation Measures 4.G-1a through 1d), set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce noise and groundborne vibration and human annoyance by requiring “quiet pile driving” techniques (pre-drilling and/or sonic pile drivers), limiting the hours of construction, and notifying nearby sensitive receptors of pile driving activity and duration. These measures would reduce construction vibration levels to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.G-2:

Implement Mitigation Measures 4.G-1a through 4.G-1d.

R. Impact 4.G-4: Non-transportation-related operations facilitated by the Project could potentially result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity.

The Final EIR finds that non-transportation noise associated with the Project operations would include stationary sources (such as HVAC units), loading docks, and park/sports recreational uses. The nearest residences would be exposed to levels of 58dBA from HVAC units, which would exceed the City day (55 dBA) and nighttime (50 dBA) noise standards. This impact would be significant without mitigation. Loading dock activities occurring during the more noise-sensitive early morning and nighttime hours may result in increased levels of annoyance and sleep disruption for occupants of nearby residential dwellings. As a result, increased noise levels would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.G-4, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level and would ensure that project-related non-transportation sources of noise would comply with the City of Alameda Noise Ordinance and General Plan standards.

Mitigation Measure 4.G-4:

During individual project phase design preparation, the City will require a project applicant to comply with the Noise Ordinance and General Plan standards. These measures implement noise control measures to ensure that all non-transportation source operations comply with City standards and will include, but not be limited to, the following:

- *The proposed land uses will be designed so that on-site mechanical equipment (e.g., HVAC units, compressors, generators) and area-source operations (e.g., loading docks, parking lots, and recreational-use areas) are located as far as possible and/or shielded from nearby noise sensitive land uses to meet City noise standards.*

- *On-site landscape maintenance equipment will be equipped with properly operating exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.*

- *The following activities will be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. unless site-specific analysis confirms that noise impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant:*

    - *Truck deliveries;*

    - *Operations of motor powered landscape maintenance equipment; and*

    - *Outdoor use of amplified sound systems.*

S. Impact 4.G-5: Development facilitated by the Project could potentially place noise-sensitive residential uses in a noise environment that would exceed the City's goal for exterior/interior noise exposure.

The Final EIR finds that the areas in which new residential uses are proposed at the project site (LT-1 and LT-2) have an existing ambient noise environment greater than 60 dBA CNEL. Furthermore, the addition of project traffic on adjacent streets (specifically Main Street) would result in greater noise exposure in the future. This is a significant impact. To allow the project to meet the City and State interior noise requirement of 45 dBA CNEL, in habitable rooms of residential dwellings, sound-rated assemblies would be required at the exterior facades of project buildings.

Mitigation Measure 4.G-5, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels. This measure would satisfy the requirements of Policy 8.7e of the City of Alameda General Plan.

Mitigation Measure 4.G-5

The City will require project sponsors for residential development to submit a detailed noise study, prepared by a qualified noise consultant, to determine design measures necessary to achieve acceptable interior noise levels at the proposed new residences. The study will be submitted to the City for review and approval. Design measures such as the following could be required, depending on the specific findings of the noise study: double-paned glass windows facing noise sources; solid-core doors; increased sound insulation of exterior walls (such as through staggered-or double-studs, multiple layers of gypsum board, and incorporation of resilient channels); weather-tight seals for doors and windows; or mechanical ventilation such as an air conditioning system.

T. Impact 4.H-1: In the event of a major earthquake in the region, seismic ground-shaking could potentially injure people and cause collapse of or structural damage to structures and/or retaining walls developed under the Project.

The project site will likely experience at least one major earthquake within the next 30 years. Due to the location of the project site in an area of high seismic risk, people could be harmed and structures may be damaged from strong ground-shaking. The Final EIR finds that, because the site could experience violent ground-shaking in the next 50 years, is located on unfavorable materials that amplify ground-shaking, and is likely to experience a variety of secondary effects. This is a significant impact. Mitigation Measure 4.H-1, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would ensure proper compliance with laws and policies, and minimize harm to people and structures. This mitigation would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.H-1:

Prior to approval of a building permit, a site specific, design-level geotechnical investigation shall be prepared for all proposed development on the project site. The investigation shall include detailed characterization of the distribution and compositions of subsurface materials and an assessment of their potential behavior during violent seismic ground-shaking. The analysis shall recommend site preparation and design parameters that would be necessary to avoid or substantially reduce structural damage under anticipated peak ground accelerations in accordance with seismic design requirements within the most current version of the California Building Code and Alameda Municipal Code. The investigation and recommendations shall be in conformance with all applicable city ordinances and policies and consistent with the design requirements of the calculated Seismic Design Category for each site in accordance with the California Building Code. The geotechnical report shall be prepared by a California-registered geotechnical engineer and approved by the City, and all recommendations contained in the report shall be included in the final design of the project.

Mitigation Measure 4.H-1 would ensure that the Project would be designed to withstand strong seismic ground-shaking, and that the occupants of the proposed development are informed of safety procedures to follow in the event of an earthquake.

U. Impact 4.H-2: In the event of a major earthquake in the region, people and property at the project site could potentially be exposed to seismically-induced ground failure, including liquefaction, lateral spreading and earthquake-induced settlement.

The CGS has designated the project site and the entirety of Alameda Island as a Seismic Hazard Zone for liquefaction due to historic occurrences, the presence of unfavorable soils and shallow groundwater. The Final EIR finds that, due to the location of the Project, people could be harmed and structures may be damaged from earthquake-induced liquefaction, rapid settlement or other earthquake-induced ground failures. This is a significant impact. Mitigation Measure 4.H-2, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would ensure that impacts due to seismically-induced ground failure are less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.H-2:

Prior to issuance of a building permit, earthwork, foundation and structural design for proposed development under the project shall be conducted in accordance with all recommendations contained in the required geotechnical investigation (Mitigation Measure 4.H-1a). The investigation must include an assessment of all potentially foreseeable seismically-induced ground failures, including liquefaction, sand boils, lateral spreading and rapid settlement. Mitigation strategies must be designed for the site-specific conditions of the project and must be reviewed for compliance with the guidelines of CGS Special Publication 117A prior to incorporation into the project. Examples of possible strategies include edge containment structures (berms, diked sea walls, retaining structures, compacted soil zones), removal or treatment of liquefiable soils, soil modification, modification of site geometry, lowering the groundwater table, in-situ ground densification, deep foundations, reinforced shallow foundations, and structural design that can accommodate predicted displacements.

V. Impact 4.H-3: In the event of a major earthquake in the region, development facilitated by the Project could potentially be subject to adverse effects resulting from seismically induced landslides.

The project site is relatively level with very little topographical relief. However, the north shoreline sediments within the Oakland Inner Harbor have an incline as a result of dredging activities within the channel. The Final EIR finds that any new loads from fill placement or buildings within 50 feet of the northern shoreline would likely have an adverse effect on static slope stability. This would be a significant impact.

As part of the dredging permit, the Port of Oakland conducted both static slope stability and seismic performance of the northern shoreline. The results of this analysis and additional analyses concluded that the slopes would likely fail under seismic

conditions with displacement ranging from 6 inches up to 3 feet. Mitigation Measure 4.H-3, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would ensure that improvements along the north shoreline could be constructed within accepted factors of safety such that impacts due to slope instability would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.H-3:

Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit for any building located within 50 feet of the northern shoreline, a slope stability plan shall be prepared by a California-licensed geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist and all recommendations implemented in accordance with City requirements. The required geotechnical stability report plan shall determine the stabilization measures (e.g., cement/soil mixing, construction of a bulkhead wall) necessary to obtain acceptable factors of safety in accordance with California Geological Surveys Special Publication 117A. All construction activities and design criteria shall comply with applicable codes and requirements of the most recent California Building Code, and applicable City construction and grading ordinances.

W. Impact 4.H-4: Development facilitated by the Project could potentially be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

The Final EIR finds that subsidence related to consolidation of Bay Mud beneath fill and foundation settlement directly related to site-specific structural building loads could affect structures proposed as part of the project. Underground utilities could also experience differential settlement along their alignments, possibly resulting in rupture or leakage, which could cause disruption of service or safety hazards. Construction of new shallow foundations and/or placement of new fill at the site would begin a new cycle of consolidation settlement in the Bay Mud. Soil consolidation and differential settlement presents a potentially significant impact to the Project.

Mitigation Measure 4.H-4, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.H-4:

The required geotechnical report for each development project (Mitigation Measure 4.H-1a) shall determine the susceptibility of the project site to settlement and prescribe appropriate engineering techniques for reducing its effects. Where settlement and/or differential settlement is predicted, mitigation measures—such as lightweight fill, geofoam, surcharging, wick drains, deep foundations, structural slabs, hinged slabs, flexible utility connections, and utility hangers—shall be used. These measures shall be evaluated and the most effective, feasible, and economical measures shall be

recommended. Engineering recommendations shall be included in the project engineering and design plans, and be reviewed and approved by a registered geotechnical engineer. All construction activities and design criteria shall comply with applicable codes and requirements of the most recent California Building Code, and applicable City construction and grading ordinances.

X. Impact 4.H-5: Development facilitated by the Project could potentially be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code creating substantial risks to life or property.

Undocumented fills placed before current building code practices were in effect could potentially contain expansive properties, thereby creating a potentially significant impact for new development. The presence of expansive soils would need to be determined on a site-specific basis and generally would be addressed largely through the integration of geotechnical information in the planning and design process for projects to determine the local soil suitability for specific projects in accordance with standard industry practices and state-provided requirements, such as the building code, used to minimize the risk associated with expansive soils. These measures are enforced through compliance with the City's building codes and ordinances, to avoid or reduce hazards relating to expansive soils. The use of imported fill must meet geotechnical engineering standards as required by the CBC which include minimizing the potential for expansion.

Therefore, the potential for expansive soils to adversely affect proposed development under the project with implementation of building code requirements included in Mitigation Measure 4.H-5, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce the potential impact from expansive soils to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.H-5:

Prior to issuance of a building permit, subsurface earthwork (e.g., placement of engineered fill), shall be conducted in accordance with all recommendations contained in the required geotechnical investigation (Mitigation Measure 4.H-1). The geotechnical report must include an assessment of all potentially expansive soils that could adversely affect proposed improvements. Geotechnical strategies must be designed for the site-specific conditions of the project and must be reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the most recent California Building Code as well as any additional City of Alameda requirements.

Y. Impact 4.I-2: Development facilitated by the Project could potentially involve dewatering and shoring activities, which would potentially result in a discharge, which if contaminated would adversely affect the receiving water quality.

Excavation and construction of structures with subsurface foundations or open trenches, such as building foundations or pipelines could intercept shallow groundwater

and require dewatering (removal of groundwater by pumping) to lower groundwater levels and dry the area for construction. The Final EIR finds that water extracted during dewatering could contain chemical contaminants from use of equipment or from pre-existing sources given the likely existing contamination underlying Alameda Point, or could become sediment-laden from construction activities, thereby creating a potentially significant impact due to extraction and discharge of contaminated groundwater. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.I-2, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would minimize the water quality impacts to the receiving waters to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.I-2:

The City shall ensure that project applicants for projects at Alameda Point implement the following measures as part associated with the extracted water during project construction:

- *The RWQCB could require compliance with certain provisions in the permit such as treatment of the flows prior to discharge. The project applicant shall discharge the extracted water to the sanitary sewer or storm drain system with authorization of and required permits from the applicable regulatory agencies, in this case the City of Alameda.*

- *The project applicant shall comply with applicable permit conditions associated with the treatment of groundwater prior to discharge.*

- *If necessary a dewatering collection and disposal method shall be prepared and implemented for the project.*

Z. Impact 4.I-4: Development facilitated by the Project would potentially result in intensified use of the Project site, including maintenance of new landscaping areas and open lawns, which would affect receiving water quality.

Stormwater from the developed portions of the project site would be discharged through the proposed storm drain system into the Bay and the Inner Harbor while the stormwater from the previous portions onsite would infiltrate into the ground. Stormwater from increased use onsite could become polluted with contaminants onsite and flow into the Bay through direct discharge or through infiltration. The Final EIR finds that this could have a significant water quality impact.

The ACCWP NPDES permit requires the City of Alameda, as a permittee, to address pesticides, which have been found by the RWQCB to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to exceedances of water quality standards. This pesticide program includes a proactive Diazinon Pollutant Reduction Plan (or Pesticide Plan). The goals of the Pesticide Plan and of its resulting implementing actions are to reduce or substitute pesticide use (especially diazinon use) with less toxic alternatives. In addition application of such chemicals as pesticides and fertilizers would require a

management approach outlined in Mitigation Measure 4.I-4, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, which reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.I-4:

The City shall ensure that future project applicants implement Integrated Pest Management measures to reduce fertilizer and pesticide contamination of receiving waters, as follows:

- *Prepare and Implement an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPM) for all common landscaped areas. The IPM shall be prepared by a qualified professional and shall recommend methods of pest prevention and turf grass management that use pesticides as a last resort in pest control. Types and rates of fertilizer and pesticide application shall be specified.*

- *The IPM shall specify methods of avoiding runoff of pesticides and nitrates into receiving storm drains and surface waters or leaching into the shallow groundwater table. Pesticides shall be used only in response to a persistent pest problem that cannot be resolved by non-pesticide measures. Preventative chemical use shall not be employed.*

- *The IPM shall fully integrate considerations for cultural and biological resources into the IPM with an emphasis toward reducing pesticide application.*

AA. Impact 4.I-6: Development facilitated by the Project would potentially place housing and other structures in an area subject to 100-year flooding, however would not subject people or structures to a substantial risk of loss from a 100-year storm event.

Localized flooding could occur along much of the northern perimeter of the site whenever any significant rainfall event coincides with the higher high tide peak, even without consideration of storm surge effects. The Final EIR finds that the design of the project site and the proposed development would incorporate flood protection measures and would not subject the structures to a substantial risk of loss from a 100-year storm event. In the Adaptive Reuse areas, where the proposed storm drain system and flood protection measures would be incrementally installed over time, there may be existing structures within the 100-year tidal flood plain that may require flood insurance, which could be a potentially significant impact related to flood hazards. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.I-6, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce impacts related to exposure of people to risk from inundation by from a 100-year storm event to a less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.I-6:

The City will require that any new construction within the Adaptive Reuse areas, prior to the installation of the proposed storm drain system and flood protection measures, would be constructed at an elevation of 1 foot above the 100-year flood risk elevation.

BB. Impact 4.I-8: Development facilitated by the Project would potentially be subjected to flooding as a result of sea rise.

Levees and floodwalls along the perimeter of the Project site would be designed initially to accommodate 24 inches of sea level rise with capability to adapt to 55 inches (~1.4 m) of sea level rise. Future adaptive measures would involve expanding the levees or floodwalls within the proposed corridors along the shorelines. The corridors would accommodate further elevation of the initial construction levee or floodwall for increased protection from future sea level rise. The stormwater system and the flood protection structures for the Project would be designed and implemented to protect the project site from inundation based on the conservative scenario of a high tide during a 100-year stormwater event in combination with sea level rise. The Project, as discussed above, would incorporate structural design and adaptive measures over time for protection from flooding from sea level rise (in concert with a 100-year storm and high tide event).

Mitigation Measure 4.I-8, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.I-8:

The City shall implement the following steps prior to project implementation:

- *Apply for membership in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Community Rating System (CRS), and as appropriate through revisions to the City Code, obtain reductions in flood insurance rates offered by the NFIP to community residents.*

- *Cooperate with FEMA in its efforts to comply with recent congressional mandates to incorporate predictions of sea level rise into its Flood Insurance Studies and FIRM.*

- *Implement climate adaptation strategies such as avoidance/planned retreat, enhance levees, setback levees to accommodate habitat transition zones, buffer zones and beaches, expanded tidal prisms for enhanced natural scouring of channel sediments, raising and flood-proofing structures, or provisions for additional floodwater pumping stations, and inland detention basins to reduce peak discharges.*

CC. Impact 4.J-1: Development of the existing structures on Alameda Point which contain hazardous materials—such as lead paint, asbestos, and PCBs—could potentially expose workers, the public, or the environment from the transport, use, or disposal of these hazardous materials and waste.

The Final EIR finds that demolition of existing structures on the project site may expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to hazardous materials such as lead-based paint ("LBP"), asbestos-containing materials ("ACMs"), and PCBs. Exposure to asbestos is possible throughout Project demolition and renovation phases if ACMs are present. This is a potentially significant impact. Potential exposure to these hazardous building materials can be reduced through appropriate abatement measures and property deed restrictions. In accordance with the Toxic Substances Control Act and other federal and state regulations, the applicant would be required to properly handle and dispose of electrical equipment and lighting ballasts that contain PCBs. Mitigation Measures 4.J-1a through 4.J-Je, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 4.J-1a:

Prior to issuance of any demolition permit, the project applicant shall submit to the City a hazardous building material assessment prepared by qualified licensed contractors for each structure intended for demolition indicating whether LBP or lead-based coatings, ACMs, and/or PCB-containing equipment are present.

Mitigation Measure 4.J-1b:

If the assessment required by Mitigation Measure 4.J-1a indicates the presence of LBP, ACMs, and/or PCBs, the project applicant shall create and implement a health and safety plan to protect demolition and construction workers and the public from risks associated with such hazardous materials during demolition or renovation of affected structures.

Mitigation Measure 4.J-1c:

If the assessment required by Mitigation Measure 4.J-1a finds presence of LBP, the project applicant shall develop and implement a LBP removal plan. The plan shall specify, but not be limited to, the following elements for implementation:

- *Develop a removal specification approved by a Certified Lead Project Designer.*
- *Ensure that all removal workers are properly trained.*
- *Contain all work areas to prohibit off-site migration of paint chip debris.*
- *Remove all peeling and stratified LBP on building and non-building surfaces to the degree necessary to safely and properly complete demolition activities*

according to recommendations of the survey. The demolition contractor shall be responsible for the proper containment and disposal of intact LBP on all equipment to be cut and/or removed during the demolition.

- *Provide on-site personnel and area air monitoring during all removal activities to ensure that workers and the environment are adequately protected by the control measures used.*
- *Clean up and/or vacuum paint chips with a high efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filter.*
- *Collect, segregate, and profile waste for disposal determination.*
- *Properly dispose of all waste.*

Mitigation Measure 4.J-1d:

If the assessment required by Mitigation Measure 4.J-1a finds asbestos, the project applicant shall prepare an asbestos abatement plan and shall ensure that asbestos abatement is conducted by a licensed contractor prior to building demolition. Abatement of known or suspected ACMs shall occur prior to demolition or construction activities that would disturb those materials. Pursuant to an asbestos abatement plan developed by a state-certified asbestos consultant and approved by the City, all ACMs shall be removed and appropriately disposed of by a state certified asbestos contractor.

Mitigation Measure 4.J-1e:

If the assessment required by Mitigation Measure 4.J-1a finds PCBs, the project applicant shall ensure that PCB abatement is conducted prior to building demolition or renovation. PCBs shall be removed by a qualified contractor and transported in accordance with Caltrans requirements.

DD. Impact 4.J-2: Construction at Alameda Point could potentially disturb soil and groundwater impacted by historical hazardous material use, which could expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to adverse conditions related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and waste.

Construction activities would include demolition of existing buildings, excavation and trenching, which could potentially intercept and/or disturb or uncover impacted soil and/or groundwater. If significant levels of hazardous materials in site soils are discovered, health and safety risks to workers could occur. In addition, contaminated soils and groundwater can present adverse effects to the environment including damage to wildlife. These are potentially significant impacts.

In general, development under the Project would not commence construction on any parcel until a Finding for Suitability of Transfer ("FOST") has been completed for that area. At sites known to be contaminated, a Site Health and Safety Plan must be

prepared to protect workers. To reduce environmental risks associated with encountering contaminated soil discovered during grading and construction, the Site Management Plan, as required by Mitigation Measure 4.J-2, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would include protocols to isolate any suspected contaminated soil, notify the appropriate regulatory overseeing agency, sample for hazardous material content and manage it in accordance with all applicable state, federal, and local laws and regulations. With implementation of the Site Health and Safety Plan, in accordance with Cal OSHA requirements, and a Site Management Plan, construction activities would not expose workers to unacceptable levels of known hazardous materials and the potential impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.J-2:

Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit for any ground breaking activities within the project site, the City shall prepare a Site Management Plan (SMP) that is approved by US EPA, DTSC, and the Water Board for incorporation into construction specifications. Any additional or remaining remediation on identified parcels from the City's tracking system shall be completed as directed by the responsible agency, U.S. EPA, DTSC, or Water Board, in accordance with the deed restrictions and requirements as well as any Covenants(s) to Restrict Use of Property (CRUP), prior to commencement of construction activities. Where necessary, additional remediation shall be accomplished by the project applicant prior to issuance of any building or grading permits in accordance with all requirements set by the overseeing agency (i.e., U.S. EPA, DTSC, or Water Board). The SMP shall be present on site at all times and readily available to site workers. The SMP shall specify protocols and requirements for excavation, stockpiling, and transport of soil and for disturbance of groundwater as well as a contingency plan to respond to the discovery of previously unknown areas of contamination (e.g., discolored soils, strong petroleum odors, an underground storage tank unearthed during normal construction activities, etc.). At a minimum the SMP shall include the following components:

1. Soil management requirements. Protocols for stockpiling, sampling, and transporting soil generated from onsite activities. The soil management requirements must include:

- *Soil stockpiling requirements such as placement of cover, application of moisture, erection of containment structures, and implementation of security measures. Additional measures related to BAAQMD dust control requirements as they apply to contamination shall also be included, as needed (see also Air Quality section).*

- *Protocols for assessing suitability of soil for on-site reuse through representative laboratory analysis of soils as approved by U.S. EPA, DTSC, or Water Board, taking into account the site-specific health-based remediation goals, other applicable health-based standards, and the proposed location, circumstances, and conditions for the intended soil reuse.*

- *Requirements for offsite transportation and disposal of soil not determined to be suitable for onsite reuse. Any soil identified for offsite disposal must be packaged, handled, and transported in compliance with all applicable state, federal, and the disposal facility's requirements for waste handling, transportation and disposal.*

- *Protocols for adherence to the City of Alameda's Marsh Crust Ordinance.*

- *Measures to be taken for areas of IR Site 13 where refinery wastes and asphaltic residues known as tarry refinery waste might be encountered. Measures shall include requirements for the storage, handling and disposal/recycling of any suspected tarry refinery waste that may be encountered.*

- *Radiological screening protocols for the radiological sites identified by the Navy as approved by the U.S. EPA, where necessary.*

2. Groundwater management requirements. Protocols for conducting dewatering activities and sampling and analysis requirements for groundwater extracted during dewatering activities. The sampling and analysis requirements shall specify which groundwater contaminants must be analyzed or how they will be determined. The results of the groundwater sampling and analysis shall be used to determine which of the following reuse or disposal options is appropriate for such groundwater:

- *Onsite reuse (e.g., as dust control);*

- *Discharge under the general permit for stormwater discharge for construction sites;*

- *Treatment (as necessary) before discharge to the sanitary sewer system under applicable East Bay MUD waste discharge criteria;*

- *Treatment (as necessary) before discharge under a site-specific NPDES permit;*

- *Offsite transport to an approved offsite facility.*

For each of the options listed, the SMP shall specify the particular criteria or protocol that would be considered appropriate for reuse or disposal options. The thresholds used must, at a minimum, be consistent with the applicable requirements of the Water Board and East Bay MUD.

3. Unknown contaminant/hazard contingency plan. Procedures for implementing a contingency plan, including appropriate notification, site worker protections, and site control procedures, in the event unanticipated potential subsurface hazards or hazardous material releases are discovered during construction. Control procedures shall include:

- *Protocols for identifying potential contamination though visual or olfactory observation;*
- *Protocols on what to do in the event an underground storage tank is encountered;*
- *Emergency contact procedures;*
- *Procedures for notifying regulatory agencies and other appropriate parties;*
- *Site control and security procedures;*
- *Sampling and analysis protocols; and*
- *Interim removal work plan preparation and implementation procedures.*

EE. Impact 4.J-7: Development facilitated by the Project could potentially be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and could result in a safety hazard to the public or environment through exposure to previous contamination of soil or groundwater including vapor intrusion into buildings.

The Final EIR finds that if ongoing remediation activities are not managed properly, future residents, visitors, and workers could be exposed to legacy contaminants through vapor intrusion into proposed structures, or contact with contaminated soils through excavation or other ground disturbing activities such as digging. This is a potentially significant impact. Closure of each IR site, Operable Unit, petroleum program site, and radiological program site would be based on all the collected data, including a Risk Assessment that uses numerical risk values estimated for both carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic compounds. Neither site closure nor a FOST would be approved by the overseeing regulatory agency unless the data clearly indicate that no significant risks to human health or the environment remains including any potential health risks from vapor intrusion.

With the appropriate disclosure and land use requirements as required by Mitigation Measure 4.J-7 below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, the potential for residual contamination to significantly impact residents, employees or the general public would be minimized and is less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 4.J-7:

The City shall include closed and open IR CERCLA sites that have land-use controls within its Land-use Restriction Tracking Program for identification and disclosure of any past cleanup efforts and current status of any remaining contamination, if any. Additional control measures such as vapor barriers and venting may be required as a condition of approval in areas where soil gas emissions have been identified. Prior to transfer of title for any parcel, the City shall require that the SMP as approved by US EPA, DTSC, and the Water Board be incorporated into intrusive site operations as required through deed restriction, enforceable Land Use Covenant, or any other applicable legal requirement.

FF. Impact 4.K-4: Development facilitated by the Project could potentially create a new source of substantial light or glare which could potentially adversely affect day or nighttime views in the project area.

The Final EIR finds that implementation of the Project would result in higher intensity development in the area, including taller buildings, and exterior lighting for security and aesthetic illumination, which would contribute to the overall ambient lighting levels at buildout. The potential for impacts from the sports complex would be greatest for the existing residential units across Main Street and on the project site, as well as any residential units that would be constructed under the Project. General project lighting would also be visible from areas across the bay such as Jack London Square and other Port of Oakland marine facilities (i.e., industrial land uses). Given the height and density of proposed uses on the site, a nighttime skyline of Alameda Point would become a prominent new visual presence within the nighttime view of the bay. This is a significant impact.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.K-4, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce potential impacts related to new sources of substantial light or glare which could potentially adversely affect day or nighttime views in the project area to a less than significant level. These lighting mitigation measures were prepared by a licensed lighting engineer and reviewed by numerous City departments, including the Community Development Department and Alameda Municipal Power. New improvements and development as part of the Project would be required to follow these measures.

Mitigation Measure 4.K-4:

All lighting installations shall be designed and installed to be fully shielded (full cutoff) and to minimize glare and obtrusive light by limiting outdoor lighting that is misdirected, excessive, or unnecessary, unless expressly exempted below. The location and design of all exterior lighting shall be shown on any site plan submitted to the City of Alameda for approval. The following lighting is exempt from these requirements:

1. Lighting in swimming pools and other water features.

2. Exit signs and other illumination required by building codes.

3. Lighting for stairs and ramps, as required by the building code.

4. Signs that are regulated by the City sign code.

5. Holiday and temporary lighting (less than thirty days use in any one year).

6. Low-voltage landscape lighting, but such lighting should be shielded in such a way as to eliminate glare and light trespass.

GG. Impact 4.M-5: Development facilitated by the proposed Project could potentially be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate solid waste generated by the Project, and would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

The Final EIR finds that construction and operation of the Project could generate up to 416,666 cubic yards of demolition debris. Where feasible, debris would be recycled and reused onsite. Because adequate landfill capacity exists to accept the Project's construction waste, impacts related to landfill capacity would not be substantial. However, because the actual phasing of Project construction is to be determined and would be driven by various factors, the timing of waste disposal generated by the Project is unknown. Thus, it is conservatively estimated that the Project could adversely affect the City's ability to comply with its diversion goals. This is a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure 4.M-5, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 4.M-5

The City shall develop a solid waste management plan for the Alameda Point project consistent with Alameda's demolition and debris ordinance. Plans for managing construction debris from specific reuse and development projects that require separation of waste types and recycling, and provide for reuse of materials onsite for the reuse and development areas, shall be developed by the project sponsor. The solid waste management plan shall be prepared in coordination with City staff, the project sponsor(s), and demolition subcontractors, and shall be approved by City staff prior to issuance of a demolition permit. The City and sponsors of projects shall work with organizations able to provide funding and technical assistance for managing and financing deconstruction, demolition, and recycling and reuse programs, should those programs exist at the time of site clearance.

VII. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS FOR WHICH MITIGATION MEASURES, THOUGH NOT REQUIRED, WILL BE INCORPORATED AS PART OF THE PROJECT

The impact listed below is a less-than-significant impact, even without the implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures for this impact, though not required, will nevertheless be incorporated as part of the Project to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

A. Impact 4.H-6: Development facilitated by the Project, combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable projects, could potentially result in substantial adverse cumulative impacts to geology, soils, or seismic hazards.

The San Francisco Bay Area region is considered seismically active and future development would expose additional people and structures to potentially adverse effects associated with earthquakes, including seismic ground shaking and seismic-related ground failure. However, site-specific geotechnical reports that future development projects would be required to prepare would determine how each development could be designed to minimize exposure of people to these effects.

Mitigation Measure 4.H-6 would require future development to be constructed to specific standards that exceed those of older structures within the region. The Final EIR finds that the Project, as well as all other future projects, would be constructed in accordance with the most current version of the California Building Code seismic safety requirements and recommendations contained in each site-specific geotechnical report as required by the Mitigation Measures in Chapter 4.H of the Final EIR. Therefore, impacts to area geology and soils resulting from future development of the Project, combined with other past, present, or probable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively significant impact. Thus, under Mitigation Measure 4.H-6, set forth below, which is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project, the cumulative impact would be less than significant given mandatory compliance with existing state and local building codes and regulations included with the required mitigations.

Mitigation Measure 4.H-6:

Implement Mitigation Measures 4.H-1a, -1b, and 4.H-2 through 4.H-5.

VIII. GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

The CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR evaluate the growth-inducing impacts of a proposed action (Section 15126.2[d]). A growth-inducing impact is defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) as:

> *[T]he ways in which the Project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth.... It must not be assumed that growth in any*

area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

A project can have direct and/or indirect growth-inducement potential. Direct growth inducement would result if a project involved construction of new housing that would result in new residents moving to the area. A project can have indirect growth-inducement potential if it would establish substantial new permanent employment opportunities (e.g., commercial, industrial or governmental enterprises) or if it would involve a substantial construction effort with substantial short-term employment opportunities and indirectly stimulate the need for additional housing and services to support the new employment demand. Similarly, under CEQA, a project would indirectly induce growth if it would remove an obstacle to additional growth and development, such as removing a constraint on a required public service. Increases in population could tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. The CEQA Guidelines also require analysis of the characteristics of projects that may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively.

The timing, magnitude, and location of land development and population growth are based on various interrelated land use and economic variables. Key variables include regional economic trends, market demand for residential and non-residential uses, land availability and cost, the availability and quality of transportation facilities and public services, proximity to employment centers, the supply and cost of housing, and regulatory policies or conditions. Because city and county general plans define the location, type and intensity of growth, they are the primary means of regulating development and growth in California.

Both the Alameda General Plan (as amended as part of the Project) and the Bay Area's Sustainable Communities Strategies, Plan Bay Area, anticipate growth at Alameda Point of essentially the same nature and density as the Project. Hence, the development of the Project has been anticipated by the City in its long-range planning (since the closure of NAS Alameda) as well as in the regionally forecast growth of the Bay Area. Thus, while the Project would not result in unplanned growth, it would accommodate an increase in both population and employment growth in Alameda as compared to the existing condition. Specifically, new infrastructure described in the Draft MIP would allow for growth to occur on the project site that has been constrained due to lack of appropriate infrastructure, as described below.

Under CEQA, a project is generally considered to be growth-inducing if it results in any one of the following:

1. Extension of urban services or infrastructure into a previously unserved area.

Although onsite infrastructure improvements would occur as part of the Project, the site is within an urban setting, and the project infrastructure would connect to existing city infrastructure and not require any major expansions of infrastructure other

than on the site itself. The project would not extend infrastructure to any other undeveloped areas. The project site, although occupied by buildings, is currently underutilized and located in an urban area. Hence, the Project would be infill development within an existing urban area.

2. Extension of a transportation corridor into an area that may be subsequently developed.

The Project would include improvement to streets that serve the project site and connect the project site to the existing street network as part of the vision of integrating the project site with the City. The project site is adjacent to City development on the east. As a redevelopment property, the Project would not extend transportation corridors into undeveloped areas resulting in growth inducing impacts. In fact, the project site's location near Interstate 880 and regional alternative transportation systems could result in less impact on regional transportation systems and air quality than would comparable development in a more outlying "greenfields" area, or an area with a lower concentration of population within the County.

3. Removal of obstacles to population growth (such as provision of major new public services to an area where those services are not currently available).

The Project involves a zoning ordinance amendment and general plan amendment for the project site to facilitate the Project. These amendments would remove "obstacles to population growth" only for the project site. The amendments would not facilitate population growth on any other property.

Further, by implementing the MIP, as part of the Project, the infrastructure improvements would allow for growth to occur on the project site that has been constrained due to lack of appropriate infrastructure. Implementing the MIP would not facilitate population growth on any other property.

The Project would result in the development of up to 1,425 residential dwelling units and 5.5 million square feet of commercial space. ABAG estimates that by 2040, Alameda would increase its housing stock by 18 percent over 2010 levels (from 32,350 housing units to 38,240 housing units. Therefore, the growth in housing units proposed by the project, and thus population growth generated by the Project, would be within the ABAG projections for the City of Alameda.

Further, because the project site is included in Plan Bay Area as the NAS Alameda PDA, from a regional standpoint the project is part of a coordinated strategy for managing land use patterns and transportation investments to accommodate projected population growth while also reducing emissions of greenhouse gases, consistent with the direction in SB 375. As Plan Bay Area's transportation projects are tied to the proposed land use development pattern and the region's population projections, they are inherently designed to focus growth primarily in PDAs, as opposed to other locations in the region. That is, the transportation projects in Plan Bay Area were selected to complement a certain type of land development (balanced and

compact) and discourage imbalanced, sprawling, and greenfields development. As such, by specifically being included in the Play Bay Area, the Project is promoting focused infill growth rather than growth beyond targeted areas. By accommodating growth in a targeted urban area, the Project would regionally contribute to reduced vehicle miles travels and greenhouse gas emissions, as required by SB 375.

The physical effects of implementing the Project, including the zoning ordinance and general plan amendments and the Master Infrastructure Plan, are described in Chapter 4 of this EIR.

IX. ALTERNATIVES

The Final EIR analyzed six alternatives to the Project, examining the environmental impacts and feasibility of each alternative, as well as the ability of the alternatives to meet project objectives. The Project and the project objectives are described in detail in the Final EIR Chapter 3, Project Description, and the potential environmental effects of implementing the Project are analyzed in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, including discussion of significant impacts resulting from the Project and mitigation measures recommended to avoid these impacts.

Brief summaries of the alternatives, including the Environmentally Superior Alternative, are provided below. As explained in Section X, below, the findings in this Section are based on the Final EIR, the discussion and analysis in which is hereby incorporated in full by this reference. The City further finds that each of the reasons given for rejecting an alternative discussed below is a separate and independent basis for rejecting that alternative.

A. The No Project/No New Development Alternative

CEQA requires consideration of a no project alternative. Consistent with State CEQA Guideline Section 15126.6(e), the No Project/No New Development Alternative assumes that the site would generally remain in its existing condition, which includes 267 existing housing units and existing non-residential business leases with approximately 1,000 jobs. Under this alternative, no construction of new housing units or new commercial development would occur.

Because this alternative would severely limit private investment at Alameda Point, this alternative would be the least likely to achieve any of the project objectives. In this alternative, the City would not allow private investment in new businesses or new residential construction. Existing tenants within the existing 267 residential units would be able to reinvest in their buildings, and existing commercial tenants would be able to reinvest in their buildings; however, it cannot be expected that existing residential tenants (200 of which are low income households) or existing commercial tenants would be able to fund rehabilitation of the site wide infrastructure, sea level rise improvements, rehabilitation and expansion of public open space and parks, or rehabilitation and

improvement of vacant buildings in the Historic District. This alternative also would result in further deterioration of infrastructure services and exposure to flood hazards.

This alternative would not achieve the Project objective of rebuilding and maintaining long-term operations of supportive housing and is unlikely to achieve the first source of hiring Project objectives. The alternative would also fail to achieve Project objectives related to the creation of new jobs and economic development opportunities (as no new businesses would be allowed), expansion of housing opportunities (as no new housing would be allowed), or creation of transit oriented, tree-lined pedestrian friendly neighborhoods.

This alternative would fail to meet the Project objectives related to climate change, greenhouse gas emissions, and transit-oriented development consistent SB 375 and the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy: Plan Bay Area. Alameda Point represents an important urban infill site for the region. From a regional perspective, prohibiting development of the property would cause future development to locate further from the urban centers, which will result in longer Bay Area commutes and increased greenhouse emissions.

Of all the alternatives considered in this analysis, the No Project/No New Development Alternative would be the least successful alternative with respect to meeting the Project objectives. This alternative would also result in further deterioration of infrastructure and exposure to flood hazards and, without reinvestment and reoccupation, the buildings and infrastructure that support the buildings and the few uses in those buildings would continue to deteriorate. With time, this deterioration and blight would increase the costs to adaptively reuse and rehabilitate existing buildings and facilities.

For the foregoing reasons, the No Project/No New Development Alternative is considered infeasible and is hereby rejected.

B. The Preservation/Less Development Alternative

The Preservation/Less Development Alternative would allow additional development on the project site, but not as much as the Project. This alternative would allow a total of 1,000 housing units (733 additional units) and up to 6,000 jobs (5,000 additional jobs). Approximately 733 of the housing units would be created through new construction. Of the 5,000 new jobs, approximately half (2,500) of the new jobs would occur in new non-residential buildings and the other half would occur in exiting vacant or underutilized buildings, primarily in the Historic District.

The limited development program in this alternative is specifically designed to minimize any environmental impact to the NAS Historic District. In this alternative, no new construction would be allowed within the Historic District. All new residential units and all new buildings for employment uses would be constructed outside of the boundaries of the NAS Historic District.

This alternative would allow limited private investment in new businesses and up to 733 new residential units. In addition, existing tenants within the existing 267 residential units would be able to reinvest in their buildings, and existing commercial tenants would be able to reinvest in their buildings.

Under this alternative, a mixed-use, pedestrian and transit-oriented development at Alameda Point could only be developed outside of the Historic District, leaving nearly one-half of the Project site in its historic military industrial configuration. By prohibiting development along the taxiways on the northern edge of the Seaplane Lagoon and at other locations within the Historic District, this alternative would limit transit-oriented development opportunities at the heart of the project.

This alternative would not achieve the project objectives as well as the Project because it would limit private reinvestment and redevelopment; thus, it is less likely to attract sufficient private capital to fund the necessary public infrastructure improvements, build the planned public parks and open spaces, and rehabilitate as many of the buildings, landscapes, and other assets in the NAS Historic District. In addition, this alternative would not do as well as the Project in attracting new business and economic development to Alameda, and would not generate as many housing opportunities.

This alternative would attract limited investment and inadequate resources to rebuild housing and infrastructure. Residents would continue to be exposed to flood hazards and deteriorating, unreliable infrastructure, thereby increasing displacement risks for residents. This alternative would not achieve the Project objective of rebuilding and maintaining long-term operation of supportive housing.

From a regional perspective, this alternative would be less effective than the Project in meeting the Project objectives related to climate change, greenhouse gas emissions, and transit-oriented development consistent with Plan Bay Area and SB 375. Limiting development of the property to 733 new housing units would increase pressures to allow future development to locate further from the urban centers, which would result in longer Bay Area commutes and increased greenhouse emissions from vehicles.

In addition to these impacts, this alternative's operational air emissions would be significant and unavoidable, as with the proposed Project. Moreover, as stated above, the alternative would increase the displacement risk for residents due to failure to mitigate flood hazards and deteriorating infrastructure.

For the foregoing reasons, the Preservation/Less Development Alternative is considered infeasible and is hereby rejected.

C. The Existing General Plan Alternative: More Housing and Less Jobs

Under the Existing General Plan Alternative: More Housing and Less Jobs, the City would not amend the existing General Plan and would allow approximately 500

more housing units (up to 1,928), but provide fewer job opportunities (6,000 instead of 8,900) than the Project.

With significantly fewer jobs, this alternative would be less effective than the Project at achieving the Project objectives related to economic development, employment and retail development. By limiting the total non-residential development to 2.3 million square feet, this alternative significantly reduces economic development opportunities compared to the Project, which would accommodate 5.5 million square feet of non-residential development. This alternative would require mothballing or demolishing a large number of existing buildings and maintaining large areas of the property in a vacant or underutilized condition.

This alternative is unlikely to achieve Project objectives for job creation, economic development or reuse of historic buildings. Buildout of a greater number of residential units in the Main Street Neighborhood is more likely to achieve rebuilding of supportive housing, but less likely to achieve first source hiring Project objectives. With limited commercial development, preservation and adaptive reuse of existing historic buildings will not be achieved, thereby increasing “historic blight” and discouraging investment in residential development in the Main Street Neighborhoods. This alternative would perform better than the proposed Project at achieving the Project objective of rebuilding and long-term operations of supportive housing but is unlikely to achieve first source hiring Project objectives.

This alternative and the limitation on non-residential use raise questions about the ability to preserve the buildings within the Historic District and achieve overall economic development Project objectives. The Historic District includes over two million square feet of existing buildings. If new non-residential and business buildings were constructed for new companies in areas of the property that are not included with the Historic District, a number of existing buildings in the Historic District would need to be indefinitely mothballed, boarded up, or demolished to ensure that the City did not exceed the 2.3 million square feet of employment uses.

Biological impacts under this alternative would be similar to the proposed Project’s impacts and would require the same mitigation. Criteria pollutant emissions would be somewhat less than those of the proposed Project, but would still be significant and unavoidable. Construction and traffic noise would also remain significant and unavoidable. As stated above, the limited commercial development and adaptive reuse under this alternative would increase “historic blight” and discourage investment in residential development in the Main Street Neighborhoods. For the foregoing reasons, the Existing General Plan Alternative: More Housing and Less Jobs Alternative is considered infeasible and is hereby rejected.

D. The Multifamily Alternative

Under the Multifamily Alternative, the City would allow the same number of housing units and jobs as the Project but the all new housing would be multifamily housing. Existing single family housing units and the “Big Whites” would remain, but no

new single family housing would be constructed. This alternative would result in large land areas remaining undeveloped and in less infrastructure investment. This alternative would not achieve the Project objective of rebuilding and long-term operation of supportive housing.

From an economic development perspective, this alternative would be very similar to the Project with regard to job growth and business expansion. From a housing perspective, this alternative would not allow for a diversity of housing types and affordability, and by limiting opportunities for the subdivision and sale of single family lots, this alternative would likely generate less financial return to support and fund reinvestment in the site wide infrastructure. For these reasons, this alternative may result in the need to reduce the geographic scope of the infrastructure improvements and relocate some existing users, such as the Alameda Point Collaborative or St. Georges Spirits into that smaller geographic area.

Also, similar to the Preservation/Less Development Alternative, which would prohibit new construction within the Historic District, the multifamily alternative would likely result in little to no new residential development within the Historic District. The new multifamily residential development would occur between Main Street and the eastern edge of the Historic District. An exception might be that some of the new multifamily units could be located in the Bachelors Officers Quarters (BOQ) or Bachelors Enlisted Men's Quarters (BEQ). Nevertheless, this alternative would generally result in a transit oriented multifamily mixed use community on approximately one-half of the property. The other half, which is roughly defined by the NAS Historic District, would remain in its current and historic military industrial configuration, which is not particularly transit oriented or pedestrian friendly.

Transportation impacts under this alternative would remain significant and unavoidable, as with the proposed Project. Biological impacts would be similar to the proposed Project and would require the same mitigation. Air emissions would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed Project. Construction and traffic noise would also remain significant and unavoidable.

For the foregoing reasons, the Multifamily Housing Alternative is considered infeasible and is hereby rejected.

E. The Transit Oriented Mixed Use Alternative

This Transit Oriented Mixed Use Alternative would provide higher levels of development and infrastructure investment, thus making it easier to achieve the Project objectives of rebuilding and maintaining long-term operation of supportive housing and achieving first source hiring Project objectives. This assumes that the real estate market can accomplish the Project objectives even with the imposition of Navy fees for housing above the no cost conveyance limits of 1,425 units.

The increased residential development and the increased retail uses allowed in this alternative are designed to attract more private investment to the property and create a more transit oriented, higher density, mixed used environment. This additional investment would make it easier for the alternative to meet the Project objectives of replacing and improving onsite and off-site infrastructure, improvement and addition of onsite parks and public facilities, and creation of additional public benefits. However, this alternative is inconsistent with the Economic Development Conveyance Memorandum of Understanding ("EDC MOA") with the Navy for the no-cost conveyance of the land, which could result in penalty payments to the Navy, making it more expensive to develop the property, and could potentially affect the conveyance of future phases of the property and the ability to ensure orderly redevelopment of the property.

Because this alternative would generate more automobile trips than the proposed Project, it would result in more transportation impacts and thus require more transportation impact mitigations than the proposed Project. This alternative would result in significant cumulative noise impacts due to increased traffic. This alternative also would result in additional local air quality impacts, but would use the same mitigation measures recommended for the Project. Biological impacts under this alternative would be similar to the proposed Project and would require the same mitigation.

For the foregoing reasons, the Transit Oriented Mixed Use Alternative is considered infeasible and is hereby rejected.

F. High Density Alternative

The High Density Alternative, which includes 4,841 housing units and 3.8 million square feet of nonresidential uses, is modeled on the plan contained in the 2009 Ballot Initiative for Alameda Point.

From a regional environmental perspective, this alternative would perform better than both the proposed Project and the Transit Oriented Mixed Use Alternative when considering the major environmental issues of global climate change and regional greenhouse gas emissions. From a local perspective, the increased traffic from this alternative would cause increased local traffic and associated air quality and noise impacts, but from a regional and global perspective, these local impacts would be offset by a corresponding decrease in regional vehicular miles traveled (from shorter commutes) and the associated reductions in air quality and noise impacts associated with regional traffic.

This alternative would provide higher levels of development and infrastructure investment, thus making it easier to achieve the Project objectives of rebuilding and maintaining long-term operations of supportive housing and achieving first source hiring Project objectives. This assumes that the real estate market can accomplish Project objectives even with the imposition of Navy fees for housing above the no cost conveyance limits of 1,425 units.

The number of transportation impacts and the severity of those impacts would likely be greater in the High Density Alternative than in any of the other alternatives because the higher level of residential development would generate more vehicle trips; therefore, additional mitigation would likely be necessary at some locations.

The air quality and noise impacts of this alternative would be the greatest of all the alternatives and would require additional mitigation. Biological impacts under this alternative would be similar to the proposed Project and would require the same mitigation.

For the foregoing reasons, the High Density Alternative is considered infeasible and is hereby rejected.

G. Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA requires EIRs to identify the environmentally superior alternative. Based on the findings of the Final EIR and the thresholds of significance used for each environmental topic in Chapter 4, the environmentally superior alternative would be the No Project Alternative. Because the No Project Alternative involves no new development, the environmental impacts associated with its implementation would be the least of all the alternatives analyzed in the EIR, including the Project. However, it would not meet any of the Project objectives.

CEQA requires that, if the No Project Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative, the EIR identify another Environmentally Superior Alternative among the alternatives.

The Environmentally Superior Alternative is therefore the Preservation/Less Development Alternative. The Preservation/Less Development Alternative would result in fewer environmental impacts than the Project. Specifically, the Preservation/Less Development Alternative would avoid or lessen environmental impacts related to Cultural Resources, Traffic, Air Quality, and Noise that are associated with the Project. The Transit Mixed Use Alternative and the High Density Alternative, on the other hand, would result in greater traffic, air quality, noise, and climate change environmental impacts, based on the thresholds of significance used in Chapter 4. This determination is due to the fact that the thresholds focus on the local rather than regional environment.

Plan Bay Area, which is the regional plan for reduction of greenhouse gases approved in 2013 by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments, finds that best way to reduce greenhouse gases regionally, improve air quality regionally, and reduce traffic regionally is to focus development within the Planned Development Areas (“PDAs”) identified in Plan Bay Area. Plan Bay Area finds that increasing density and the number of jobs and housing in locations like Alameda Point, which is a PDA, will decrease pressures to develop in the outer Bay Area communities, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and generally improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gases.

The Preservation/Less Development Alternative would also avoid or lessen impacts related to cultural resources and noise that are associated with the project. Therefore, under the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6, the Preservation/Less development Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

X. INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

These findings incorporate the text of the Final EIR for the Project, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, City Staff Reports relating to the Project, and other documents relating to public hearing on the Project, by reference, in their entirety. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of mitigation measures, project and cumulative impacts, the basis for determining the significance of impacts, the comparison of the alternatives to the Project, the determination of the environmentally superior alternative, and the reasons for approving the Project.

XI. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Various documents and other materials constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City bases its findings contained herein. The record of proceedings is located in the offices of the custodian for these documents and materials, which is the Office of the City Clerk of the City of Alameda, 2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Room 380, Alameda, CA, 94501.

XII. RECIRCULATION NOT REQUIRED

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 requires a lead agency to recirculate an EIR for further review and comment when “significant new information” is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR but before certification. Recirculation of the EIR is not required because no significant new information has been received which disclosed that a new significant environmental impact would result from the Project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented, that a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance, that a feasible mitigation measure or alternative considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the Project but the City declines to adopt it, or that the Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

XIII. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15093, the City has balanced the economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the Project, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, against its significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. The City finds that the Project’s benefits outweigh its unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and that the adverse environmental effects

are therefore acceptable. The reasons set forth below are based on the Final EIR and other information in the record.

The following statement identifies the reasons why, in the City's judgment, specific benefits of the Project outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects. The substantial evidence supporting the benefits of the Project can be found in the preceding sections of these Findings, in the Project itself, and in the record of proceedings as defined in Section XI, above. The City further finds that each of the Project benefits discussed below is a separate and independent basis for these findings. The reasons set forth below are based on the Final EIR and other information in the administrative record.

A. **Strengthen Community Economic Base:** The project will strengthen and diversify the economic base of the community by emphasizing employment and a mix of economic development opportunities that complement economic development strategies in other parts of Alameda. It will provide a range of employment opportunities and quality jobs through adaptive reuse of existing buildings and new construction to replace up to 9,000 of the jobs lost to Alameda and the region by the closure of NAS Alameda. The Project will reoccupy existing buildings and construct new buildings to create 5.5 million square feet of business, commercial, industrial, maritime and retail uses that will provide jobs, services, tax revenue, and new amenities for Alameda residents.

B. **Reinvest in Infrastructure:** The Project will eliminate the blighted conditions on the property, and correct geotechnical and flood hazards and infrastructure deficiencies in the area, by developing the Project site into an integrated, mixed-use community with an integrated network of public open spaces, trails, and streets. Where feasible, the Project will facilitate reinvestment in substandard infrastructure systems and buildings, including contributing structures and cultural landscapes within the NAS Alameda Historic District.

C. **Increase Supply of a Range of Housing Types:** The Project will increase the City's supply of land available for residential development and the supply of affordable housing sites for Alameda and the region to balance the jobs proposed for the Project site and attract potential riders for proposed transit. It will rehabilitate and construct 1,425 residential units, including a mix of single-family homes, attached townhomes, a mix of stacked flats and low and midrise multifamily housing with higher-density housing concentrated around transit nodes for a mix of household types and incomes. The Project will relocate and consolidate existing supportive housing providers in new facilities at Alameda Point to help ensure a mix of incomes and populations are represented at the Project site. The Project will provide a diversity of housing types and pricing that attract the market segments most likely to use alternatives to the

automobile, such as self-selective transit commuters and households with zero to low-automobile ownership.

D. **Promote Sustainable Development:** The Project will protect the local, regional, and global environment and facilitate sustainable reuse and redevelopment of Alameda Point by creating opportunities for transit-oriented development consistent with SB 375 and the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy: Plan Bay Area. The Project will invest in improvements to adapt to sea-level rise and climate change over time, and the replacement and rehabilitation of substandard infrastructure systems that may contribute to regional water quality impacts. It will apply sustainability principles in the design and development of open spaces, recreation facilities, buildings, and infrastructure, including wastewater, storm water, electrical and transportation systems.

E. **Provide Transit-Oriented, Mixed-Use Development Opportunities:** The Project will provide transit-oriented, mixed-use development opportunities by ensuring that the site design reflects the established transit-oriented and mixed-use goals, policies, and objectives of the NAS Alameda Community Reuse Plan and the City of Alameda General Plan. It will provide for mixed-use development opportunities and sites within close proximity to existing and planned transit and encourage the types of non-residential uses that serve the everyday needs of Alameda Point residents and employees and reduce the need to use an automobile to obtain goods and services. The Project will promote use of alternative modes of transportation through preparation and implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program.

F. **Provide Open Space and Other Community Benefits:** The project will produce tangible community benefits for the Alameda community as a whole by creating an open space network that incorporates preservation, restoration and enhancement of wetlands and other natural habitats and provides for both passive and active recreational uses. The Project will enhance views of water and public access to the waterfront in all development and creatively encourage the usage of the waterfront by providing a waterfront promenade, open space, and other public amenities, including an extension of the Bay Trail. It will create human-scale, tree-lined walkable streets and bicycle routes throughout the Project site and extend the street grid street pattern that is characteristic of the existing city neighborhoods and districts throughout Alameda Point.

G. **Ensure Predictable and Fiscally Sound Development Process:** The Project will provide for clear and orderly phasing, sizing, and financing of site infrastructure for both the circulation and utility network and provide for a predictable development process. It will address the impact of the site development on the City's operating budget to comply with City Council Policies adopted by Resolution 13643 related to fiscal neutrality.

Based on the entire record, including the EIR, the specific economic, social, and environmental benefits of the Project, as stated above, outweigh and override any significant unavoidable environmental effects that would result from future Project implementation. The Council has determined that any significant environmental effects caused by the Alameda Point Project have been mitigated to the extent feasible through the mitigation measures identified herein and adopted and incorporated into the Project, and, where mitigation is not feasible, has been outweighed and counterbalanced by the economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the Project, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits.

XIV. SUMMARY

A. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, the City has made one or more of the following Findings with respect to each of the significant environmental effects of the Project:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Final EIR.

2. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.

3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

B. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, it is determined that:

1. All significant effects on the environment due to the approval of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.

2. Any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the factors described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section XIII, above.

EXHIBIT B

ALAMEDA POINT PROJECT
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

A. Introduction

When approving projects with Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) that identify significant impacts, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires public agencies to adopt monitoring and reporting programs or conditions of project approval to mitigate or avoid the identified significant effects (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(1)). A public agency adopting measures to mitigate or avoid the significant impacts of a proposed project is required to ensure that the measures are fully enforceable, through permit conditions, agreements, or other means (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(b)). The mitigation measures required by a public agency to reduce or avoid significant project impacts not incorporated into the design or program for the project may be made conditions of project approval as set forth in a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). The program must be designed to ensure project compliance with mitigation measures during project implementation.

The MMRP includes the mitigation measures identified in the EIR required to address the significant impacts associated with the proposed project. The required mitigation measures are summarized in this program; the full text of the impact analysis and mitigation measures is presented in the Draft EIR in Chapter 2, Summary, except as revised in the Final EIR. The mitigation revisions are presented Chapter 5 of this Final EIR.

B. Format

The MMRP is organized in a table format (see **Table 1**), keyed to each significant impact and each EIR mitigation measure. Only mitigation measures adopted to address significant impacts are included in this program. Each mitigation measure is set out in full, followed by a tabular summary of monitoring requirements. The column headings in the tables are defined as follows:

- **Mitigation Measures adopted as Conditions of Approval:** This column presents the mitigation measure identified in the EIR.

- **Site(s) Affected:** The mitigation measures are, in some cases, site specific. This column identifies which areas or aspect of the project would need to adhere to or would be affected by the mitigation measure.

- **Implementation Procedures:** This column identifies the procedures associated with implementation of the mitigation measure.
- **Monitoring Responsibility:** This column contains an assignment of responsibility for the monitoring and reporting tasks.
- **Monitoring and Reporting Action:** This column refers to the outcome from implementing the mitigation measure.
- **Mitigation Schedule:** The general schedule for conducting each mitigation task, identifying, where appropriate, both the timing and the frequency of the action.

C. Enforcement

If the project is approved, the MMRP would be incorporated as a condition of such approval. Therefore, all mitigation measures for significant impacts must be carried out in order to fulfill the requirements of approval. A number of the mitigation measures would be implemented during the course of the development review process. These measures would be checked on plans, in reports, and in the field prior to construction. Most of the remaining mitigation measures would be implemented during the construction or project implementation phase.

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

TABLE 1
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
C. Transportation and Circulation						
1. A set of comprehensive traffic control measures shall be developed, including scheduling of major truck trips and deliveries to avoid peak traffic hours, detour signs if required, lane closure procedures, signs, cones for drivers, and designated construction access routes. 2. The Construction Management Plan shall identify haul routes for movement of construction vehicles that would minimize impacts on motor vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic, circulation, and safety, and specifically to minimize impacts, to the greatest extent possible, to streets in and around the Alameda Point project site. The haul routes shall be approved by the City. 3. The Construction Management Plan shall provide for notification procedures for adjacent property owners and public safety personnel regarding when major deliveries, detours, and lane closures would occur. 4. The Construction Management Plan shall provide for monitoring surface streets used for haul routes so that any damage and debris attributable to truck hauling can be identified and corrected by the project applicant.	All sites	Project applicant and its contractor(s) obtain approval of Construction Management Plan and implement the plan during construction.	City of Alameda Public Works Department		Prior to issuance of building or grading permit(s); inspect during construction	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a (TDM Program): Prior to issuance of building permits for each development project at Alameda Point, the City of Alameda shall prepare, and shall require that the sponsor of the development project participate in implementation of, a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program/plan for Alameda Point aimed at meeting the General Plan peak-hour trip reduction goals of 10 percent for residential development and 30 percent for commercial development.	All development sites	Project applicant shall implement the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program/plan prepared by the City of Alameda.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall require implementation of TDM program.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
C. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.C-2b (Monitoring): Prior to issuance of the first building permits for any development project at Alameda Point, the City of Alameda shall adopt a Transportation Network Monitoring and Improvement Program to: 1) determine the cost of the transportation network improvements identified in this EIR; 2) identify appropriate means and formulas to collect fair share financial contributions from Alameda Point development; 3) monitor conditions at the locations that will be impacted by the redevelopment of Alameda Point; 4) monitor traffic generated by Alameda Point; and 5) annually report to the Planning Board to determine the appropriate time to implement any necessary secondary physical improvements required in this EIR to minimize or eliminate significant transportation impacts prior to the impacts occurring at affected locations where a secondary impact mitigation is recommended.	Fernside Boulevard/ Otis Drive	City of Alameda shall adopt a Transportation Network Monitoring and Improvement Program.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor traffic generated by redevelopment of Alameda Point at identified locations and establish the appropriate time to implement necessary improvements described in other mitigation measures	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) and prior to impact occurring	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-2c (Otis/Fernside): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when and if required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall implement the following improvements: • Remove the right turn island for the westbound approach on Otis Drive, add a dedicated right turn lane with approximately 50 feet of storage length, and move the westbound stop-bar upstream approximately 20 feet to accommodate the right turn lane storage length. Restripe Fernside Boulevard with two receiving lanes. • Optimize signal timing.	Fernside Boulevard/ Otis Drive	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to fund a fair-share of the total cost of the improvements, as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-2c, and, if determined necessary after implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, the City shall be responsible for ensuring implementation of the improvements at the appropriate time,.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and improvements at appropriate time.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) for collection of funds for fair-share of total cost and prior to impact occurring for implementation of the improvements, if necessary	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-2d (Jackson/Sixth): The City of Alameda shall implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program).	Jackson/ Sixth Streets	Project applicant shall implement TDM program	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall require implementation of TDM program	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-2e (Brush/11th): The City of Alameda shall implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program.	Brush/11th	Project applicant shall implement TDM program	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall require implementation of TDM program.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
C. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.C-2f (23rd/Seventh): The City of Alameda shall implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a (TDM Program).	23rd Street and Seventh Street	Project applicant shall implement TDM program	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall require implementation of TDM program.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-2g (Main/Pacific Pedestrian): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall implement the following physical improvements: • change the signal timing to a two-phase timing plan (i.e., northbound and southbound move concurrently; then eastbound and westbound move concurrently); and • optimize cycle length.	Main Street and Pacific Avenue	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to fund a fair-share of the total cost of the improvements, as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-2g, and, if determined necessary after implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, the City shall be responsible for ensuring implementation of the improvements at the appropriate time,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and improvements at appropriate time.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) for collection of funds for fair-share of total cost and prior to impact occurring for implementation of the improvements, if necessary	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-2h (Webster/Appezzato Parkway Pedestrian): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall optimize the signal timing during the p.m. peak hour.	Webster Street and Appezzato Parkway	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to fund a fair-share of the total cost of signal optimization, as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-2h, and, if determined necessary after implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, the City shall be responsible for ensuring implementation of the improvement at the appropriate time,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and improvement at appropriate time.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) for collection of funds for fair-share of total cost and prior to impact occurring for implementation of the improvement, if necessary	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
C. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.C-2i (Park/Otis Pedestrian): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall optimize the signal timing during the a.m. and p.m. and peak hours.	Park Street and Otis Drive	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to fund a fair-share of the total cost of signal optimization, as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-2i, and, if determined necessary after implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, the City shall be responsible for ensuring implementation of the improvement at the appropriate time,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and improvement at appropriate time.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) for collection of funds for fair-share of total cost and prior to impact occurring for implementation of the improvement, if necessary	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-2j (Broadway/Tilden Pedestrian): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall optimize the signal timing during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.	Broadway and Tilden Way	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to fund a fair-share of the total cost of signal optimization, as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-2j, and, if determined necessary after implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, the City shall be responsible for ensuring implementation of the improvement at the appropriate time,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and improvement at appropriate time.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) for collection of funds for fair-share of total cost and prior to impact occurring for implementation of the improvement, if necessary	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-2k (High/Fernside Pedestrian): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall optimize the signal timing during the p.m. peak hour.	High Street and Fernside Boulevard	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to fund a fair-share of the total cost of signal optimization, as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-2k, and, if determined necessary after implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, the City shall be responsible for ensuring implementation of the improvement at the appropriate time,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and improvement at appropriate time.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) for collection of funds for fair-share of total cost and prior to impact occurring for implementation of the improvement, if necessary	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
C. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.C-2l (Atlantic/Constitution Pedestrian): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall implement the following physical improvements: • modify the phasing sequence and • optimize the signal timing.	Atlantic Avenue and Constitution Way	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to fund a fair-share of the total cost of the improvements, as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-2l, and, if determined necessary after implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, the City shall be responsible for ensuring implementation of the improvements at the appropriate time,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and improvements at appropriate time	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) for collection of funds for fair-share of total cost and prior to impact occurring for implementation of the improvements, if necessary	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-2m (Stargell Avenue Bike): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall construct a Class I bicycle facility between Main Street and Webster Street.	Stargell Avenue	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to fund a fair-share of the total cost of the improvements, as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-2m, and, if determined necessary after implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, the City shall be responsible for ensuring implementation of the improvement at the appropriate time,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and improvement at appropriate time	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) for collection of funds for fair-share of total cost and prior to impact occurring for implementation of the improvements, if necessary	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
C. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.C-2n (Main Street Bike): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall implement the following physical improvements: • improve the existing Class I bicycle path on the west side of the street between Appezzato Parkway and Pacific Avenue to current City standards; • provide connectivity to existing Class I bicycle path on the east and west sides of the street north of Appezzato Parkway. Appropriate intersection treatments for connectivity may include striping, signage, and/or bicycle boxes at the intersection of Main Street and Appezzato Parkway; and • if Mitigation Measure 4.C-4c (described below) is implemented, provide connectivity to that bicycle facilities on west side of the street north of the Main Street-Pacific Street intersection.	Main Street	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to fund a fair-share of the total cost of the improvements, as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-2n, and, if determined necessary after implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, the City shall be responsible for ensuring implementation of the improvements at the appropriate time,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and improvements at appropriate time	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) for collection of funds for fair-share of total cost and prior to impact occurring for implementation of the improvements, if necessary	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-2o (Central Avenue Bike): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall use its best efforts to implement the following physical improvements: • improve the existing Class I bicycle path on the west (south) side of the street between the Main Street-Pacific Street intersection and Lincoln Avenue to current City standards; • extend a Class I bicycle path to Third Street; and • restripe and sign the street segment between Third Street and Fourth Street to provide Class II bicycle lanes between Lincoln Avenue and Fourth Street.	Central Avenue	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to fund a fair-share of the total cost of the improvements, as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-2o, and, if determined necessary after implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, the City shall be responsible for ensuring implementation of the improvements at the appropriate time,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and improvements at appropriate time	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) for collection of funds for fair-share of total cost and prior to impact occurring for implementation of the improvements, if necessary	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
C. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5a (Park/Clement): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following physical improvements: • Add northbound left turn pocket along Park Street; • Optimize the signal offsets and splits; and • Complete the Clement Avenue extension, which would reduce the demand for left turn movements onto Park Street from eastbound traffic on Clement Avenue.	Park/ Clement	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvements (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5a) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds. The northbound left-turn pocket along Park Street will be completed by ACTC as part of the I-880/23rd/29th Street project.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5b (Park/Encinal): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvement: • Optimize offsets and splits.	Park/Encinal	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvement (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5b) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5c: (Broadway/Otis): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement, the following improvement: • Optimize the signal timing during both peak hours.	Broadway/ Otis	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvement (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5c) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
C. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5d: (Tilden/Blanding/Fernside): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvement: • Optimize the offsets and splits.	Tilden/ Blanding/ Fernside	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvement (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5d) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5e (High/Fernside): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvements: • Adjust the signal cycle phasing during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours such that the southbound left turn from High Street is a permitted rather than protected movement; and • Optimize signal timing.	High/ Fernside	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvements (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5e) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5f (High/Otis): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvements: • Optimize the signal timing at High and Otis for both peak hours, and • Install traffic calming strategies on Bayview Drive to include improvements, such as: restriping Bayview Drive to create narrower driving lanes to reduce speeding, installing a cross walk and caution sign at the location of the public coastal access easement, and/or construction of sidewalk bulb-outs to improve pedestrian safety at the intersections of Bayview/Court Street and Bayview/Broadway.	High/Otis	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvements (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5f) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
C. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5g (Island Drive/Otis Drive and Doolittle Drive): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvement: • Optimize signal timing during both peak hours.	Island Drive/Otis Drive/ Doolittle Drive	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvement (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5g) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5h (Fernside Boulevard and Otis Drive): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and implement Mitigation Measure 4.C-2c (Otis/Fernside), and fund a fair share contribution to add a westbound right-turn overlap phase from Fernside Boulevard.	Fernside Boulevard and Otis Drive	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a, 4.C-2b, and 4.C-2c, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvement (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5h) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, Mitigation Measure 4.C-2c (if necessary), and collection of fair-share of funds.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5i (Park/Blanding). The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvements: • Change east-west signal phasing to protected phasing; and • Optimize signal timing during both peak hours.	Park Street and Blanding	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvement (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5i) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5j (Challenger/Atlantic): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, a fairshare to contribution optimize signal timing during the p.m. peak hour.	Challenger/Atlantic	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvement (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5j)	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
		attributable to the project,				
C. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5k (Park/Lincoln): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, the City shall fund a fairshare to optimize signal timing during the p.m. peak hour.	Park and Lincoln	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvement (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5k) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5l (Jackson/Sixth): The City of Alameda shall implement TDM (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a).	Jackson/Sixth	Project applicant shall implement TDM program.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall require implementation of TDM program	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5m (Webster/Eighth): The City of Alameda shall implement TDM (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a).	Webster Street and Eight Street	Project applicant shall implement TDM program.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall require implementation of TDM program	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5n (Broadway/Fifth): The City of Alameda shall implement TDM (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a).	Broadway and Fifth Street	Project applicant shall implement TDM program and City shall adopt a.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall require implementation of TDM program.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5o (Brush/12th): The City of Alameda shall implement TDM (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a).	Brush and 12th Street	Project applicant shall implement TDM program.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda City of Alameda Community Development Department shall require implementation of TDM program.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5p (High/Oakport): The City of Alameda shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and work with the City of Oakland to optimize the signal timing to allow for more green time for northbound traffic.	High and Oakport	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvement (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5p) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
C. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5q (High/Coliseum): The City of Alameda shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and work with the City of Oakland to optimize the signal timing.	High and Coliseum	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvement (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5q) attributable to the project.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5r (29th/Ford): The City of Alameda shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b).	29th/Ford	Project applicant shall implement TDM program.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall require implementation of TDM program.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5s (23rd Ave./Seventh St.): The City of Alameda shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and work with the City of Oakland to modify the northbound to provide a separate left – turn lane and a shared through-right-turn lane, and optimize the signal.	23rd Avenue and Seventh Street	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvement (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5s) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5t (Main/Pacific Pedestrian): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fairshare contribution to change signal timing to two-phase timing plan (i.e., northbound and southbound move concurrently; then eastbound and westbound move concurrently) and optimize cycle length.	Main/Pacific	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvements (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5t) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5u (**Webster/Appezzato Pedestrian):** The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to optimize signal timing.	Webster/ Appezzato	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvement (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5u) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
C. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5v (High/Fernside Pedestrian): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and Mitigation Measure 4.C-5e (optimize signal timing during the p.m. peak hour).	High/ Fernside	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a, 4.C-2b, and 4.C-5e,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5w (**Appezzato/Constitution Pedestrian):** The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvements: • Modify phasing sequence; and • Optimize the signal timing.	Appezzato/ Constitution	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvements (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5w) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5x (Park Street Transit): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvements: • Provide transit signal priority at intersections along this corridor; and • Optimize splits at the Park Street and Blanding Avenue intersection during a.m. and p.m. peak hours.	Park Street Transit	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvements (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5x) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
C. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5y (Appezzato Parkway Transit): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the following improvements: • Install transit signal priority at intersections along this corridor; • Optimize cycle length at the Appezzato Parkway and Webster Street intersection during a.m. and p.m. peak hours and provide signal priority; and • Establish exclusive transit lanes or queue jump lanes from Alameda Point to Webster Street.	Appezzato Parkway Transit	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvements (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5y) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5z (Stargell Avenue Transit): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, implement the following improvements: • Provide westbound queue jump lanes on Willie Stargell Avenue at Main Street or construct exclusive transit lanes on Willie Stargell Avenue; • Install transit signal priority at intersections along this corridor; and • Optimize cycle length at the Main Street and Willie Stargell Avenue intersection during a.m. and p.m. peak hours.	Stargell Avenue Transit	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvements (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5z) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5zi (Stargell Avenue Bike): The City shall implement Mitigation Measure 4.C-2m (Stargell Avenue bike path).	Stargell Avenue Bike	See Mitigation Measure 4.C-2m, above.				
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5zii: The City shall implement Mitigation Measure 4.C-2n (Main Street bicycle improvements).	Main Street Bike	See Mitigation Measure 4.C-2n, above.				
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5ziii (Central Avenue Bike): The City shall implement Mitigation Measure 4.C-2o (Central Avenue bicycle improvements).	Central Avenue Bike	See Mitigation Measure 4.C-2o, above.				

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
C. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.C-5ziv (Oak Street Bike): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, fund a fair share contribution to implement the completion of a bicycle boulevard with appropriate signage and striping along Oak Street from Blanding Avenue to Encinal Avenue to advise motorists and bicyclists to share the street.	Oak Street Bike	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and fund a fair-share of the portion of the cost of the improvements (as stated in Mitigation Measure 4.C-5ziv) attributable to the project,	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and collection of fair-share of funds	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.C-9 (Chinatown Pedestrians): The City of Alameda shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b) and shall continue to work with the City of Oakland, the ACTC, and Caltrans, to evaluate and implement measures to reduce or divert the volume of traffic that travels through Oakland Chinatown to and from Alameda Point and other City of Alameda destinations.	Chinatown	City of Alameda shall require Project applicant to implement Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and 4.C-2b, and coordinate with the City of Oakland, the ACTC, and Caltrans to evaluate and then implement measures that reduce/divert volume of traffic that travels through Oakland Chinatown to and from Alameda Point and other City of Alameda destinations.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall monitor to ensure implementation of TDM Program, Monitoring, and continue coordination with the City of Oakland, the ACTC, and Caltrans.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources						
Mitigation Measure 4.D-1a (Historic Preservation Ordinance): The City shall implement the requirements of the Historic Preservation Ordinance, which requires a certificate of approval by the HAB for modifications to contributors and resources within the Historic District. As part of the certificate of approval process, project sponsors shall provide: 1) An analysis of the proposal's conformity with the *Guide to Preserving the Character of the Naval Air Station Alameda Historic District* as adopted and amended by the City Council; 2) An analysis of the proposal's conformity with general	NAS Alameda Historic District	Project applicant shall conduct analyses listed to comply with the Historic Preservation Ordinance.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda's Historical Advisory Board (HAB) shall verify completion of analyses.	During the certificate of approval process	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
management and design guidelines contained within the NAS Alameda Cultural Landscape Report (JRP, 2012), including						
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)						
application of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes*. These include special treatments organized by functional area for such topics as spatial organization, topography, vegetation, views and vistas, circulation, as well as structures, furnishings and objects; and 3) An analysis of impacts to the integrity of the Historic District, as a whole, and an analysis of alternatives to avoid potential impacts on the Historic District as a whole, and on an individual resource						
Mitigation Measure 4.D-1b (Guidelines): Prior to approval of new buildings within the NAS Alameda Historic District, the City shall complete and adopt Guidelines for New Infill Development within the Historic District. All new building will be reviewed for conformance with the guidelines.	NAS Alameda Historic District	City shall complete and adopt Guidelines for New Infill Development Project applicant shall conform to the City's adopted Guidelines	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Review new buildings for conformance with Guidelines	Prior to approval of new buildings within the NAS Alameda Historic District	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.D-1c (Removal Mitigation Plans): As a condition of approval for demolition or removal of a contributor to the Historic District, the City shall require that the project applicant: 1) Document any Historic District contributor contemplated for demolition under the proposed project in accordance with the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II documentation standards of the National Park Service[9] including the following: 1. *Photographs*. Large-format (4 x 5-inch negatives or greater), black and white photographs will be taken of all elevations of the building(s), plus limited context and detail shots. A limited number of historical photos of buildings, where available, should also be photographically reproduced. All photographs should be printed on acid-free archival bond paper on 8 x 10 enlargements. Digital photography may be substituted for large-format photographs where necessary. 2. *Written History*. Prepare a written history of the resource using the HABS standard outline format. Building-specific historical and architectural information from the National Register Nominations and prior inventories and technical reports can be utilized for this effort. If available, reproduce original building drawings on mylar or through photographic means. 3. *Archiving*. The completed HABS documentation package (photos, report, and drawings) shall be archived at the City of Alameda, the City of Alameda Public Library, the Alameda Naval Air Station Museum, and the Northwest Information Center of Sonoma State University. 2) Prepare and implement a public interpretation plan to describe and convey the historic significance of the NAS Alameda Historic District or resource to the general public. The plan will contain recommendations for the location and design of interpretive elements, such as plaques, markers, exhibits, expansion of the existing Alameda Point self-guided tour,[10]	NAS Alameda Historic District	Project applicant shall document any Historic District contributor in accordance with HABS Level II standards by including large-format photographs of buildings, preparing a written history of the resource, and archiving documentation package as outlined in Measure 4.D-1c. Project applicant shall prepare and implement a public interpretation plan to convey historic significance of the NAS Alameda Historic District to the public. Project applicant shall prepare and implement architectural salvage plan.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Verify completion of documentation and preparation of plans for submittal to the National Park Service.	Prior to approval of demolition or removal of a contributor to the Historic District.	

[9] It shall be noted that pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(b)(2), "In some circumstances, documentation of an historical resource, by way of historic narrative, photographs or architectural drawings, as mitigation for the effects of demolition of the resource will not mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur."

[10] http://www.alameda-point.com/resources/pdf/self-guided-tour-map.pdf

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
and/or other methods for interpreting the history of the former NAS Alameda. Information generated from the HABS documentation effort, described above, as well as historical information from the National Register Nomination and other technical background reports may be utilized. The interpretive plan will be designed by a professional architectural historian meeting the qualifications of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. 3) Prepare and implement an architectural salvage plan for any Historic District contributor contemplated for demolition under the proposed project. The plan will identify architectural components that are worthy of salvage and reuse either as part of the design of the replacement structures, or elsewhere on the project site. The salvage plan will be prepared by a professional architectural historian meeting the qualifications of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.						
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.D-2 (Archaeological Resources): If cultural resources are encountered, all activity within 100 feet of the find shall halt until it can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American representative. Prehistoric archaeological materials might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil ("midden") containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-era materials might include stone, concrete, or adobe footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. If the archaeologist and Native American representative determine that the resources may be significant, they shall notify the City of Alameda and shall develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. The archaeologist shall consult with Native American monitors or other appropriate Native American representatives in determining appropriate treatment for unearthed cultural resources if the resources are prehistoric or Native American in nature. In considering any suggested measures proposed by the archaeologist and Native American representative in order to mitigate impacts to cultural resources, the project applicant shall determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, project design, costs, and	All sites	Project applicant and its contractor(s) shall halt work and notify archaeologist and Native American representative if materials are discovered. Archaeologist and Native American representative shall conduct independent review and prepare treatment plan, if necessary. Project applicant or its contractor(s) shall implement treatment plan and mitigate impacts pursuant to CEQA Guidelines.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	If resources are encountered, verify work is suspended and review and approve the treatment and monitoring plan if archaeological materials are discovered	If resources encountered, review of treatment and monitoring plan prior to continuation of construction	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
other considerations. If avoidance is infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) shall be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the project area while mitigation for cultural resources is being carried out. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(b), *Mitigation Measures Related to Impacts on Historical Resources*, the City of Alameda will, whenever feasible, seek to avoid damaging effects on any historical resource of an archaeological nature. The following factors shall be considered for a project involving an archaeological site: A. Preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to archaeological sites. Preservation in place maintains the relationship between artifacts and the archaeological context. Preservation may also avoid conflict with religious or cultural values of groups associated with the site.						
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)						
B. Preservation in place may be accomplished by, but is not limited to, the following: 1. Planning construction to avoid archaeological sites; 2. Incorporation of sites within parks, greenspace, or other open space; 3. Covering the archaeological sites with a layer of chemically stable soil before building tennis courts, parking lots, or similar facilities on the site. 4. Deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement. C. When data recovery through excavation is the only feasible mitigation, a data recovery plan, which makes provisions for adequately recovering the scientifically consequential information from and about the historical resource, shall be prepared and adopted prior to any excavation being undertaken. Such studies shall be deposited with the California Historical Resources Regional Information Center. Archeological sites known to contain human remains shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 7050.5 Health and Safety Code. If an artifact must be removed during project excavation or testing, curation may be an appropriate mitigation. D. Data recovery shall not be required for an historical resource if						

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
the lead agency determines that testing or studies already completed have adequately recovered the scientifically consequential information from and about the archaeological or historical resource, provided that the determination is documented in the EIR and that the studies are deposited with the California Historical Resources Regional Information Center.						
Mitigation Measure 4.D-3 (Paleontological Resources): If paleontological resources, such as fossilized bone, teeth, shell, tracks, trails, casts, molds, or impressions are discovered during ground-disturbing construction activities, all such activities within 100 feet of the find shall be halted until a qualified paleontologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate salvage measures in consultation with the City of Alameda and in conformance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology Guidelines (SVP, 1995; SVP, 1996).	All sites	Project applicant and its contractor(s) shall halt construction within 100 feet of paleontological resources Project applicant shall retain a paleontologist to assess significance of resources and develop salvage measures, if necessary	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Consult paleontologist in development of appropriate salvage measures for any paleontological resources found	If resources encountered, review of treatment and monitoring plan prior to continuation of construction	
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.D-3 (cont.)		Project applicant shall incorporate measures upon continuation of construction				
Mitigation Measure 4.D-4 (Human Remains): In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during construction activities, such activities within 100 feet of the find shall cease. The Alameda County Coroner shall be contacted immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, and no investigation of the cause of death is required, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) will be contacted within 24 hours. The NAHC will identify and contact the person or persons it believes to be the “most likely descendant (MLD)” of the deceased Native American, who in turn would make recommendations for the appropriate means of treating the human remains and any grave goods.	All sites	Project applicant and its contractor(s) shall halt work and notify coroner and City of Alameda Community Development Department if remains are discovered NAHC shall assign most likely descendant Project applicant and its contractor(s) shall hire archaeologist and cease work if site is a Native American Cemetery	City of Alameda Community Development Department; NAHC; County Coroner	Contact City, NAHC, or County Coroner if human remains are encountered	Ongoing	
Mitigation Measure 4.D-5: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.D-1.	See Mitigation Measure 4.D-1.					
Mitigation Measure 4.D-6: Implement Mitigation Measures 4.D-2, -3, and -4.	See Mitigation Measures 4.D-2, 4.D-3, and 4.D-4.					

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
E. Biological Resources						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-1a (Sound Attenuation Monitoring Plan): Prior to the start of marina or ferry terminal construction, the City shall require a NMFS-approved sound attenuation monitoring plan to protect fish and marine mammals, if pile driving is planned for the Seaplane Lagoon. This plan shall provide detail on the sound attenuation system, detail methods used to monitor and verify sound levels during pile driving activities, and describe management practices to be taken to reduce impact hammer pile-driving sound in the marine environment to an intensity level of less than 183 dB. The sound monitoring results shall be made available to the NMFS. The plan shall incorporate, but not be limited, to the following best management practices (BMPs): • To the extent feasible, all pilings shall be installed and removed with vibratory pile drivers only. Vibratory pile driving will be conducted following the Corps' "*Proposed Procedures for Permitting Projects that will Not Adversely*	Marina and the proposed ferry terminal	Project applicant shall create a NMFS-approved sound attenuation monitoring plan. Project applicant shall implement plan and record monitoring results.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Verify completion of plan and monitor throughout construction. Ensure that monitoring results get submitted to NMFS.	Prior to start of marina or ferry terminal construction	
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
Affect Selected Listed Species in California". USFWS and NOAA completed Section 7 consultation on this document, which establishes general procedures for minimizing impacts to natural resources associated with projects in or adjacent to jurisdictional waters. • An impact pile driver may only be used where necessary to complete installation of larger steel pilings in accordance with seismic safety or other engineering criteria • The hammer shall be cushioned using a 12-inch thick wood cushion block during all impact hammer pile driving operations • All piling installation using impact hammers shall be conducted between June 1 and November 30, when the likelihood of sensitive fish species being present in the work area is minimal • If pile installation using impact hammers must occur at times other than the approved work window, the project applicant shall obtain incidental take authorization from NMFS and CDFW, as necessary, to address potential impacts on steelhead trout, chinook salmon, and Pacific						

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
herring and implement all requested actions to avoid impacts • The project applicant shall monitor and verify sound levels during pile driving activities. The sound monitoring results will be made available to NMFS and the City • In the event that exceedance of noise thresholds established and approved by NMFS occurs, a contingency plan involving the use of bubble curtains or air barrier shall be implemented to attenuate sound levels to below thresholds						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-1b (NMFS and CDFW Consultation): During the project permitting phase, the City will ensure that any projects requiring in-water work include consultation with NMFS to determine if the work can be covered under one of the programmatic consultations for federally listed species described above or if a project-level BO would be required and whether an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) for marine mammals would be needed for dredging or pile driving activities. The project applicant shall also consult	Marina and the proposed ferry terminal	Project applicant shall consult with NMFS if project requires in-water work. Project applicant shall consult with CDFW regarding potential need for an ITP	City of Alameda Community Development Department; NMFS; CDFW	Confirm consultation with NMFS and CDFW.	During the project permitting phase, prior to construction.	
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
with CDFW regarding State special-status fish and the potential need for an incidental take permit (ITP). The project applicant shall submit to the City copies of any IHA and/or ITP received or, alternatively, copies of correspondence confirming that an IHA and/or ITP is not required for the project in question.		Project applicant shall submit copies of any IHA and/or ITP to the City or confirm that they are not required.				
Mitigation Measure 4.E-1c (Additional Noise Attenuation Measures): As part of the NMFS-approved sound attenuation monitoring plan required for pile driving in the Seaplane Lagoon in Mitigation Measure 4.E-1a, the City shall ensure that the project applicant implements the following actions in addition to those listed in Mitigation Measure 4.E-1a to reduce the effect of underwater noise transmission on marine mammals. These actions shall include at a minimum: • Establishment of a 1,600-foot (500-meter) safety zone that shall be maintained around the sound source, for the protection of marine mammals in the event that sound levels are unknown or cannot be adequately predicted • Work activities shall be halted when a marine mammal enters the 1,600-feet (500-meter) safety zone and resume only after the animal has been gone from the area for a	Marina and the proposed ferry terminal	Project applicant shall implement the listed actions to reduce the effects of underwater noise transmission. Project applicant shall hire a NMFS-approved biological monitor to conduct daily surveys.	City of Alameda Community Development Department, NMFS	NMFS will review and the sound attenuation monitoring plan and approve the biological monitor that would conduct daily surveys before and during impact hammer pile driving work. City will ensure implementation of the listed actions and daily surveys described in Measure 4.E-1c along with those listed in Measure 4.E-1a.	Prior to construction	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
minimum of 15 minutes • A "soft start" technique shall be employed in all pile driving to marine mammals an opportunity to vacate the area • Maintain sound levels below 90 dBA in air when pinnipeds (seals and sea lions) are present • A NMFS-approved biological monitor will conduct daily surveys before and during impact hammer pile driving to inspect the work zone and adjacent Bay waters for marine mammals. The monitor will be present as specified by NMFS during the impact pile-driving phases of construction						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-1d (Dock Lighting): Prior to occupancy, the City shall ensure that the project applicant installs dock lighting on all floating docks that minimizes artificial lighting of Bay waters by using shielded, low-mounted, and low light-intensity fixtures and bulbs.	Marina and the proposed ferry terminal docks	Project applicant shall include dock lighting measures in construction plans and specifications.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Review construction plans and specifications to ensure it includes dock lighting requirements. Inspect light fixtures to ensure lighting meets requirements stated in Measure 4.E-1d.	Prior to construction and after construction.	
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-1e (Northwest Territories Sensitive Resources Measures): Prior to opening the proposed regional park in the Northwest Territories and the proposed Bay Trail in the Northwest Territories and on the Federal Property, the City shall ensure that measures are taken to identify sensitive resources in these areas and to restrict access of humans and dogs to those resources. Measures to be implemented could include, but are not limited to, the following: • Surveys conducted by a qualified biologist to identify sensitive resources locations throughout the City's portion of the Northwest Territories and on the Federal Property along the proposed Bay trail alignment • Additional seasonal access restrictions, as appropriate • Educational signage and brochures regarding sensitive resources and the need to avoid them • Fencing trails where they run proximate to sensitive biological resources (e.g. wetlands, known breeding grounds) • On-leash restrictions on dogs throughout or prohibition of	Northwest Territories and recreational trails	Project applicant shall take measures to identify sensitive resources and restrict access of humans and dogs to those areas. Project applicant shall obtain a qualified biologist to conduct surveys and incorporate restrictions based on survey results.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Review construction specifications to ensure inclusion of measures to restrict access to sensitive resources.	Prior to opening of park and Bay Trail.	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
dogs altogether in certain areas based on the results of the sensitive resources surveys (e.g., on the Bay Trail in the Federal Property)						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-1f: (Bat Pre-Construction Survey) Potential direct and indirect disturbances to bats shall be identified by locating colonies, and instituting protective measures prior to construction. No more than two weeks in advance of tree removal, demolition of buildings onsite, or initiation of construction within 100 feet of trees or structures providing potential bat roosting sites, a qualified bat biologist (e.g., a biologist holding a CDFW collection permit and a Memorandum of Understanding with CDFW allowing the biologist to handle and collect bats) shall conduct pre-construction surveys for bat roosts. No activities that could disturb active roosts shall proceed prior to the completed surveys.	Building demolition and tree removal sites	Project applicant will obtain a qualified biologist to conduct pre-construction surveys for bat roosts. Qualified biologist will conduct pre-construction bat surveys two weeks prior to tree removal and building demolition work and shall develop protective measures.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Review construction specifications to ensure inclusion of protective measures for active bat roosts. Monitor to ensure completion of pre-construction survey.	Prior to issuance of demolition or tree removal permit	
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-1g: (Bat Maternity Colony Measures) If a maternity colony is located within the project site during pre-construction surveys, the project shall be redesigned to avoid impacts if feasible, and a no-disturbance buffer acceptable in size to the CDFW shall be created around the roost. Bat roosts (maternity or otherwise).	Building removal and tree removal areas	Project applicant and its contractor(s) shall incorporate measures in the construction specifications to reduce impacts to maternity colonies.	City of Alameda Community Development Department; CDFW	Monitor to ensure adequate measures are taken to avoid impacts to maternity colonies.	Prior to issuance of demolition or tree removal permit	
initiated during construction are generally presumed to be unaffected by increased noise, vibration, or human activity, and no buffer is necessary as long as roost sites are not directly altered or destroyed. However, the “take” of individuals is still prohibited at any time. • If there is a maternity colony present and the project cannot be redesigned to avoid removal of the tree or structure inhabited by the bats, demolition of that tree or structure shall not commence until after young are flying (i.e., after July 31, confirmed by a qualified bat biologist) or before maternity colonies form the following year (i.e., prior to March 1). • If a non-maternity roost must be removed as part of the project, the non-maternity roost shall be evicted prior to building/tree removal by a qualified biologist, using methods such as making holes in the roost to alter the air-flow or creating one-way funnel exits for the bats.		During pre-construction surveys, Project applicant and/or its contractor(s) will redesign the project if maternity colony is located within the project site.				

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
• If significant (e.g., maternity roosts or large non-maternity roost sites) bat roosting habitat is destroyed during building/tree removal, artificial bat roosts shall be constructed in an undisturbed area in the project site vicinity away from human activity and at least 200 feet from project demolition/construction activities. The design and location of the artificial bat roost(s) shall be determined by a qualified bat biologist.						
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-1h: (Monarch Butterflies) The City shall ensure that the project applicant for development facilitated by the proposed project protects active autumnal/overwintering roost sites used by monarch butterflies by conducting construction activities in and around identified butterfly autumnal roost/overwintering sites outside of the autumnal migratory/overwintering season (October to March), to the greatest extent feasible, to avoid potential impacts on monarch butterfly. • The project applicant shall retain a biologist familiar with monarch butterfly life history and habitat requirements to conduct surveys for active monarch butterfly roost sites anywhere groves (greater than 3 trees planted together) of mature conifers (e.g. Italian stone pine, Monterey cypress) and/or eucalyptus occur in the Main Street Neighborhood	Groves of Mature Conifers and Eucalyptus Trees in Main Street Neighborhood Sub-Area	The Project applicant shall retain a biologist to conduct surveys for active monarch butterfly roost sites. Project applicant shall protect active autumnal/ overwintering roost sites used by monarch butterflies. Project applicant will incorporate listed measures to avoid potential impacts on monarch butterflies.	City of Alameda Community Development Department; CDFW	Review specifications to ensure inclusion of protective measures for active autumnal/ overwintering roost sites used by monarch butterflies. During construction, monitor to ensure implementation of avoidance measures are implemented. If avoidance is not feasible, ensure that additional measures (described in Measure 4.E-1h) are implemented.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) Ongoing during construction	
Sub-area and in open space to the south of Main Street as it skirts the northern edge of the project area between November and January and prior to start of construction. • All active roost sites encountered during the survey shall be identified and mapped for future reference. The previously active roost site identified in 2002 shall be considered active until proven otherwise. Active sites shall be monitored annually to inform future development. Once identified, such sites shall be considered active until such time as monarchs have not returned to the site for a period of ten years. Once ten years have passed with no significant butterfly use (as						

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
determined by the qualified biologist) of a site the restrictions below would no longer apply. • No tree removal shall be conducted at any time in or around active roost sites to the extent that such removal would: a) result in the loss of an active roost tree; b) result in changes to the amount of wind affecting an active roost; or c) result in changes of the thermal environment surrounding an active roost tree. If active roost sites are identified and it is not feasible to avoid the overwintering season and construction activities take place during this time (October through March), the following measures shall apply: • Mapped autumnal roost/overwintering roosts within 100 feet of construction areas shall be surveyed not more than two weeks prior to construction to determine whether they are actively being used by butterflies. • If a mapped autumnal roost/overwintering site is supporting butterflies, work activities shall be delayed within 100 feet of the site location until avoidance measures have been implemented. Appropriate avoidance measures shall include the following measures (which may be modified as a result of consultation with CDFW to provide equally effective measures): - If the qualified wildlife biologist determines that construction activities shall not affect an active autumnal roost/overwintering site, activities may proceed without restriction.						
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
- A no-disturbance buffer may be established around the autumnal roost/overwintering site to avoid disturbance or destruction until butterflies resume their migration. - The extent of the no-disturbance buffers is typically 100 feet but shall be determined by a qualified wildlife biologist in consultation with the CDFW.						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-2a: (Native Oysters and Eelgrass) Prior to marina or ferry terminal construction, the City shall ensure that the project applicant conducts a pre-construction survey to determine if native oysters and eelgrass are present in Seaplane Lagoon.	Marina and Ferry Terminal in Seaplane Lagoon	Project applicant shall conduct pre-construction survey for oysters and eelgrass.	City of Alameda Community Development Department, NMFS	City will ensure completion of pre-construction survey. NMFS will provide guidance if project applicant finds	Prior to construction	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
• The eelgrass survey shall be conducted according to the methods contained in the California Draft Eelgrass Mitigation Policy (CDEMP) (NMFS 2011), with the exception that the survey shall be conducted with 120 days (rather than 60 days, as recommended in the CDEMP) prior to the desired construction start date, to allow sufficient time for modification of project plans (if feasible) and agency consultation. • If found within or immediately adjacent to the construction footprint, the project applicant shall first determine whether avoidance of the beds is feasible. If feasible, impacts to the oyster or eelgrass bed shall be avoided. If complete avoidance is not feasible, the applicant shall request guidance from the National Marine Fisheries Service (or other applicable agency) as to the need and/or feasibility to move affected beds. Any translocation of eelgrass beds shall be conducted consistent with the methods described in the CDEMP and/or those described in Eelgrass Conservation in San Francisco Bay: Opportunities and Constraints (Boyer and Wyllie-Echeverria, 2010). Translocation of oyster beds shall be consistent with methods and recommendations presented in Shellfish Conservation and Restoration in San Francisco Bay: Opportunities and Constraints (Zabin et al., 2010) • If it is not possible to translocate oyster or eelgrass beds then the City shall ensure that the project applicant provides compensatory mitigation consistent with the CDEMP for eelgrass (a ratio of 3.01:1 [transplant area to impact area]) and a minimum 1:1 ratio for oyster beds. • The relocation of compensatory mitigation site for eelgrass or oyster beds shall be located within San Francisco Bay.		If eelgrass is found within or immediately adjacent to construction footprint, project applicant will contact NMFS. Project applicant will abide by NMFS' guidance and ensure that any translocation of eelgrass beds are conducted consistent with those in the Eelgrass Conservation in San Francisco Bay: Opportunities and Constraints (Boyer and Wyllie-Echeverria, 2010). Project applicant will provide compensatory mitigation if translocation of oyster or eelgrass beds is not possible.		eelgrass within the construction footprint. City will ensure implementation of other measures identified in Measure 4.E-2a.		
Mitigation Measure 4.E-2b: (Boater Education) Prior to occupancy the City shall ensure that the marina project applicant prepares educational information regarding sensitive biological resources at Alameda Point, the adjacent Federal Property, and within Bay waters. This information shall be disseminated to all boaters using the marina and shall include, but not be limited to, information educating boat owner/operators about sensitive habitats and species in the Bay and actions they are required to implement to avoid impacts to marine resources.	Marina	Project applicant shall prepare educational information and disseminate to all boaters using the marina and solicit input from NMFS, USCG, California State Lands Commission, NPS, CDPR, BCDC, and other local organizations.	City of Alameda Community Development Department; NMFS; USCG; NPS; CDPR; DCDC and local organizations active in protecting Bay marine resources	Ensure preparation and dispersal of educational materials.	Prior to and during occupancy	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
The educational information will be disseminated to visiting boaters through multiple methods including, but not limited to, brochures or pamphlets; marina and/or City websites; boating, cruising, and newspaper periodicals; and social media. The information shall be prepared soliciting input from, and in cooperation with, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), United States Coast Guard (USCG), California State Lands Commission, National Park Service (NPS), California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR), Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), and local organizations active in protecting Bay marine resources, as appropriate. Educational information shall clearly address in multiple languages, but not be limited to, the following topics: • Information on the location of eelgrass beds in the vicinity of Alameda Island, as well as the greater central Bay and the importance of protecting and avoiding these sensitive habitats (e.g., by not anchoring in or boating through them) • Marinas and safe anchoring locations in the Bay where boaters may dock or anchor their vessels • Common sources of pollution from boats and marinas and outline relevant regulations and clean boating policies • Information on proper and legal waste handling in the Bay and facilities for onshore disposal • Information on invasive species and their impact on Bay marine ecosystems and preventative steps that boaters should take to prevent the introduction or spread of invasive						

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
species into the Bay • Federal and state regulations prohibiting the harassment of marine mammals • Information on the watercraft exclusion zones and no wake zones in effect for the waters off Alameda Island and any other buffer zones established in other Bay locations to protect sensitive biological resources (e.g., Breakwater Island, other bird nesting sites, harbor seal haul outs) • Information about onsite and nearby environmental services that support clean boating practices (such as the locations						
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
of sewage pumpouts, oil change facilities, used oil recycling centers, bilge pumpouts, absorbent pad distribution and spent pad collection, and boat-to-boat environmental services) • Information regarding the importance of keeping plastic and other trash out of Bay waters • Signage regarding locations of waste collection containers posted at the marina						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-2c: (Invasive Species Control Plan) The City shall require that the project applicant develop and implement a Marine Invasive Species Control Plan prior to commencement of any in-water work including, but not limited to, construction of piers and seawalls, dredging, pile driving, and construction of new stormwater outfalls. The plan shall be prepared in consultation with the United States Coast Guard (USCG), RWQCB, and other relevant state agencies. Provisions of the plan shall include but not be limited to the following: • Environmental training of construction personnel involved in in-water work • Actions to be taken to prevent the release and spread of marine invasive species, especially algal species such as *Undaria* and *Sargasso* • Procedures for the safe removal and disposal of any invasive taxa observed on the removed structures prior to disposal or reuse of pilings, docks, wave attenuators, and	In-water construction for piers and seawalls, dredging, pile driving, and stormwater outfalls.	Project applicant shall develop and implement a Marine invasive Species Control Plan during construction of in-water work. Project applicant will prepare a post-construction report and submit to the City, USCG, and RWQCB.	City of Alameda Community Development; USCG; RWQCB and other relevant state agencies	Review and approve Marine Invasive Species Control Plan. Ensure the provisions of the approved plan are implemented, including preparation of a post-construction.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) and during construction	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
other features • The onsite presence of qualified marine biologists to assist the contractor in the identification and proper handling of any invasive species on removed Port equipment or materials • A post-construction report identifying which, if any, invasive species were discovered attached to equipment and materials following removal from the water, and describing the treatment/handling of identified invasive species. Reports shall be submitted to the City, as well as the USCG and the RWQCB if requested by the agencies.						
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-3a: (Wetlands) Prior to issuance of final grading or building permits that include work within or in the vicinity of jurisdictional waters, the City shall confirm that the project applicant has obtained all necessary wetland permits and shall further ensure that the project applicant implements measures to avoid or minimize adverse effects on jurisdictional waters and sensitive natural communities. Specifically: • The existing wetlands in the Northwest Territories shall be preserved and incorporated into compatible open space uses to the maximum extent feasible. • Wetlands to be avoided shall be protected by setbacks throughout project construction. Based on recommendations in the *Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals* (Goals Project, 1999) a minimum 300-foot wetland buffer shall be incorporated into project design wherever possible to protect water quality and the wildlife that use the wetlands. Where existing uses preclude the establishment of a 300 foot or larger buffer-, the largest buffer possible shall be established. Buffer width should be determined by considering the quality of the wetlands, actual or potential wildlife use, existing and proposed future uses, amount and type of vegetation within the buffer, and angle and direction of slope in proximity to the wetland (McElfish et al. 2008). Open space uses shall incorporate these buffers in the siting of recreational trails and development of facilities to ensure the wetlands and the wildlife that use them are adequately buffered from recreational uses.	Proposed activities within or in the vicinity of jurisdictional waters in Northwest Territories, Runway Wetlands and West Wetlands areas	Project applicant shall obtain all necessary wetland permits. Project applicant shall implement measures to avoid or minimize adverse effects on jurisdictional waters and sensitive natural communities. Project applicant will implement measures to avoid or minimize adverse effects on jurisdictional waters and sensitive natural communities as identified in Mitigation Measure 4.E-3a.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Confirm all necessary wetland permits have been obtained. Ensure implementation of measures to avoid sensitive natural communities.	Prior to issuance of final grading or building permit(s) and during construction.	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
• During project construction, areas to be avoided and provided with setbacks pursuant to the provisions described above shall be further protected by best management practices (BMPs), as described in Mitigation Measure 4.E-3b, below. Such measures shall include the installation of silt fencing, straw wattles, or other appropriate erosion and sediment control methods or devices along roads and at the 100-foot setback limits. To minimize impacts on wetlands and other waters, equipment such as backhoes and cranes used for installation of rip-rap or other shore stabilization measures along the Bay shoreline shall operate from dry land where possible. Any construction operations within Bay waters shall be barge-mounted or use other water-based equipment such as scows, derrick barges, and tugs.						
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-3b: (BMPs for Wetlands) Standard BMPs shall be employed to avoid degradation of aquatic habitat and wetlands by maintaining water quality and controlling erosion and sedimentation during construction as required by compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Construction Activities (see also Section 4.H, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of this EIR, which addresses impacts on water quality). BMPs shall include, but not be limited to, the following: (1) installing silt fencing between wetlands and aquatic habitat and construction-related activities, (2) locating fueling stations away from potentially jurisdictional features, and (3) otherwise isolating construction work areas from any identified jurisdictional features. In addition, BMPs to avoid impacts on water quality resulting from dredging or other activities within open waters that are identified in the *Long-term Management Strategy for the Placement of Dredged Material in the San Francisco Bay Region* (LTMS) (Corps, 2001) shall be implemented. These BMPs include silt fencing and gunderbooms or other appropriate methods for keeping dredged materials or other sediments from leaving a project site.	Proposed activities within or in the vicinity of jurisdictional waters in Northwest Territories, Runway Wetlands and West Wetlands areas	Project applicant shall comply with the NPDES General Permit for Construction through implementation of BMPs described in Mitigation Measure 4.E-3b.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Ensure that Project applicant implements applicable BMPs and complies with NPDES General Permit.	During construction	
Mitigation Measure 4.E-3c: (Wetland Mitigation and Monitoring Plan) Where disturbance to jurisdictional waters cannot be avoided, compensation shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio for temporary impacts and permanent loss. Actual compensatory mitigation ratios will be specified in project permits issued by the Corps, RWQCB, and BCDC. Where	Proposed activities within or in the vicinity of jurisdictional waters in	Project applicant shall develop a mitigation plan to compensate disturbance to jurisdictional waters at a minimum 1:1 ratio by either (1) developing an onsite	City of Alameda Community Development Department; Corps; RWQCB; BCDC	Review of construction specifications to ensure it includes wetland replaced or restored at a minimum 1:1 ratio for temporary and permanent loss.	Prior to issuance of grading permit	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
applicable, compensation shall be detailed on a project-specific basis and shall include development of an onsite wetland mitigation and monitoring plan, which shall be developed prior to the start of the first phase of development or in coordination with permit applications and/or conditions. Alternatively, off-site mitigation may be pursued through an approved mitigation bank, although this option may result in a higher mitigation ratio. At a minimum, such plans shall include: • Baseline information, including a summary of findings for the most recent wetland delineation applicable to the project site; • Anticipated habitat enhancements to be achieved through compensatory actions, including mitigation site location (onsite enhancement or offsite habitat creation) and hydrology;	Northwest Territories, Runway Wetlands and West Wetlands areas	wetland mitigation monitoring plan or (2) pursue off-site mitigation options. Ensure that mitigation plan incorporates items described in Measure 4.E-3c.		Review compensation plan to ensure incorporation of items described in Mitigation Measure 4.E-3c.		
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
• Performance and success criteria for wetland creation or enhancement including, but not limited to, the following[11]: - At least 70 percent survival of installed plants for each of the first three years following planting. - Performance criteria for vegetation percent cover in Years 1-4 as follows: at least 10 percent cover of installed plants in Year 1; at least 20 percent cover in Year 2; at least 30 percent cover in Year 3; at least 40 percent cover in Year 4. - Performance criteria for hydrology in Years 1-5 as follows: Fourteen or more consecutive days of flooding, ponding, or a water table 12 inches or less below the soil surface during the growing season at a minimum frequency of three of the five monitoring years; OR establishment of a prevalence of wetland obligate plant species. - Invasive plant species that threaten the success of created or enhanced wetlands should not contribute relative cover greater than 35 percent in Year 1, 20 percent in Years 2 and 3, 15 percent in Year 4, and 10 percent in Year 5. - If necessary, supplemental water shall be provided by a water truck for the first two years following installation. Any supplemental water must be removed or turned off for a						

[11] Vegetation-related criteria listed here apply only mitigation required for impacts to vegetated wetlands and would not be required for mitigation required for impacts to unvegetated wetlands.

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
minimum of two consecutive years prior to the end of the monitoring period, and the wetland must meet all other criteria during this period. At the end of the five-year monitoring period, the wetland must be self-sufficient and capable of persistence without supplemental water. - At least 75 percent cover by hydrophytic vegetation at the end of the five-year monitoring period. In addition, wetland hydrology and hydric soils must be present and defined as follows: ▪ *Hydrophytic vegetation* – A plant community occurring in areas where the frequency and duration of inundation or soil saturation produce permanently or periodically saturated soils of sufficient duration to exert a controlling influence on the plant species present.						
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
▪ *Wetland hydrology* – Identified by indicators such as sediment deposits, water stains on vegetation, and oxidized rhizospheres along living roots in the upper 12 inches of the soil, or satisfaction of the hydrology performance criteria listed above. ▪ *Hydric soils* – Soils that are saturated, flooded, or ponded long enough during the growing season to develop anaerobic conditions, which are often characterized by features such as redox concentrations, which form by the reduction, translocation, and/or oxidation of iron and manganese oxides. Hydric soils may lack hydric indicators for a number of reasons. In such cases, the same standard used to determine wetland hydrology when indicators are lacking can be used. - Five years after any wetland creation, a wetland delineation shall be performed to determine whether created wetlands are developing according to the success criteria outlined in the project permits. If they are not, remedial measures such as re-planting and or re-design and construction of the created wetland shall be taken to ensure that the Project's mitigation obligations are met. • If permanent and temporary impacts on jurisdictional waters cannot be compensated onsite through the restoration or enhancement of wetland features incorporated within proposed open space areas, the specific project applicant						

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
shall provide additional compensatory mitigation for these habitat losses. Potential options include the creation of additional wetland acreage onsite or the purchase of offsite mitigation. Offsite compensatory mitigation would be required to fulfill the performance standards described above.						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-4a: (Marine Craft Access Corridor) The City shall deploy buoys between Breakwater Island and the shoreline to create a 500-foot access corridor for all marine craft, including pleasure crafts and ferries, under non-emergency situation, in order to minimize disturbance to biological habitat on the shoreline and on the breakwater. Signs shall be posted that include a speed limit of 10 mph on the harbor side of Breakwater Island.	Between Breakwater Island and the shoreline	City shall deploy buoys between Breakwater Island and the shoreline. City shall install signs that include speed limit on the harbor side of Breakwater Island.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Ensure that buoys and speed limit signage get installed.	During or after construction of marina and ferry terminal are complete.	
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-4b: (Bird Strike Mitigation) Prior to the issuance of the first building permit for each new building, or for any exterior renovation that would increase the surface area of glazing by 50 percent or more or that would replace 50 percent or more of existing glazing, the City shall require that the project applicant retain a qualified biologist experienced with bird strike issues to review and approve the design of the building to ensure that it sufficiently minimizes the potential for bird strikes. The City may also consult with resource agencies such as the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or others, as it determines to be appropriate during this review. The project applicant shall provide to the City a written description of the measures and features of the building design that are intended to address potential impacts on birds. The design shall include some of the following measures or measures that are equivalent to, but not necessarily identical to, those listed below, as new, more effective technology for addressing bird strikes may become available in the future: • Employ design techniques that create "visual noise" via cladding or other design features that make it easy for birds to identify buildings as such and not mistake buildings for open sky or trees; • Decrease continuity of reflective surfaces using "visual marker" design techniques, which techniques may include: - Patterned or fritted glass, with patterns at most 28 centimeters apart,	All sites where new building construction occurs	Project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to review and approve design of buildings for potential impacts on birds related to bird strike, lighting, and placement of rooftop antennae and other rooftop elements. Project applicant shall provide educational materials to building tenants and occupants, hotel guests, and residents encouraging them to minimize light transmission from windows. Project applicant or City shall document activities undertaken per this mitigation measure. Project applicant or City shall maintain records that include the written descriptions provided by the building developer of the measures and features of the design for each building	City of Alameda Community Development Department; CDFW; USFWS	Review submittal and documentation of measures and features incorporated to address potential impacts on birds. Ensure that education materials get distributed to building tenants, occupants, hotel guests, and residents appropriately. Ensure proper documentation of activities prescribed by Measure 4.E-4b.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
- One-way films installed on glass, with any picture or pattern or arrangement that can be seen from the outside by birds but appear transparent from the inside, - Geometric fenestration patterns that effectively divide a window into smaller panes of at most 28 centimeters, and/or - Decals with patterned or abstract designs, with the maximum clear spaces at most 28 centimeters square. • Up to 60 feet high on building facades facing the shoreline, decrease reflectivity of glass, using design techniques such as plastic or metal screens, light-colored blinds or curtains, frosting of glass, angling glass towards the ground, UV-A glass, or awnings and overhangs;		that are intended to address potential impacts on birds, and the recommendations and memoranda prepared by the qualified biologist experienced with bird strikes.				
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
• Eliminate the use of clear glass on opposing or immediately adjacent faces of the building without intervening interior obstacles such that a bird could perceive its flight path through the glass to be unobstructed; • Mute reflections in glass using strategies such as angled glass, shades, internal screens, and overhangs; and • Place new vegetation sufficiently away from glazed building facades so that no reflection occurs. Alternatively, if planting of landscapes near a glazed building façade is desirable, situate trees and shrubs immediately adjacent to the exterior glass walls, at a distance of less than 3 feet from the glass. Such close proximity will obscure habitat reflections and will minimize fatal collisions by reducing birds' flight momentum. ***Lighting.*** In addition to implementation of the City/VA Lighting MOA, the project applicant shall similarly ensure that the design and specifications for buildings implement design elements to reduce lighting usage, change light direction, and contain light. These include, but are not limited to, the following general considerations that should be applied wherever feasible throughout Alameda Point to reduce night lighting impacts on species other than least terns: • Avoid installation of lighting in areas where not required for public safety • Examine and adopt alternatives to bright, all-night, floor-wide lighting when interior lights would be visible from the						

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
exterior or exterior lights must be left on at night, including: - Installing motion-sensitive lighting - Installing task lighting - Installing programmable timers - Installing fixtures that use lower-wattage, sodium, and yellow-red spectrum lighting. • Install strobe or flashing lights in place of continuously burning lights for any obstruction lighting. • Where exterior lights are to be left on at night, install fully shielded lights to contain and direct light away from the sky.						
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
Antennae, Monopole Structures, and Rooftop Elements. The City shall ensure, as a condition of approval for every building permit, that buildings minimize the number of and co-locate rooftop-antennas and other rooftop equipment, and that monopole structures or antennas on buildings, in open areas, and at sports and playing fields and facilities do not include guy wires. ***Educating Residents and Occupants.*** The City shall ensure, as a condition of approval for every building permit, that the project applicant agrees to provide educational materials to building tenants and occupants, hotel guests, and residents encouraging them to minimize light transmission from windows, especially during peak spring and fall migratory periods, by turning off unnecessary lighting and/or closing window coverings at night. The City shall review and approve the educational materials prior to building occupancy. ***Documentation.*** The project applicant and/or City shall document undertaking the activities described in this mitigation measure and maintain records that include, among others, the written descriptions provided by the building developer of the measures and features of the design for each building that are intended to address potential impacts on birds, and the recommendations and memoranda prepared by the qualified biologist experienced with bird strikes who reviews and approves the design of any proposed projects to ensure that they sufficiently minimize the potential for bird strikes.						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-4c: (**Breeding Birds)** The City shall require project applicants to conduct pre-construction breeding	Northwest Territories	Project applicant shall conduct pre-construction	City of Alameda Community	Review construction specifications to ensure	Prior to issuance of building	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
bird surveys for projects proposed in areas containing, or likely to contain, habitat for nesting birds as a condition of approval for any development-related permit. Specific measures to avoid and minimize impacts on nesting birds include, but are not limited to, those described below. • To avoid and minimize potential impacts on nesting raptors and other birds, preconstruction surveys shall be performed not more than one week prior to initiating vegetation removal and/or construction activities during the breeding season (i.e., February 1 through August 31)	and the Federal Property, Breakwater Island, and trees, shrubs, and buildings throughout Alameda Point	breeding bird surveys. Project applicant shall implement identified avoidance and minimization measures for nesting bird impacts.	Development Department	incorporation of nesting bird avoidance and minimization measures. Monitor to ensure implementation of avoidance and minimization measures during construction.	permit(s) and during construction	
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
• To avoid and minimize potential impacts on nesting raptors and other birds, a no-disturbance buffer zone shall be established around active nests during the breeding season until the young have fledged and are self-sufficient, when no further mitigation would be required • Typically, the size of individual buffers ranges from a minimum of 250 feet for raptors to a minimum of 50 feet for other birds but can be adjusted based on an evaluation of the site by a qualified biologist in cooperation with the USFWS and/or CDFW • Birds that establish nests after construction starts are assumed to be habituated to and tolerant of the indirect impacts resulting from construction noise and human activity. However, direct take of nests, eggs, and nestlings is still prohibited and a buffer must be established to avoid nest destruction. • If construction ceases for a period of more than two weeks, or vegetation removal is required after a period of more than two weeks has elapsed from the preconstruction surveys, then new nesting bird surveys must be conducted.						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-4d: (Burrowing Owl) The City shall ensure that any project applicant for work on City property in the Northwest Territories or on Bay Trail construction through the Federal Property implements the following measures to avoid and minimize impacts on burrowing owl: a) Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits, protocol surveys for burrowing owl shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. The survey methodology shall be consistent with	Northwest Territories or Bay Trail	Project applicant shall implement measures to avoid and minimize impacts on burrowing owls. Project applicant shall obtain a qualified wildlife biologist to conduct protocol surveys for burrowing owls	City of Alameda Community Development Department and CDFW.	Review construction plan and specifications to ensure inclusion of burrowing owl protection measures. City and CDFW to review protocol survey results and ensure that biologist conducts pre-construction surveys of	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) and Bay Trail construction, prior to construction, and during construction.	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
the methods outlined in the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG March 2012) and shall consist of walking parallel transects 7 to 20 meters apart, adjusting for vegetation height and density as needed, and noting any potential burrows with fresh burrowing owl sign or presence of burrowing owls. A copy of the survey results shall be submitted to the City and CDFW. b) In areas positive for burrowing owl presence the Lead Biologist or biological monitor shall be onsite during all construction activities in potential burrowing owl habitat.		consistent with CDFW's methodology. Submit copy of the survey results to City and CDFW. Qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys of project impact areas not more than 14 days prior to construction.		the project impact areas. City will monitor to ensure that a biological monitor is onsite at areas positive for burrowing owl presence during all construction activities. City will monitor to ensure that applicant/ qualified biologist implements owl avoidance and minimization measures.		
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
c) A qualified wildlife biologist (i.e., a wildlife biologist with previous burrowing owl survey experience) shall conduct pre-construction surveys of the permanent and temporary impact areas to locate active breeding or wintering burrowing owl burrows not more than 14 days prior to construction and/or prior to exclusion fencing installation. The survey methodology shall be consistent with the methods outlined in the *Staff Report*. d) If no burrowing owls are detected, no further mitigation is necessary. If burrowing owls are detected, no ground-disturbing activities, such as road construction or installation of solar arrays or ancillary facilities, shall be permitted within the distances specified in Table 4.E-3 from an active burrow during the nesting and fledging seasons (April 1 to August 15 and August 16 to October 15, respectively), unless otherwise authorized by CDFW. The specified buffer distance ranges from 656 feet to 1,640 feet, according to the time of year and the level of disturbance. Buffers shall be established in accordance with Table 4.E-3 and occupied burrows shall not be disturbed during the nesting season unless a qualified biologist approved by CDFW, verifies through noninvasive methods that either: (1) the birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation; or (2) juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival. Burrowing owls shall not be moved or excluded from burrows during the breeding season (April 1 to October 15). e) During the nonbreeding (winter) season (October 16 to March 31), consistent with Table 4.E-3, ground-disturbing work shall maintain a distance ranging from 164 feet to		If burrowing owls are detected, project applicant will abide by measures described in Mitigation Measure 4.E-4d, including establishment of buffers, site monitoring, excavation of burrows using hand tools, and prepare monthly and final compliance reports.		City and CDFW will review monthly and final compliance reports.		

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
1,640 feet from any active burrows depending on the level of disturbance. If active winter burrows are found that would be directly affected by ground-disturbing activities, owls can be displaced from winter burrows according to recommendations made in the *Staff Report*. If active winter burrows are found that would not be directly affected and it is not possible to establish a buffer in accordance with Table 4.E-3 then owls shall not be evicted and the largest buffer possible shall be established in consultation with CDFW.						
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
f) Burrowing owls should not be excluded from burrows unless or until a Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan is developed by the project applicant approved by CDFW, and submitted to the City. The plan shall include, at a minimum:						
i. Confirmation by site surveillance that the burrow(s) is empty of burrowing owls and other species preceding burrow scoping;						
ii. Type of scope to be used and appropriate timing of scoping to avoid impacts;						
iii. Occupancy factors to look for and what shall guide determination of vacancy and excavation timing (e.g., one-way doors should be left in place 48 hours to ensure burrowing owls have left the burrow before excavation, visited twice daily and monitored for evidence that owls are inside and can't escape).						
iv. Methods for burrow excavation. Excavation using hand tools with refilling to prevent reoccupation is preferable whenever possible (may include using piping to stabilize the burrow to prevent collapsing until the entire burrow has been excavated and it can be determined that no owls reside inside it);						
v. Removal of other potential owl burrow surrogates or refugia onsite;						
vi. Photographing the excavation and closure of the burrow to demonstrate success and sufficiency;						
vii. Monitoring of the site to evaluate success and, if needed, to implement remedial measures to prevent subsequent owl use and to avoid take;						
viii. Methods to ensure the impacted site shall continually be						

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
made inhospitable to burrowing owls and fossorial mammals (e.g., by allowing vegetation to grow tall, heavy disking, or immediate and continuous grading) until development is complete.						
g) Site monitoring shall be conducted prior to, during, and after exclusion of burrowing owls from their burrows sufficient to ensure take is avoided. Daily monitoring shall be conducted for one week to confirm young of the year have fledged if the exclusion occurs immediately after the end of the breeding season.						
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
h) In accordance with the Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan a qualified wildlife biologist shall excavate burrows using hand tools. Sections of flexible plastic pipe or burlap bag shall be inserted into the tunnels during excavation to maintain an escape route for any animals inside the burrow. One-way doors shall be installed at the entrance to the active burrow and other potentially active burrows within 160 feet of the active burrow. Forty-eight hours after the installation of the one-way doors, the doors can be removed, and ground-disturbing activities can proceed. Alternatively, burrows can be filled to prevent reoccupation. Excluded burrowing owls shall be documented if observed using artificial or natural burrows on an adjoining mitigation site (if able to confirm by band re-sight).						
i) During construction activities, monthly and final compliance reports shall be provided to CDFW, and the City documenting the effectiveness of mitigation measures and the level of burrowing owl take associated with the proposed project.						
j) Should burrowing owls be found onsite, compensatory mitigation for lost breeding and/or wintering habitat shall be implemented on-site or off-site in accordance with burrowing owl *Staff Report* guidance and in consultation with CDFW. The project applicant or its contractor shall prepare a Burrowing Owl Habitat Mitigation Plan and, at a minimum, the following recommendations shall be implemented:						
i. Temporarily disturbed habitat shall be restored, if feasible, to pre-project conditions, including decompacting soil and revegetation.						
ii. Permanent impacts to nesting, occupied and satellite burrows and/or burrowing owl habitat shall be mitigated						

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
such that the habitat acreage, number of burrows and burrowing owl impacted are replaced based on a site-specific analysis and shall include: a. Permanent conservation of similar grassland habitat to provide for burrowing owl nesting, foraging, wintering, and dispersal (i.e., during breeding and non-breeding seasons) comparable to or better than that of the impact area, and with sufficiently large acreage, and presence of fossorial mammals.						
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
1. Mitigation lands should be on, adjacent or proximate to the impact site where possible and where habitat is sufficient to support the number of burrowing owls present. 2. The CDFW shall be consulted when determining off-site mitigation acreages. b. Permanent protection of mitigation land through a conservation easement deeded to a nonprofit conservation organization or public agency with a conservation mission. If the project is located within the service area of a CDFW approved burrowing owl conservation bank, burrowing owl conservation bank credits may be purchased. c. Development and implementation of a mitigation land management plan in accordance with burrowing owl *Staff Report* guidelines to address long-term ecological sustainability and maintenance of the site for burrowing owls. d. Funding the maintenance and management of mitigation land through the establishment of a long-term funding mechanism such as an endowment. k) Habitat shall not be altered or destroyed, and burrowing owls shall not be excluded from burrows, until mitigation lands have been secured, are managed for the benefit of burrowing owls according to CDFW-approved management, monitoring and reporting plans, and the endowment or other long-term funding mechanism is in place or security is provided until these measures are completed. l) Copies of all completed survey reports and plans shall be						

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
submitted to the City and the CDFW.						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-4e: (Noise Mitigation Measures for Breeding Birds) The City shall ensure that project construction activities on City property that would result in noise levels exceeding existing maximum ambient noise levels in the Northwest Territories or as measured on the Federal Property by more than 10 dBA and/or generally exceeding 60 dBA will avoid and minimize adverse effects on California least tern and other breeding bird reproductive success through one or more of the following measures:	Northwest Territories	Project applicant will implement measures to avoid and minimize adverse effects on California least tern and other breeding bird reproductive success	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Ensure that avoidance and minimization measures for California least tern and other breeding bird are incorporated in construction specifications and that measures are implemented during construction.	Prior to and during construction.	
E. Biological Resources (cont.)						
a) Demolition and construction on City owned property in the Northwest Territories directly adjacent to the Federal Property, and construction of the Bay Trail on Federal Property shall take place in September-January, outside the general bird breeding season of February through August, to the extent feasible. When such work is unavoidable, solid plywood fences shall be constructed between the project site and sensitive wildlife habitat prior to initiation of construction to serve as noise attenuation barriers. The fencing shall be a minimum of 8 feet in height. The fences shall shield the breeding birds from major noise generating phases of demolition and; b) In all other areas, major noise generating phases of demolition and construction that would exceed ambient noise levels as measured in the Federal Property by more than 10 dBA shall take place in September-January, outside the general bird breeding season of February through August; OR solid plywood fences shall be constructed as described above.						
Mitigation Measure 4.E-4f: (Open Refuse Containers) The City shall prohibit open refuse containers that contain food waste throughout the project area. This prohibition shall be incorporated into the terms and conditions of all City approvals for future development at Alameda Point.	All planning sub-areas adjacent to the Federal Property	The City will prohibit placement of open refuse containers that contain food waste.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City to ensure that measure is implemented.	After construction is complete.	
F. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases						
Mitigation Measure 4.F-1a: (Fugitive Dust) The following BAAQMD Best Management Practices for fugitive dust control will be required for all construction activities within the project area. These measures will reduce fugitive dust emissions	All sites	Project applicant shall incorporate the BAAQMD BMPs for fugitive dust control in construction	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Review construction specifications for inclusion of BAAQMD BMPs.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) and on-going during	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
primarily during soil movement, grading and demolition activities, but also during vehicle and equipment movement on unpaved project sites: ***Basic Controls that Apply to All Construction Sites*** 1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. 2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.		specifications. Project applicant shall implement BMPs during construction.		Monitor to ensure that BMPs are implemented during construction.	construction.	
F. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases (cont.)						
3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. 4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. 5. All streets, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. 6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of CCR). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. 7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. 8. A publicly visible sign shall be posted with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.						
Mitigation Measure 4.F-1.b: (**Construction Exhaust)** The following control measures for construction emissions will be	All sites	Project applicant shall incorporate control	City of Alameda Community	Review construction specifications to ensure	Prior to issuance of building	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
required for all construction activities within the project area: • All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. • Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to two minutes. Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.		measures for construction emissions in construction specifications. Project applicant shall implement control measures during construction.	Development Department	incorporation of control measures for construction emissions. Monitor to ensure that construction exhaust measures are implemented during construction.	permit(s) and during construction.	
F. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases (cont.)						
• The Project shall develop a plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment (more than 50 horsepower) to be used in the construction project (i.e., owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles) would achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOx reduction and 45 percent PM reduction compared to the most recent CARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on devices such as particulate filters, and/or other options as such become available. (The Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control (VDEC) required under Mitigation Measure 4.F-1d would also comply with this measure) • Require that all construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NOx and PM. • Require all contractors to use equipment that meets CARB's most recent certification standard for off-road heavy duty diesel engines						
Mitigation Measure 4.F-1c: (Demolition Controls) Demolition and disposal of any asbestos containing building material shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures specified by Regulation 11, Rule 2 (Asbestos Demolition, Renovation and Manufacturing) of BAAQMD's regulations.	Demolition sites	Project applicant shall incorporate BAAQMD's Regulation 11, Rule 2 procedures in construction specifications. Project applicant shall implement measures as outlined in Regulation 11, Rule 2 of BAAQMD's	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Review construction specifications to ensure incorporation of BAAQMD's measures for the demolition and disposal of asbestos. Ensure Project applicant complies with Regulation 11, Rule 2 procedures of BAAQMD's regulations.	Prior to and during construction.	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
		regulations.				
Mitigation Measure 4.F-1d: (Toxic Air Contaminants and PM2.5) The project sponsors shall ensure that construction contract specifications include a requirement that all off-road construction equipment used for project improvements be equipped with a Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control (VDEC), which would reduce diesel particulate emissions by at least 85 percent.	All sites	Project applicant shall incorporate toxic air contaminants and PM2.5 measure in construction contract specifications. Project applicant will use off-road construction equipment with a Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Review construction specifications to ensure that toxic air contaminants and PM2.5 measure is incorporated. Ensure that Project applicant uses off-road construction equipment with a Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control.	Prior to and during construction.	
F. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.F-1.e: (Delayed Occupancy) Health risks from construction-related emissions to new residences proposed under the project shall be minimized by delaying issuance of occupancy permits for new residential until after the completion of construction activities at adjacent buildings upwind in prevailing west and northwest winds during individual development phases of the project.	New residential areas	Project applicant shall delay occupancy until after completion of construction activities at adjacent buildings.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Ensure that occupancy is delayed until after completion of construction activities at adjacent buildings.	Prior to issuance of occupancy permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.F-2: (Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures) The following measures shall be incorporated into the project design for properties within the project area: • Implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program, as described in detail in Mitigation Measure 4.C.1a in Section 4.C, Transportation. • Require only natural gas hearths in residential units as a condition of final building permit; • Consider smart meters and programmable thermostats; • Meet Green State and Local Building Code standards in all new construction; • Install solar water heaters for all uses as feasible; • Use recycled water when available; • Install low-flow fixtures (faucets, toilets, showers); • Use water efficient irrigation systems; and • Institute recycling and composting services.	All sites	Project applicant shall incorporate measures into project design documents.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Ensure that project design documents incorporate measures identified in Mitigation Measure 4.F-2.	During design phase.	
Mitigation Measure 4.F-4: Implement Mitigation Measures	See Mitigation Measures 4.F-1a, 4.F-1b, and 4.F-1e.					

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
4.F-1a, 4.F-1b, and 4.F-1e.						
Mitigation Measure 4.F-7a: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.F-2.	See Mitigation Measure 4.F-2.					
Mitigation Measure 4.F-7b: (Fuel-Efficient Vehicles) The City shall promote use of clean fuel-efficient vehicles through preferential parking, installation of charging stations, and low emission electric vehicle carsharing programs to reduce the need to have a car or second car vehicles in the TDM Program.	Development areas	City shall require implementation of measures identified in Measure 4.F-7b.	City of Alameda Community Development Department			
Mitigation Measure 4.F-8: Implement Mitigation Measures 4.F-2 and 4.F-7b.	See Mitigation Measures 4.F-2 and 4.F-7b.					
G. Noise						
Mitigation Measure 4.G-1a: (Construction Hours) The City will require construction contractors to limit standard construction activities hours to be in compliance with the Noise Ordinance. Pile driving activities greater than 90 dBA limited to between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. No pile driving shall be allowed on weekends and National holidays.	All sites	Project applicant and its contractor(s) to include noise limitations in construction specifications. Project applicant and its contractor(s) to comply with the Noise Ordinance and ensure that pile driving activities greater than 90 dBA are limited between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Review construction specifications to ensure measure is incorporated; inspection to ensure conformance.	Prior to issuance of grading or building permit(s); inspection during construction	
Mitigation Measure 4.G-1b: (Construction Noise Measures) To reduce daytime noise impacts due to construction, the City will require construction contractors to implement the following measures: • Equipment and trucks used for project construction will utilize the best available noise control techniques, such as improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures and acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible. Impact tools (i.e., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust will be used; this muffler can lower	All sites	Project applicant and its contractor(s) shall use best available noise-control techniques described and locate stationary noise sources as far from adjacent receptors as possible.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Require use of noise-control techniques in building permit; inspect construction site to confirm adherence to those requirements.	Prior to issuance of grading building permit(s); inspect during construction	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves will be used where feasible, and this could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures will be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever feasible. • Stationary noise sources will be located as far from adjacent receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or other measures to the extent feasible. • Haul routes that affect the fewest number of people will be selected.						
G. Noise (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.G-1c: (Pile Driving Noise Attenuation Measures) Pile driving activities within 300 feet of sensitive receptors will require additional noise attenuation measures. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures will be submitted for review and approval by the City to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. These attenuation measures will include as many of the following control strategies as feasible: • Erect temporary plywood noise barriers if they would block the line of sight between sensitive receptors and construction activities, particularly for existing residences in the northern area of the project site and for residences across Main Street; • Implement "quiet" pile driving technology (such as pre-drilling of piles or use of sonic pile drivers), where feasible, in consideration of geotechnical and structural requirements and conditions; and • Utilize noise control blankets on the building structure as the building is erected to reduce noise emission from the site.	All sites	Project applicant and its contractor(s) shall prepare plan and submit to City; implement during construction.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Review noise-attenuation plan and incorporate plan into building permit; inspect site during construction to confirm adherence to plan.	Prior to issuance of grading or building permit(s); inspect site during construction	
Mitigation Measure 4.G-1d: (Complaint Tracking) Prior to the issuance of each building permit, along with the submission of construction documents, the project applicant will submit to the City a list of measures to respond to and track complaints pertaining to construction noise. These measures will include: • Signs will be posted at the construction site that include permitted construction days and hours, a day and evening contact number for the job site, and a contact number with the City of Alameda in the event of noise complaints. The	All development sites	Project applicant and its contractor(s) shall post construction information and track complaints pertaining to construction noise	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Review construction specifications to ensure conformance; inspection to ensure conformance	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
project applicant will designate an onsite complaint and enforcement manager to track and respond to noise complaints; and • Notification of neighbors within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of pile-driving activities about the estimated duration of the activity.						
Mitigation Measure 4.G-2: Implement Mitigation Measures 4.G-1a through 4.G-1d.	See Mitigation Measures 4.G-1a through 4.G-1d.					
Mitigation Measure 4.G-3: To reduce automobile trips and associated automobile noise impacts, implement Mitigation Measure 4.C2a (TDM Program).	See Mitigation Measure 4.C-2a.					
G. Noise (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.G-4: (Noise Ordinance) During individual project phase design preparation, the City will require a project applicant to comply with the Noise Ordinance and General Plan standards. These measures implement noise control measures to ensure that all non-transportation source operations comply with City standards and will include, but not be limited to, the following: • The proposed land uses will be designed so that on-site mechanical equipment (e.g., HVAC units, compressors, generators) and area-source operations (e.g., loading docks, parking lots, and recreational-use areas) are located as far as possible and/or shielded from nearby noise sensitive land uses to meet City noise standards. • On-site landscape maintenance equipment will be equipped with properly operating exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. • The following activities will be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. unless site-specific analysis confirms that noise impacts to sensitive receptors would be less-than-significant: - Truck deliveries; - Operations of motor powered landscape maintenance equipment; and - Outdoor use of amplified sound systems.	Commercial, loading docks, parks and sports complex	Project applicant and its contractor(s) shall incorporate operational noise control measures in project design phase documents.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City shall ensure that design phase documents of individual projects incorporate operational noise control measures.	During design phase and prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.G-5: (Noise Study and Design Measures) The City will require project sponsors for residential development	Residential	Project applicant shall obtain a qualified noise	City of Alameda Community	City shall review and approve noise study and ensure that	Prior to	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
to submit a detailed noise study, prepared by a qualified noise consultant, to determine design measures necessary to achieve acceptable interior noise levels at the proposed new residences. The study will be submitted to the City for review and approval. Design measures such as the following could be required, depending on the specific findings of the noise study: double-paned glass windows facing noise sources; solid-core doors; increased sound insulation of exterior walls (such as through staggered-or double-studs, multiple layers of gypsum board, and incorporation of resilient channels); weather-tight seals for doors and windows; or mechanical ventilation such as an air conditioning system.	sites	consultant to prepare a noise study. Noise consultant will prepare a noise study and determine design measures necessary to achieve acceptable interior noise levels at new residences.	Development Department	design measures would meet acceptable interior noise level standards.	construction.	
Mitigation Measure 4.G-6: Implement Mitigation Measures 4.G-3 and 4.G-5.	See Mitigation Measures 4.G-3 and 4.G-5.					
H. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity						
Mitigation Measure 4.H-1: (Geotechnical Investigation) Prior to approval of a building permit, a site specific, design-level geotechnical investigation shall be prepared for all proposed development on the project site. The investigation shall include detailed characterization of the distribution and compositions of subsurface materials and an assessment of their potential behavior during violent seismic ground-shaking. The analysis shall recommend site preparation and design parameters that would be necessary to avoid or substantially reduce structural damage under anticipated peak ground accelerations in accordance with seismic design requirements within the most current version of the California Building Code and Alameda Municipal Code. The investigation and recommendations shall be in conformance with all applicable city ordinances and policies and consistent with the design requirements of the calculated Seismic Design Category for each site in accordance with the California Building Code. The geotechnical report shall be prepared by a California-registered geotechnical engineer and approved by the City, and all recommendations contained in the report shall be included in the final design of the project. Mitigation Measure 4.H-1 would ensure that the proposed project would be designed to withstand strong seismic ground-shaking, and that the occupants of the proposed development are informed of safety procedures to follow in the event of an earthquake.	All proposed development sites	Project applicant shall obtain a California-registered geotechnical engineer to conduct design-level geotechnical investigation. Geotechnical engineer shall conduct geotechnical investigation, prepare a report and develop recommendations in accordance to Measure 4.H-1. Engineer shall ensure that recommendations conform to city ordinances and policies.	Project applicant and City of Alameda Community Development Department	City shall review and approve geotechnical report.	Prior to approval of building permit(s)	
Mitigation Measure 4.H-2: (Geotechnical Mitigation) Prior to issuance of a building permit, earthwork, foundation and structural design for proposed development under the project	All proposed development sites	Project applicant shall ensure that geotechnical investigation includes	Project applicant and City of Alameda Community	Ensure that geotechnical report addresses seismically-induced ground failures listed	Review mitigation strategies prior to incorporation into	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
shall be conducted in accordance with all recommendations contained in the required geotechnical investigation (Mitigation Measure 4.H-1a). The investigation must include an assessment of all potentially foreseeable seismically-induced ground failures, including liquefaction, sand boils, lateral spreading and rapid settlement. Mitigation strategies must be designed for the site-specific conditions of the project and must be reviewed for compliance with the guidelines of CGS Special Publication 117A prior to incorporation into the project. Examples of possible strategies include edge containment structures (berms, diked sea walls, retaining structures, compacted soil zones), removal or treatment of liquefiable soils, soil modification, modification of site geometry, lowering the groundwater table, in-situ ground densification, deep foundations, reinforced shallow foundations, and structural design that can accommodate predicted displacements.		assessment of all potentially foreseeable seismically-induced ground failures, including liquefaction, sand boils, lateral spreading and rapid settlement. Project applicant shall ensure that mitigation strategies are developed consistent with the guidelines of CGS Special Publication 117A.	Development Department	in the measure. Review and ensure that mitigation strategies are developed consistent with the guidelines of CGS Special Publication 117A.	the project. Prior to issuance of building permit(s).	
H. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.H-3: (Slope Stability Plan) Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit for any building located within 50 feet of the northern shoreline, a slope stability plan shall be prepared by a California-licensed geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist and all recommendations implemented in accordance with City requirements. The required geotechnical stability report plan shall determine the stabilization measures (e.g., cement/soil mixing, construction of a bulkhead wall) necessary to obtain acceptable factors of safety in accordance with California Geological Surveys Special Publication 117A. All construction activities and design criteria shall comply with applicable codes and requirements of the most recent California Building Code, and applicable City construction and grading ordinances.	Development within 50 feet of northern shoreline	Project applicant will obtain a California-licensed geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist to prepare a slope stability plan. Geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist will prepare a slope stability plan and determine stabilization measures. Implement approved stabilization measures during construction.	Project applicant and City of Alameda Community Development Department	Ensure that slope stability plan includes stabilization measures in accordance with California Geological Surveys Special Publication 117A. Ensure that construction activities and design criteria comply with applicable codes and requirements stated in most recent California Building Code.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s) and during construction.	
Mitigation Measure 4.H-4: (Settlement Mitigation) The required geotechnical report for each development project (Mitigation Measure 4.H-1a) shall determine the susceptibility of the project site to settlement and prescribe appropriate engineering techniques for reducing its effects. Where settlement and/or differential settlement is predicted, mitigation measures—such as lightweight fill, geofoam, surcharging, wick drains, deep foundations, structural slabs, hinged slabs, flexible utility connections, and utility hangers—shall be used. These measures shall be evaluated and the most effective, feasible, and economical measures shall be recommended. Engineering recommendations shall be included in the project engineering	All proposed development sites	Project applicant shall ensure that geotechnical investigation assesses the susceptibility of the site to settlement, prescribes engineering techniques for reducing its effects, and includes recommended mitigation measures. Project applicant will include recommendations in project	City of Alameda Community Development Department and registered geotechnical engineer.	Ensure that geotechnical report evaluates susceptibility of the site to settlement and that recommendations and mitigation measures are included. Registered geotechnical engineer will review and approve engineering recommendations. City will ensure that	During the design and construction phases.	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
and design plans, and be reviewed and approved by a registered geotechnical engineer. All construction activities and design criteria shall comply with applicable codes and requirements of the most recent California Building Code, and applicable City construction and grading ordinances.		engineering and design plans. Applicant will comply with all applicable codes and requirements during construction.		construction activities and design criteria comply with applicable codes and requirements.		
Mitigation Measure 4.H-5: (Expansive Soils Assessment) Prior to issuance of a building permit, subsurface earthwork (e.g., placement of engineered fill), shall be conducted in accordance with all recommendations contained in the required geotechnical investigation (Mitigation Measure 4.H-1). The geotechnical report must include an assessment of all potentially expansive soils that could adversely affect proposed improvements. Geotechnical strategies must be designed for the site-specific conditions of the project and must be reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the most recent California Building Code as well as any additional City of Alameda requirements.	All proposed development sites	Project applicant will ensure that geotechnical report includes assessment of expansive soils and strategies consistent with most recent California Building Code as well as any additional City of Alameda requirements.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City will review and approve strategies/recommendations outlined in geotechnical report.	Prior to issuance of building permit(s)	
I. Hydrology and Water Quality (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.I-1: (Water Quality Measures) The City shall ensure that project applicants for projects at Alameda Point implement the following measures as part associated with the extracted water during project construction: • The RWQCB could require compliance with certain provisions in the permit such as treatment of the flows prior to discharge. The project applicant shall discharge the extracted water to the sanitary sewer or storm drain system with authorization of and required permits from the applicable regulatory agencies, in this case the City of Alameda. • The project applicant shall comply with applicable permit conditions associated with the treatment of groundwater prior to discharge. • If necessary a dewatering collection and disposal method shall be prepared and implemented for the project.	All proposed development sites	Project applicant will incorporate water quality measures in the construction specifications. Project applicant will obtain and comply with necessary permits from RWQCB and City of Alameda for any activities requiring discharge of extracted water to the sanitary sewer or storm drain system.	City of Alameda Community Development Department, RWQCB	RWQCB and City will review permit application for activities involving discharge or extracted water necessary during construction activities. Upon approval, City will monitor to ensure compliance with permit conditions.	Prior to construction	
Mitigation Measure 4.I-2: (Integrated Pest Management) The City shall ensure that future project applicants implement Integrated Pest Management measures to reduce fertilizer and pesticide contamination of receiving waters, as follows: • Prepare and Implement an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPM) for all common landscaped areas. The IPM shall	All proposed development sites	The Project applicant will incorporate Integrated Pest Management measures into construction specifications. The Project applicant will implement Integrated Pest	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City will ensure that the Integrated Pest Management measures are included in the construction specifications. City will monitor and ensure that Project applicant	Prior to construction and after construction.	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
be prepared by a qualified professional and shall recommend methods of pest prevention and turf grass management that use pesticides as a last resort in pest control. Types and rates of fertilizer and pesticide application shall be specified. • The IPM shall specify methods of avoiding runoff of pesticides and nitrates into receiving storm drains and surface waters or leaching into the shallow groundwater table. Pesticides shall be used only in response to a persistent pest problem that cannot be resolved by non-pesticide measures. Preventative chemical use shall not be employed. • The IPM shall fully integrate considerations for cultural and biological resources into the IPM with an emphasis toward reducing pesticide application.		Management measures including an integrated pest management plan.		implements pest management measures.		
I. Hydrology and Water Quality (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.I-6: (Flood Protection Measures) The City will require that any new construction within the Adaptive Reuse areas, prior to the installation of the proposed storm drain system and flood protection measures, would be constructed at an elevation of 1 foot above the 100-year flood risk elevation.	Adaptive Reuse areas	Project applicant will incorporate the measure ensuring that construction of new facilities is at an elevation of 1 foot above the 100-year flood risk elevation.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City will review construction specifications to ensure that flood protection measure is included. City will monitor and inspect new facilities to ensure that facilities are at an elevation of 1 foot above the 100-year flood risk elevation.	Prior to installation of proposed storm drain system and flood protection measures.	
Mitigation Measure 4.I-8: (Sea-Level Protection) The City shall implement the following steps prior to project implementation: • Apply for membership in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Community Rating System (CRS), and as appropriate through revisions to the City Code, obtain reductions in flood insurance rates offered by the NFIP to community residents. • Cooperate with FEMA in its efforts to comply with recent congressional mandates to incorporate predictions of sea level rise into its Flood Insurance Studies and FIRM. • Implement climate adaptation strategies such as avoidance/planned retreat, enhance levees, setback levees to accommodate habitat transition zones, buffer zones and beaches, expanded tidal prisms for enhanced natural scouring	All sites	City will incorporate measures into construction plans and specifications. City will implement measures as stated in Measure 4.I-8.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City shall ensure that structural design and adaptive measures are incorporated in construction plans and specifications. City will monitor to ensure implementation of measures.	Prior to construction.	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
of channel sediments, raising and flood-proofing structures, or provisions for additional floodwater pumping stations, and inland detention basins to reduce peak discharges.						
J. Hazards and Hazardous Materials						
Mitigation Measure 4.J-1a: (Hazardous Building Material Assessment) Prior to issuance of any demolition permit, the project applicant shall submit to the City a hazardous building material assessment prepared by qualified licensed contractors for each structure intended for demolition indicating whether LBP or lead-based coatings, ACMs, and/or PCB-containing equipment are present.	Demolition areas	Project applicant will obtain a qualified licensed contractor to prepare and submit a hazardous building material assessment. Qualified contractor will prepare and submit hazardous building material assessment for the Project applicant and City's review.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City will review the hazardous building material assessment.	Prior to issuance of demolition permit(s).	
J. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.J-1b: (Health and Safety Plan) If the assessment required by Mitigation Measure 4.J-1a indicates the presence of LBP, ACMs, and/or PCBs, the project applicant shall create and implement a health and safety plan to protect demolition and construction workers and the public from risks associated with such hazardous materials during demolition or renovation of affected structures.	Demolition areas	Project applicant will prepare and implement a health and safety plan if Measure 4.J-1 indicates the presence of LBP, ACMs, and/or PCBs.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City will review health and safety plan. City will monitor to ensure that the health and safety plan is implemented.	Prior to and during construction.	
Mitigation Measure 4.J-1c: (LBP Removal Plan) If the assessment required by Mitigation Measure 4.J-1a finds presence of LBP, the project applicant shall develop and implement a LBP removal plan. The plan shall specify, but not be limited to, the following elements for implementation: • Develop a removal specification approved by a Certified Lead Project Designer. • Ensure that all removal workers are properly trained. • Contain all work areas to prohibit off-site migration of paint chip debris. • Remove all peeling and stratified LBP on building and non-building surfaces to the degree necessary to safely and properly complete demolition activities according to recommendations of the survey. The demolition contractor shall be responsible for the proper containment and disposal of intact LBP on all equipment to be cut and/or	Demolition areas	Project applicant will prepare and implement a LBP removal plan if LBP is found present.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City will review LBP removal plan. City will monitor to ensure that LBP removal plan is implemented.	Prior to construction and during construction.	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
removed during the demolition. • Provide on-site personnel and area air monitoring during all removal activities to ensure that workers and the environment are adequately protected by the control measures used. • Clean up and/or vacuum paint chips with a high efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filter. • Collect, segregate, and profile waste for disposal determination. • Properly dispose of all waste.						
J. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)						
Mitigation Measure 4.J-1d: (Asbestos Abatement Plan) If the assessment required by Mitigation Measure 4.J-1a finds asbestos, the project applicant shall prepare an asbestos abatement plan and shall ensure that asbestos abatement is conducted by a licensed contractor prior to building demolition. Abatement of known or suspected ACMs shall occur prior to demolition or construction activities that would disturb those materials. Pursuant to an asbestos abatement plan developed by a state-certified asbestos consultant and approved by the City, all ACMs shall be removed and appropriately disposed of by a state certified asbestos contractor.	Demolition areas	If asbestos is found upon implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.J-1a, Project applicant will prepare an asbestos abatement plan. Project applicant will obtain a state-certified asbestos consultant to prepare the asbestos plan. State-certified asbestos consultant will ensure that all ACMs are removed and appropriately disposed of.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City will review and shall approve the asbestos abatement plan. Ensure that abatement of known or suspected ACMs are removed by a state certified asbestos contractor.	Prior to building demolition activities, and during demolition work.	
Mitigation Measure 4.J-1e: (PCB Abatement) If the assessment required by Mitigation Measure 4.J-1a finds PCBs, the project applicant shall ensure that PCB abatement is conducted prior to building demolition or renovation. PCBs shall be removed by a qualified contractor and transported in accordance with Caltrans requirements.	Demolition areas	If PCBs are found upon implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.J-1a, Project applicant will obtain a qualified contractor to implement PCB abatement. Qualified contractor will remove PCBs and will transport in accordance with Caltrans requirements.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City will ensure that PCB abatement measure is incorporated in construction plans and specifications. City will monitor and ensure that PCB abatement measures are implemented.	Prior to and during building demolition or renovation work.	
Mitigation Measure 4.J-2: (Site Management Plan) Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit for any ground breaking activities within the project site, the City shall prepare a Site Management Plan (SMP) that is approved by US EPA, DTSC, and the Water Board for incorporation into construction	All sites	City and Project applicant shall prepare a Site Management Plan (SMP) for U.S. EPA, DTSC, or State Water Resources Control	City of Alameda Community Development Department and U.S. EPA, DTSC, or	The City, U.S. EPA, DTSC, or Water Board will review SMP and ensure SMP is incorporated into construction	Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
specifications. Any additional or remaining remediation on identified parcels from the City's tracking system shall be completed as directed by the responsible agency, U.S. EPA, DTSC, or Water Board, in accordance with the deed restrictions and requirements as well as any Covenants(s) to Restrict Use of Property (CRUP), prior to commencement of construction activities. Where necessary, additional remediation shall be accomplished by the project applicant prior to issuance of any building or grading permits in accordance with all requirements set by the overseeing agency (i.e., U.S. EPA, DTSC, or Water Board). The SMP shall be present on site at all times and readily available to site workers. The SMP shall specify protocols and requirements for excavation, stockpiling, and transport of soil and for disturbance		Board's (Water Board) approval. City and Project applicant shall implement additional or remaining remediation efforts from the City's tracking system and as directed by the U.S. EPA, DTSC, or Water Board. City will implement measures contained in the approved SMP.	Water Board.	specifications. City and the overseeing agency will ensure that Project applicant implements additional remediation requirements based on those established by overseeing agency as well as any Covenants to Restrict Use of Property (CRUP). The City and the overseeing agency will ensure that the SMP is present on site at all		
J. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)						
of groundwater as well as a contingency plan to respond to the discovery of previously unknown areas of contamination (e.g., discolored soils, strong petroleum odors, an underground storage tank unearthed during normal construction activities, etc.). At a minimum the SMP shall include the following components: 1. *Soil management requirements*. Protocols for stockpiling, sampling, and transporting soil generated from onsite activities. The soil management requirements must include: • Soil stockpiling requirements such as placement of cover, application of moisture, erection of containment structures, and implementation of security measures. Additional measures related to BAAQMD dust control requirements as they apply to contamination shall also be included, as needed (see also Air Quality section). • Protocols for assessing suitability of soil for on-site reuse through representative laboratory analysis of soils as approved by U.S. EPA, DTSC, or Water Board, taking into account the site-specific health-based remediation goals, other applicable health-based standards, and the proposed location, circumstances, and conditions for the intended soil reuse. • Requirements for offsite transportation and disposal of soil not determined to be suitable for onsite reuse. Any soil identified for offsite disposal must be packaged, handled, and transported in compliance with all applicable state, federal, and the disposal facility's requirements for waste handling, transportation and disposal.				times and readily available to the site workers.		

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
• Protocols for adherence to the City of Alameda's Marsh Crust Ordinance. • Measures to be taken for areas of IR Site 13 where refinery wastes and asphaltic residues known as tarry refinery waste might be encountered. Measures shall include requirements for the storage, handling and disposal/recycling of any suspected tarry refinery waste that may be encountered. • Radiological screening protocols for the radiological sites identified by the Navy as approved by the U.S. EPA, where necessary.						
J. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)						
2. *Groundwater management requirements*. Protocols for conducting dewatering activities and sampling and analysis requirements for groundwater extracted during dewatering activities. The sampling and analysis requirements shall specify which groundwater contaminants must be analyzed or how they will be determined. The results of the groundwater sampling and analysis shall be used to determine which of the following reuse or disposal options is appropriate for such groundwater: • Onsite reuse (e.g., as dust control); • Discharge under the general permit for stormwater discharge for construction sites; • Treatment (as necessary) before discharge to the sanitary sewer system under applicable East Bay MUD waste discharge criteria; • Treatment (as necessary) before discharge under a site-specific NPDES permit; • Offsite transport to an approved offsite facility. For each of the options listed, the SMP shall specify the particular criteria or protocol that would be considered appropriate for reuse or disposal options. The thresholds used must, at a minimum, be consistent with the applicable requirements of the Water Board and East Bay MUD. 3. *Unknown contaminant/hazard contingency plan*. Procedures for implementing a contingency plan, including appropriate notification, site worker protections, and site control procedures, in the event unanticipated potential subsurface						

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
hazards or hazardous material releases are discovered during construction. Control procedures shall include: • Protocols for identifying potential contamination though visual or olfactory observation; • Protocols on what to do in the event an underground storage tank is encountered; • Emergency contact procedures; • Procedures for notifying regulatory agencies and other appropriate parties;						
J. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)						
• Site control and security procedures; • Sampling and analysis protocols; and 4. Interim removal work plan preparation and implementation procedures.						
Mitigation Measure 4.J-7: (Land Use Restriction Tracking Program) The City shall include closed and open IR CERCLA sites that have land-use controls within its Land-use Restriction Tracking Program for identification and disclosure of any past cleanup efforts and current status of any remaining contamination, if any. Additional control measures such as vapor barriers and venting may be required as a condition of approval in areas where soil gas emissions have been identified. Prior to transfer of title for any parcel, the City shall require that the SMP as approved by US EPA, DTSC, and the Water Board be incorporated into intrusive site operations as required through deed restriction, enforceable Land Use Covenant, or any other applicable legal requirement.	All sites	City will include closed and open Installed Restoration (IR) CERCLA sites that have land-use controls within its Land-use Restrictions Tracking Program. City will ensure that the SMP (as approved by U.S. EPA, DTSC, and Water Board) be incorporated into intrusive site operations as required through deed restriction, enforceable Land Use Covenant, or any other applicable legal requirement.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City shall ensure that its Land-use Restrictions Tracking Program includes open and closed IR CERCLA sites.	Prior to transfer of title for any parcel.	
K. Aesthetics						
Mitigation Measure 4.K-4: (Lighting Mitigation) All lighting installations shall be designed and installed to be fully shielded (full cutoff) and to minimize glare and obtrusive light by limiting outdoor lighting that is misdirected, excessive, or unnecessary, unless expressly exempted below. The location and design of all exterior lighting shall be shown on any site plan submitted to	All development sites with lighting	Project applicant and its contractor(s) shall prepare landscape plans that adhere to all specifications in Mitigation Measure 4.K-4.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	Verify that the design features and recommendations listed in the mitigation measure are incorporated into the design review application for the	Prior to approval of building permit(s)	

TABLE 1 (Continued)
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Site(s) Affected	Implementation Procedures	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring and Reporting Action	Mitigation Schedule	
the City of Alameda for approval. The following lighting is exempt from these requirements: 1. Lighting in swimming pools and other water features. 2. Exit signs and other illumination required by building codes. 3. Lighting for stairs and ramps, as required by the building code. 4. Signs that are regulated by the City sign code.				project.		
K. Aesthetics (cont.)						
5. Holiday and temporary lighting (less than thirty days use in any one year). Low-voltage landscape lighting, but such lighting should be shielded in such a way as to eliminate glare and light trespass.						
M. Utilities and Service Systems						
Mitigation Measure 4.M-5: (Solid Waste Management Plan) The City shall develop a solid waste management plan for the Alameda Point project consistent with Alameda's demolition and debris ordinance. Plans for managing construction debris from specific reuse and development projects that require separation of waste types and recycling, and provide for reuse of materials onsite for the reuse and development areas, shall be developed by the project sponsor. The solid waste management plan shall be prepared in coordination with City staff, the project sponsor(s), and demolition subcontractors, and shall be approved by City staff prior to issuance of a demolition permit. The City and sponsors of projects shall work with organizations able to provide funding and technical assistance for managing and financing deconstruction, demolition, and recycling and reuse programs, should those programs exist at the time of site clearance.	All demolition sites	Project applicant(s) shall develop a solid waste management plan through coordination with City staff and demolition subcontractors. City and Project applicant(s) shall work with organizations that would provide funding and technical assistance for managing and financing deconstruction, demolition and recycling and reuse programs.	City of Alameda Community Development Department	City of Alameda Community Development Department shall review plan.	Plan shall be developed prior to issuance of demolition permit.	

558435.1 ALAMEDA.NAS 558418.1

EXHIBIT C

Supplemental Revisions to Final EIR

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2b (Monitoring): Prior to issuance of the first building permits for any development project at Alameda Point, the City of Alameda shall adopt a Transportation Network Monitoring and Improvement Program to: 1) determine the cost of the transportation network improvements identified in this EIR; 2) identify appropriate means and formulas to collect fair share financial contributions from Alameda Point development; 3) monitor conditions at the locations that will be impacted by the redevelopment of Alameda Point; 4) monitor traffic generated by Alameda Point; and 5) annually report to the Planning Board to determine ~~establish~~ the appropriate time to implement any necessary secondary physical improvements required in this EIR to minimize or eliminate significant transportation impacts prior to the impacts occurring at affected locations where a secondary impact mitigation is recommended.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2m (Stargell Avenue Bike): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall construct a Class I ~~or Class II~~ bicycle facility between Main Street and Webster Street

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2n (Main Street Bike): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall implement the following physical improvements:

- ~~construct a Class II bicycle lane or~~ improve the existing Class I bicycle path on the west side of the street between Appezzato Parkway and Pacific Avenue to current City standards;
- provide connectivity to existing Class I bicycle path on the east and west sides of the street north of Appezzato Parkway. Appropriate intersection treatments for connectivity may include striping, signage, and/or bicycle boxes at the intersection of Main Street and Appezzato Parkway; and if Mitigation Measure 4.C-4c (described below) is implemented, provide connectivity to that bicycle facilities on west side of the street north of the Main Street-Pacific Street intersection.

Mitigation Measure 4.C-2o (Central Avenue Bike): The City shall implement TDM and Monitoring (Mitigation Measures 4.C-2a and C-2b) and, when required to avoid the impact or reduce its severity, shall use its best efforts to implement the following physical improvements:

- ~~construct a Class II bicycle lane o~~r improve the existing Class I bicycle path on the west (south) side of the street between the Main Street-Pacific Street intersection and Lincoln Avenue to current City standards;
- extend a Class I bicycle path to Third Street; and
- restripe and sign the street segment between Third Street and Fourth Street to provide Class II bicycle lanes between Lincoln Avenue and Fourth Street.

Mitigation Measure 4.F-2: (Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures) The following measures shall be incorporated into the project design for properties within the project area:

- Implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program, as described in detail in Mitigation Measure 4.C.1a in Section 4.C, Transportation.
- Require only natural gas hearths in residential units as a condition of final building permit;

- ~~Require~~ Consider smart meters and programmable thermostats;
- Meet State and local Green Building Code standards in all new construction;
- Install solar water heaters for all uses as feasible;
- Use recycled water when available;
- Install low-flow fixtures (faucets, toilets, showers);
- Use water efficient irrigation systems; and
    - Institute recycling and composting services.

Revision to Table 5-6 of the Alameda Point Draft EIR per Comment 34-22 in the Response to Comment Document

Edits shown in ~~strikeout~~ / underline

TABLE 5-6
QUALITATIVE COMPARISON OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Objectives	Project	No Project	Preservation	Existing Gen Plan	Multi family	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
Property Rehabilitation and Reinvestment Objectives - The project should eliminate the blighted conditions on the property, and correct geotechnical and flood hazards and infrastructure deficiencies in the area by:							
Ensuring orderly and systematic reinvestment and development of the project site into an integrated mixed use community with an integrated network of public open spaces, trails, and streets.	0	-2	-1	0	1	2	2
Facilitating reinvestment in substandard infrastructure systems and buildings, including reinvestment in contributing structures and cultural landscapes within the NAS Alameda Historic District, where feasible.	0	-2	-1	1	1	2	2
Ensuring orderly and timely clean-up and conveyance of the remaining property under Navy ownership consistent with the Economic Development Conveyance Memorandum of Agreement (EDC MOA), and the Navy's other conveyance obligations.	0	-2	-1	0	0	-1	-1
Environmental Protection and Sustainability Objectives – The project should protect the local, regional, and global environment and facilitate sustainable reuse and redevelopment of Alameda Point by:							
Creating opportunities for transit-oriented development consistent with Regional Sustainable Communities Strategies for greenhouse gas emission reductions as required by SB 375.	0	-2	-1	0	0	+1	+2
Reinvesting in the replacement and rehabilitation of substandard infrastructure systems that may contribute to regional water quality impacts due to infiltration, inflow, storm water run-off, and substandard storm water treatment facilities.	0	-2	-1	0	0~~-1~~	1	2
Investing in improvements to adapt to sea-level rise and climate change over time.	0	-2	-1	0	0~~-1~~	1	2
Applying sustainability principles in the design and development of open spaces, recreation facilities, buildings, and infrastructure, including wastewater, storm water, electrical and transportation systems, including promotion of alternative modes of transportation through preparation and implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program.	0	-2	-1	0	1~~0~~	1	1
Public Benefit Objectives – The project should produce tangible community benefits for the Alameda community as a whole by:							
Creating an open space network that incorporates preservation, restoration and enhancement of wetlands and other natural habitats and provides for both passive and active recreational uses.	0	-2	-1	0	0	0	-1
Enhancing views of water and public access to the waterfront in all development and creatively encouraging the usage of the waterfront, by providing a waterfront promenade, public art, open space, and other public amenities.	0	-2	-1	0	0~~-1~~	0	0
Economic Development and Employment Objectives – The project should strengthen and diversify the economic base of the community by:							
Emphasizing employment and a mix of economic development opportunities that complement economic development strategies in other parts of Alameda; and provide a range of employment opportunities and quality jobs, through adaptive reuse of existing	0	-2	-1	+1	+1	0	0

Objectives	Project	No Project	Preservation	Existing Gen Plan	Multi family	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
buildings and new construction to replace up to 9,000 of the 14,000 jobs lost to Alameda and the Region by the closure of NAS Alameda.							
Economic Development and Employment Objectives (cont.) – The project should strengthen and diversify the economic base of the community by:							
Reoccupying existing buildings and constructing new buildings to create 5.5 million square feet of business, commercial, industrial, maritime and retail uses that will provide jobs, services, tax revenue, and new amenities for Alameda residents.	0	-2	-1	+1	0	0	-1
Actively seeking new retail land uses that will complement and provide synergies with existing retail development at Webster Street, Park Street and other locations within Alameda.	0	-2	-1	-1	0	+2	+1
Provide for orderly phasing, sizing, and financing of site infrastructure for both the circulation and utility network and provide for a predictable development process.	0	-1	-1	0	0 ~~-1~~	0	0
Address the impact of the site development on the City's operating budget to comply with City Council Policies adopted by Resolution 13643 related to fiscal neutrality.	0	-1	-1	0	0 ~~-1~~	+1	+2
Transit Oriented Mixed Use Development Objectives – The project should provide transit oriented mixed use development opportunities, by							
Ensuring that the project site design is in concert with the established goals, policies, and objectives of the *NAS Alameda Community Reuse Plan* as incorporated into the Alameda General Plan.	0	-2	-1	0	0	0	0
Balancing development objectives with transportation constraints and opportunities.	0	0	+1	0	+1	0	-2
Providing for mixed use development opportunities and sites within close proximity to transit and encouraging the types of non-residential uses that provide for the everyday needs of Alameda Point residents and employees and reduce the need to use an automobile to obtain goods and services.	0	-2	-1	0	+1	+1	+2
Creating human-scale, tree-lined walkable streets and bicycle routes throughout the project site and extending the street grid street pattern that is characteristic of the existing city neighborhoods and districts throughout Alameda Point.	0	-2	-1	0	0	+1	+2
Increasing the City's supply of land available for residential development and increasing the supply of affordable housing sites for Alameda and the region to balance the jobs proposed for the project site and attract potential riders for proposed transit.	0	-2	-1	+1	0	+1	+2
Including a mix of single-family homes, attached townhomes, a mix of stacked flats and low and midrise multifamily housing with higher-density housing concentrated around transit nodes, where possible.	0	-2	-1	0	0 ~~-1~~	+1	+2
Including a diversity of housing types and pricing that attract the market segments most likely to use alternatives to the automobile, such as self-selective transit commuters and households with zero to low-automobile ownership.	0	-2	-1	0	+1	+1	+2
Facilitating the relocation and consolidation of existing supportive housing providers in new facilities at Alameda Point.	0	-1	-1	+1	0 ~~-1~~	+1	+2

TABLE 5-7
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
A. Land Use Consistency and Compatibility							
Impact 4.A-1: Development facilitated by the proposed Alameda Point project would not physically divide an established community within the City of Alameda. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.A-2: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the General Plan and zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.A-3: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially conflict with an applicable Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.A-4: Development facilitated by the proposed project, combined with cumulative development in the defined geographic area, including past, present, reasonably foreseeable future development, could potentially have significant adverse cumulative impacts in the area. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
B. Population and Housing							
Impact 4.B-1: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially induce substantial population or housing growth both directly and indirectly. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS	LS⇧
Impact 4.B-2: Development facilitated by the proposed could potentially displace a substantial number of people or housing. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.B-3: Development facilitated by the proposed project, in conjunction with potential past, present, and future development in the surrounding region could potentially introduce additional population to the region, and would result in unanticipated population, housing, or employment growth, or the displacement of existing residents or housing units on a regional level. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS	LS⇧
C. Transportation and Circulation							
Impact 4.C-1: Development facilitated by the proposed project would generate temporary increases in traffic volumes on area roadways during construction. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM⇩	LSM	LSM	LSM⇧	LSM⇧

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
Impact 4.C-2: Development facilitated by the proposed project would potentially result in a transportation impact at study intersection under Existing plus Project conditions. (Significant)	N	SU	SU⇩	SU	SU	SU⇧	SU⇧
Impact 4.C-3: The increase in traffic on the freeway mainline due to the project would result in negligible changes in density (vehicles per lane) and no change in LOS, with the exception of the segment of I-980 south of I-580. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.C-4: The change in traffic volumes on the freeway ramps due to the project would result in no change in LOS and minimal, if any, change in density (vehicles per lane). (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.C-5: Cumulative development, including the proposed project, would potentially result in transportation impacts at local study intersections under Cumulative plus project conditions. (Significant)	N	SU	SU⇩	SU	SU	SU⇧	SU⇧
Impact 4.C-6: The increase in traffic on the freeway mainline due to the project results in negligible changes in density and no change in LOS under cumulative conditions. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.C-7: The change in traffic volumes on the freeway ramps due to the project results in no change in LOS and minimal, if any, change in density under existing conditions. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.C-8: Development facilitated by the proposed project would potentially result in inadequate emergency access. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.C-9: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially increase traffic safety hazards for vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians on public roadways due to roadway design features or incompatible uses. (Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
C. Transportation and Circulation (cont.)							
Impact 4.C-10: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially be inconsistent with adopted polices, plans, and programs supporting alternative transportation. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS⇩	LS⇩	LS⇩
Impact 4.C-11: The addition of project-generated traffic would increase traffic volumes on many CMP and MTC roadways above	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧

LSM = Less than Significant with any proposed mitigation
LSM⇧ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
LSM⇩ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also decreased effect compared to proposed project

SU = Significant and Unavoidable
SU⇧ = Significant and Unavoidable, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
SU⇩ = Significant and Unavoidable; but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
N = No Impact
LS = Less than Significant

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
levels identified under 2020 Baseline Conditions. (Less than Significant)							
Impact 4.C-12: The addition of project-generated traffic would increase traffic volumes on many CMP and MTC roadways above levels identified under 2035 Baseline Conditions. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.C-13: The addition of project-generated traffic would increase ridership on AC Transit buses above that under 2020 Baseline conditions. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.C-14: The addition of project-generated traffic would increase ridership on AC Transit buses above that under 2035 Cumulative Baseline conditions. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.C-15: The addition of project-generated passengers would increase ridership on BART above that under 2020 Baseline conditions. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.C-16: The addition of project-generated passengers would increase ridership on BART above that under 2035 Cumulative Baseline conditions. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources							
Impact 4.D-1: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially have a significant, adverse impact on Historic Resources within the Alameda Historic District. (Significant)	N	SU	LSM⇩	SU	SU	SU	SU⇧
Impact 4.D-2: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially result in the inadvertent discovery of unique archaeological resources. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
D. Cultural and Paleontological Resources (cont.)							
Impact 4.D-3: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially result in the discovery of unidentified unique paleontological resources. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.D-4: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially result in the inadvertent discovery of human remains. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.D-5: Development facilitated by the proposed project, in conjunction with, past, present, and future development, could potentially adversely affect historic architectural resources in the	N	SU	LSM	SU	SU	SU	SU

LSM = Less than Significant with any proposed mitigation
LSM⇧ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
LSM⇩ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
SU = Significant and Unavoidable
SU⇧ = Significant and Unavoidable, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
SU⇩ = Significant and Unavoidable; but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
N = No Impact
LS = Less than Significant

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
project vicinity. (Significant)							
Impact 4.D-6: Development facilitated by the proposed project, in conjunction with cumulative development, would have a less-than-significant impact on unique archaeological and paleontological resources, as well as human remains, in the project vicinity. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
E. Biological Resources							
Impact 4.E-1: Development facilitated by the proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.E-2: Development facilitated by the proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.E-3: Development facilitated by the proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, 'other waters', and navigable waters as defined by Sections 404 and 10 of the Clean Water Act and waters of the State through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM⇩	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
E. Biological Resources (cont.)							
Impact 4.E-4: Development facilitated by the proposed project would interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.E-5: Development facilitated by the proposed project would conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.E-6: Development facilitated by the proposed project would conflict with an adopted local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM

LSM = Less than Significant with any proposed mitigation
LSM⇧ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
LSM⇩ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
SU = Significant and Unavoidable
SU⇧ = Significant and Unavoidable, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
SU⇩ = Significant and Unavoidable; but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
N = No Impact
LS = Less than Significant

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
Impact 4.E-7: The proposed project, in conjunction with other past, current, or foreseeable development in Alameda, could result in cumulative impacts on special-status species, habitats, wetlands and other waters of the U.S. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
F. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases							
Impact 4.F-1: Development facilitated by proposed project could potentially result in air quality impacts due to construction activities. (Significant)	N	SU	SU⇩	SU	SU	SU	SU⇧
Impact 4.F-2: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially generate operational emissions that would result in a considerable net increase of criteria pollutants and precursors for which the air basin is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. (Significant)	N	SU	SU⇩	SU	SU	SU⇧	SU⇧
Impact 4.F-3: Operation of the development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants or respirable particulate matter (PM2.5). (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.F-4: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially expose persons (new receptors) to substantial levels of TACs, which may lead to adverse health. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM⇩	LSM	LSM	LSM⇧	LSM⇧
F. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases (cont.)							
Impact 4.F-5: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially expose sensitive receptors to substantial carbon monoxide concentrations. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.F-6: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.F-7: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.F-8: Development facilitated by the proposed, when combined with past, present and other reasonably foreseeable development in the vicinity, could potentially result in cumulative criteria air pollutant air quality impacts. (Significant)	N	SU	SU⇩	SU	SU	SU⇧	SU⇧
Impact 4.F-9: Development facilitated by the proposed project could cumulatively expose persons to substantial levels of TACs,	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS

LSM = Less than Significant with any proposed mitigation
LSM⇧ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
LSM⇩ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
SU = Significant and Unavoidable
SU⇧ = Significant and Unavoidable, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
SU⇩ = Significant and Unavoidable; but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
N = No Impact
LS = Less than Significant

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
which may lead to adverse health effects. (Less than Significant)							
Impact 4.F-10: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.F-11: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
G. Noise							
Impact 4.G-1: Construction facilitated by the proposed project could potentially expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of the City noise standards. (Significant)	N	SU	SU	SU	SU	SU⇧	SU⇧
Impact 4.G-2: Construction facilitated by the proposed project could potentially result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM⇧	LSM⇧
G. Noise (cont.)							
Impact 4.G-3: Transportation-related operations facilitated by the proposed project could potentially result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity or above levels existing without the project. (Significant)	N	SU	SU⇩	SU	SU	SU⇧	SU⇧
Impact 4.G-4: Non-transportation-related operations facilitated by the proposed project could potentially result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.G-5: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially place noise-sensitive residential uses in a noise environment that would exceed the City's goal for exterior/interior noise exposure. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.G-6: Increases in traffic from development facilitated by the proposed project in combination with other development could potentially result in cumulatively considerable noise increases. (Significant)	N	SU	SU⇩	SU	SU	SU⇧	SU⇧

LSM = Less than Significant with any proposed mitigation
LSM⇧ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
LSM⇩ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
SU = Significant and Unavoidable
SU⇧ = Significant and Unavoidable, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
SU⇩ = Significant and Unavoidable; but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
N = No Impact
LS = Less than Significant

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
H. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity							
Impact 4.H-1: In the event of a major earthquake in the region, seismic ground-shaking could potentially injure people and cause collapse of or structural damage to structures and/or retaining walls developed under the proposed project. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.H-2: In the event of a major earthquake in the region, people and property at the project site could potentially be exposed to seismically-induced ground failure, including liquefaction, lateral spreading and earthquake-induced settlement. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.H-3: In the event of a major earthquake in the region, development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially be subject to adverse effects resulting from seismically induced landslides. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
H. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity (cont.)							
Impact 4.H-4: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.H-5: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code creating substantial risks to life or property. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
I**mpact 4.H-6:** Development facilitated by the proposed project, combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable projects, could potentially result in substantial adverse cumulative impacts to geology, soils, or seismic hazards. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
I. Hydrology and Water Quality							
Impact 4.I-1: Project construction facilitated by the proposed project, on-land and in-water, would potentially involve activities that could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.I-2: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially involve dewatering and shoring activities, which	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM

LSM = Less than Significant with any proposed mitigation
LSM⇧ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
LSM⇩ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
SU = Significant and Unavoidable
SU⇧ = Significant and Unavoidable, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
SU⇩ = Significant and Unavoidable; but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
N = No Impact
LS = Less than Significant

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
would potentially result in a discharge, which if contaminated would adversely affect the receiving water quality. (Significant)							
Impact 4.I-3: Development facilitated by the proposed project would potentially increase runoff and result in flooding on or offsite. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.I-4: Development facilitated by the proposed project would potentially result in increased use at the project site, including maintenance of new landscaping areas and open lawns, which would affect receiving water quality. (Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
I. Hydrology and Water Quality (cont.)							
Impact 4.I-5: Maintenance dredging to serve development facilitated by the proposed project would potentially affect water quality of the Bay. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.I-6: Development facilitated by the proposed project would potentially place housing and other structures in an area subject to 100-year flooding, however would not subject people or structures to a substantial risk of loss from a 100-year storm event. (Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.I-7: Development facilitated by the proposed project could expose people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death from inundation by a tsunami. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.I-8: Development facilitated by proposed project would potentially be subjected to flooding as a result of sea level rise. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.I-9: Increased construction activity and new development facilitated by the proposed project, in conjunction with past, present, reasonably foreseeable future development in Alameda, could potentially impact hydrologic resources including water quality. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
J. Hazards and Hazardous Materials							
Impact 4.J-1: Demolition of the existing structures on Alameda Point which contain hazardous building materials—such as lead-based paint, asbestos, and PCBs—could potentially expose workers, the public, or the environment from the transport, use, or disposal of these hazardous materials and waste. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.J-2: Construction at Alameda Point could potentially	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM

LSM = Less than Significant with any proposed mitigation
LSM⇧ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
LSM⇩ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
SU = Significant and Unavoidable
SU⇧ = Significant and Unavoidable, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
SU⇩ = Significant and Unavoidable; but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
N = No Impact
LS = Less than Significant

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
disturb soil and groundwater impacted by historical hazardous material use, which could expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to adverse conditions related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and waste. (Significant)							
J. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)							
Impact 4.J-3: Hazardous materials used onsite during construction activities (e.g., oils, solvents, etc.) at Alameda Point could potentially be spilled through improper handling or storage, potentially increasing public health and/or safety risks to future residents, maintenance workers, visitors, and the surrounding area. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.J-4: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially involve the transportation, use, and storage of hazardous materials, which could present public health and/or safety risks to residents, visitors, and the surrounding area. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.J-5: Hazardous materials used at Alameda Point during the operational phase could potentially be spilled through upset or accidental conditions, potentially increasing public health and/or safety risks to future residents, workers, visitors, and the surrounding area. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.J-6: Hazardous materials use at Alameda Point could potentially emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.J-7: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and could result in a safety hazard to the public or environment through exposure to previous contamination of soil or groundwater including vapor intrusion into buildings (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.J-8: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.J-9: Hazards at Alameda Point, in combination with past, present, and future projects could potentially contribute to cumulative hazards in the vicinity of the project site. (Less than	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS

LSM = Less than Significant with any proposed mitigation
LSM⇧ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
LSM⇩ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
SU = Significant and Unavoidable
SU⇧ = Significant and Unavoidable, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
SU⇩ = Significant and Unavoidable; but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
N = No Impact
LS = Less than Significant

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
Significant)							
K. Aesthetics							
Impact 4.K-1: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially have an adverse effect on a scenic vista. (Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.K-2: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rocks, outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.K-3: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings in a substantial manner. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 4.K-4: Development facilitated by proposed project could potentially create a new source of substantial light or glare which could potentially adversely affect day or nighttime views in the project area. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact 4.K-5: Development facilitated by the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, existing, approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could potentially result in cumulatively considerable impacts to aesthetic resources. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
L. Public Services and Recreation							
Impact 4.L-1: Development facilitated by proposed project could potentially result in an increase in calls for fire protection and emergency medical response services, and could require new or physically altered fire protection facilities in order to maintain acceptable performance standards. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.L-2: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially result in an increase in calls for police services, but would not require new or physically altered police facilities in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
L. Public Services and Recreation (cont.)							
Impact 4.L-3: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially result in new students for local schools, but would	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧

LSM = Less than Significant with any proposed mitigation
LSM⇧ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
LSM⇩ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
SU = Significant and Unavoidable
SU⇧ = Significant and Unavoidable, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
SU⇩ = Significant and Unavoidable; but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
N = No Impact
LS = Less than Significant

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
not require new or physically altered school facilities to maintain acceptable performance objectives. (Less than Significant)							
Impact 4.L-4: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially result in increased use of other governmental facilities, including libraries, but would not require new or physically altered government facilities to maintain acceptable performance objectives. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.L-5: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and recreation centers, but not to the extent that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated, nor would it cause the necessity for new or expanded facilities. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.L-6: Development facilitated by the proposed project would include recreational facilities and the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which could potentially have an adverse physical effect on the environment. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
Impact 4.L-7: Development facilitated by the proposed project, in conjunction with other past, current, or foreseeable development in Alameda, could potentially result in impacts related to public services and recreation. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
M. Utilities and Service Systems							
Impact 4.M-1: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially result in an exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS	LS⇧
Impact 4.M-3: Development facilitated by the proposed project would require and result in the need for new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
M. Utilities and Service Systems (cont.)							
Impact 4.M-4: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially have insufficient water supplies available to serve the development from existing entitlements and could require construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS

LSM = Less than Significant with any proposed mitigation
LSM⇧ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
LSM⇩ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
SU = Significant and Unavoidable
SU⇧ = Significant and Unavoidable, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
SU⇩ = Significant and Unavoidable; but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
N = No Impact
LS = Less than Significant

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
Impact 4.M-5: Development facilitated by the proposed project could potentially be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate solid waste generated by the project, and would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM⇩	LSM	LSM	LSM⇧	LSM⇧
Impact 4.M-6: Development facilitated by the proposed project, in combination with other past, present, existing, approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could potentially result in cumulatively considerable impacts to utilities and service systems. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧

LSM = Less than Significant with any proposed mitigation
LSM⇧ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
LSM⇩ = Less than significant with any proposed mitigation, but also decreased effect compared to proposed project

SU = Significant and Unavoidable
SU⇧ = Significant and Unavoidable, but also increased effect compared to proposed project
SU⇩ = Significant and Unavoidable; but also decreased effect compared to proposed project
N = No Impact
LS = Less than Significant

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly and regularly adopted and passed by the Council of the City of Alameda in a regular meeting assembled on the 4th day of February, 2014, by the following vote to wit:

AYES:	Councilmembers Chen, Daysog, Ezzy Ashcraft, Tam and Mayor Gilmore – 5.
NOES:	None.
ABSENT:	None.
ABSTENTIONS:	None.

IN WITNESS, WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of said City this 5th day of February, 2014.

Lara Weisiger, City Clerk
City of Alameda