CHAPTER 5
Alternatives

The purpose of this chapter is to describe and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project in order to inform the public and decision makers regarding the comparative merits of alternatives that might avoid or substantially lessen any of the project's significant environmental effects.

A. CEQA Requirements

CEQA requires that an EIR describe and evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, or to the location of the proposed project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(a), (d)). The "range of alternatives" is governed by the "rule of reason," which requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit informed public participation and an informed and reasoned choice by the decision-making body (Section 15126.6(a), (f)).

The range of alternatives shall include alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(a)-(c)). CEQA generally defines "feasible" to mean an alternative that is capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, technological, and legal factors. In addition, the following may be taken into consideration when assessing the feasibility of alternatives: site suitability; economic viability; availability of infrastructure; general plan consistency; other plans or regulatory limitations; jurisdictional boundaries; and the ability of the proponent to attain site control (Section 15126.6(f)(1)). If the lead agency concludes that no feasible alternative locations exist, it must disclose the reasons for this conclusion, and should include the reasons in the EIR (Section 15126.6(f)(2)(B)).

The description or evaluation of alternatives does not need to be exhaustive, and an EIR need not consider alternatives for which the effects cannot be reasonably determined and for which implementation is remote or speculative. An EIR need not describe or evaluate the environmental effects of alternatives in the same level of detail as the proposed project, but must include enough information to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(d)).

The "no project" alternative must be evaluated. This analysis shall discuss the existing conditions, as well as what could be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were

not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(2)).

CEQA also requires that an environmentally superior alternative be selected from among the alternatives. The environmentally superior alternative is the alternative with the fewest or least severe adverse environmental impacts. When the "no project" alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(2)).

B. Project Objectives

As previously presented in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, the proposed project is designed to achieve a specific set of objectives. The selection of alternatives was designed to create a range of alternatives that would achieve at least some of the project objectives. **Table 5-6** itemizes each of the project objectives and summarizes how each alternative evaluated may or may not meet the objectives. The Alameda Point project objectives are:

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:

- 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.

C. Factors in the Selection and Rejection of Alternatives

The *CEQA Guideline*s provide that an EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed, identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible, and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(c)). The following factors were considered in identifying the reasonable range of alternatives analyzed in this EIR:

- Requests by interested parties, community members, and decision makers at the scoping sessions for information regarding the relative environmental impacts of different development programs and different numbers of housing units;
- The extent to which the alternative would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the project;
- The feasibility of the alternative, taking into account site suitability, availability of infrastructure, consistency with applicable plans and regulatory limitations, and other factors;
- The extent to which an alternative contributes to a "reasonable range" of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice;
- The extent to which the alternatives may inform public decision making about whether to amend existing City plans and zoning and to adopt revised development plans for Alameda Point;
- The requirement of the *CEQA Guidelines* to consider a "no project" alternative and to identify an "environmentally superior" alternative;
- Previously completed planning and other studies concerning Alameda Point; and
- The extent to which the alternative would feasibly accomplish most of the basic project objectives.

CEQA *Guidelines* § 15126.6(c) requires an EIR to identify and briefly discuss any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process. In identifying alternatives, primary consideration was given to alternatives that would reduce significant impacts while still meeting most of the project objectives.

Because the basic purpose of the proposed project is to guide the redevelopment of Alameda Point, an alternative site would not be appropriate as an alternative to the proposed project. An environmental impact report will sometimes examine an "off-site" alternative in which the proposed project is constructed on a different site. This alternatives analysis does not include an analysis of an off-site alternative. The purpose of the subject project is to determine the best uses and development standards and requirements for a specific property: the lands vacated by the Navy when the federal government vacated NAS Alameda. Consideration of an alternative that considers the impact of developing a different property located at some other location would have no practical use or relevance to the decisions that must be made about the development of this particular piece of property.

A project that focuses exclusively on non-residential land uses which would exclude residential development would not achieve the mixed use and residential objectives of the proposed project, or the intent and obligations of the 2001 Settlement Agreement between the City and Renewed Hope Housing Advocates and its co-plaintiffs. Therefore, these alternatives were rejected from further analysis in the EIR because they do not meet the objectives, nor do they fulfill legal requirements.

D. Description of Alternatives Selected for Analysis

The alternatives selected for analysis are designed to inform the public discussion and the final decisions by the City of Alameda Planning Board and City Council on the proposed Alameda Point zoning, master infrastructure plan, and town center plan. Specifically, the range of alternatives is designed to inform decision makers about:

- Potential modifications to the proposed Alameda Point project that might minimize or avoid environmental impacts.
- The relative change in environmental impact (increase or decrease) that might be expected by potential modifications to the proposed project.
- The impact on the City's ability to achieve the project objectives with the potential modifications to the project.

D.1 The No Project/No New Development Alternative

This alternative considers the environmental impacts of continuing the existing uses on the site, which include 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; and rehabilitation and improvement of vacant buildings in the Historic District. 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.

Finally, this alternative would fail to meet the objectives related to climate change, greenhouse gas emissions, and transit-oriented development consistent with *Plan Bay Area*, the regional Sustainable Communities Strategies, related to greenhouse gas emission reductions as required by SB 375. 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.

As shown in Table 5-6, of all the alternatives considered in this analysis, the No Project Alternative would be the least successful alternative with respect to meeting the project objectives.

D.2 The Preservation/Less Development Alternative

This alternative considers the environmental impacts of allowing some additional development, but not as much as the proposed project. This alternative would include 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.

Given the limited development program in this alternative, the 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 in outside of the boundaries of the NAS Historic District.

This alternative would be able to achieve more of the objectives for the project than the No Project Alternative because it would allow for limited private reinvestment in Alameda Point. 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 almost half of the project site (i.e., the portion within the Historic District) in its historic military industrial configuration. The Historic District was designed by the Navy as a military industrial facility for the movement of large equipment, airplanes, and material, not for pedestrians and bicyclists. The spacing between buildings, the size of the streets and the orientation of buildings were all designed for industrial and military purposes, not mixed-use, transit-oriented development. By prohibiting development along the taxiways on the northern edge of the Seaplane Lagoon and within other appropriate locations within the Historic District, this alternative would limit transit-oriented development opportunities at the heart of the project.

Although this alternative would achieve more of the project objectives than the No Project Alternative, it would not achieve the project objectives as well as the proposed 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.

By limiting development on the taxiways and within the District, this alternative severely limits reinvestment potential. Land adjacent to or along the waterfront achieves greater land values, which can be leveraged to help pay for more infrastructure development or other public benefits such as public parks and waterfront promenades. By limiting private development along the taxiways, this alternative would make it more difficult to achieve reinvestment objectives. It is likely, that this alternative would require a significant reduction in the extent and scope of the infrastructure and sea level rise improvements. Given the location of the Historic District at the western end of the site, it is likely that the reductions in the infrastructure plan would be most evident in the Historic District, which may not be able to support sea level rise improvements or sewer, storm water or other utility upgrades.

Similar to the No Project Alternative, from a regional perspective, this would be less effective than the proposed project with regard to the objectives related to climate change, greenhouse gas emissions, and transit-oriented development consistent with *Plan Bay Area*, the regional Sustainable Communities Strategies, related to greenhouse gas emission reductions as required by SB 375. From a regional perspective, 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.

As shown in Table 5-6, the Preservation/Less Development Alternative would be marginally better than the No Project Alternative in meeting the project objectives, but not as good as the proposed project.

D.3 The Existing General Plan Alternative: More Housing and Less Jobs

Under this alternative, the City would not amend the existing General Plan and would allow approximately 500 more housing units (up to 1,928), but fewer jobs (6,000 instead of 8,900) than the proposed project. This, therefore, would constitute the No Project Alternative applicable to a proposed plan, under which existing land use plans continue in effect and are implemented.

With significantly fewer jobs, this alternative would be less effective than the proposed project at achieving the 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 as compared to the proposed project which would accommodate 5.5 million square feet of non-residential development. Alameda Point currently includes over 5 million square feet of existing buildings, of which approximately 1.8 million is occupied space. This alternative would require mothballing or demolishing a large number of existing buildings and maintaining large areas of the property vacant or underutilized. Alternatively, large areas of the property could be used for land intensive uses that do not require a lot of employees or improvements, such as large scale outdoor storage uses, such as lumber yard and auto storage yards.

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 goals. 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.

This alternative would perform slightly better on objectives related to housing opportunities because the alternative allows for up to 1,928 units as compared to the proposed project which is limited to 1,425 units.

D.4 The Multifamily Alternative

Under this alternative, the City would allow the same number of housing units and jobs as the proposed project but the all new housing would be limited to multifamily housing. Existing single family housing units and the “Big Whites” would remain, but no new single family housing would be constructed.

At the request of the public and the Oakland Chinatown community, this alternative was included to provide an opportunity to examine and document the potential transportation benefits of multifamily housing relative to single family housing, given the significant transportation constraints in West Alameda.

From an economic development perspective, this alternative would be very similar to the proposed project relative to job growth and business expansion. From a housing perspective, this alternative would not allow for a diversity of housing, 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 – similar to the Preservation/Less Development Alternative – may require a reduction in the scope of the infrastructure plan.

Also, similar to the Preservation/Less Development Alternative, 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 half the property, and 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.

D.5 The Transit Oriented Mixed Use Alternative

This alternative is designed to examine the relative environmental impacts of more housing and more retail development at Alameda Point. Generally consistent with the "Mixed Use Alternative" examined in the 2003 General Plan Amendment EIR and the "Transit Plus Scenario" examined in the 2008 Alameda Point Station Area Plan: Transit-Oriented Development Alternatives, this alternative increases the number of residential units to 3,400 units to create a more transit supportive development. The alternative maintains the total number of square feet of non-residential uses (approximately 5.5 million), but changes the mix of non-residential uses to increase the retail uses on the site from 300,000 square feet to 1 million, and decreases the industrial, warehouse, and office space to 4.5 million square feet to increase retail opportunities and services on the site and increase revenues for infrastructure and other site improvements.

This alternative provides an opportunity to examine the additional environmental impacts that might occur with these types of changes to the proposed project.

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 its objectives for the replacement and improvement of the 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 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 development the property, and could potentially affect the conveyance of future phases of the property and the ability to ensure orderly redevelopment of the property.

By increasing the retail component of the land use program, this alternative would do a better job of meeting the objectives for expansion of retail development and achievement of fiscal neutrality, through increase sales tax generated by the project. Additionally, by increasing the retail and residential component of the program, this alternative would create a more transit-oriented, mixed-use development than the project.

From a regional environmental perspective, as explained in the analysis of Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases below, this alternative would perform better than the project when considering the major environmental issues of global climate change and regional greenhouse gas emissions, with lower GHG emissions per service population. By allowing for more development at Alameda Point and within the inner Bay Area, this alternative would perform better related when considering project objectives related to climate change and greenhouse gas emissions.

D.6 High Density Alternative

The High Density Alternative includes 4,841 housing units and 3.8 million square feet of non-residential uses. This alternative is included at the request of speakers who attended the January and February 2013 Planning Board Scoping Sessions. This alternative is modeled on the plan contained in the 2009 Ballot Initiative for Alameda Point. It includes 4,841 housing units and 3,800,000 square feet of commercial uses.

This alternative includes significantly more housing than the proposed project (4,841 units compared to 1,425 units) and less non-residential use. With more housing this alternative has many of the same strengths and weaknesses associated with the More Housing/More Retail Alternative. With significantly more residential development, it can be expected that its weaknesses related to balancing development objectives with transportation constraints and capacity, as well as consistency with the EDC MOA will be significantly increased.

From a regional environmental perspective, this alternative will perform better than both the project and the Transit Oriented Mixed Use Alternative when considering the major environmental issues of global climate change and regional greenhouse gas emissions. By allowing far more development at Alameda Point and within the inner Bay Area, this alternative would perform better when considering project objectives related to climate change and 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 off-set 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.

Table 5-6 summarizes the analysis of ability of each alternative to achieve the project objectives. The ability of each alternative to achieve each project objective is assessed and given a numerical grade from -2 to +2, to qualitatively compare how each alternative performs compared to the proposed project on each objective. Hence, the project is ranked with a 0 (meets project objective) for all project objectives. A “-1” ranking indicates that the alternative would only partially achieve the objective. A “-2” ranking indicates that the alternative will not achieve the

objective. A "+1" ranking indicates that the alternative would do a slightly better job than the proposed project, and a "+2" ranking indicates that the alternative would do a much better job.

F. Environmental Assessment

This section presents an environmental assessment of each alternative relative to the proposed project, by environmental topic. As permitted by CEQA, the significant environmental effects of the alternatives are discussed in less detail than are the effects of the proposed project (CEQA *Guidelines*, Section 15126.6(d)). However, the analysis is conducted at a sufficient level of detail to provide the public and decision-makers with adequate information to fully evaluate the alternatives and to approve any of the alternatives without further environmental review.

The proposed project would result in significant environmental impacts, which are described in the previous sections of this document and summarized in Chapter 2. The impact discussion of each alternative below addresses each alternative's ability to avoid or reduce each of the significant impacts identified for the project. The following evaluation of the environmental impacts is summarized in **Table 5-7**.

F.1 Land Use

The analysis presented in Section 4.A, *Land Use*, found less than significant impacts associated with development of the proposed project. The analysis found that no mitigation measures would be needed to address potential land use impacts from redevelopment of Alameda Point.

The land use impacts from all of the alternatives would also be expected to be less than significant. All the alternatives (with the possible exception of the No Project Alternative) are designed to allow for the redevelopment of the former Naval Air Station in a manner that:

1) Would not divide an established community,

2) Would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding an environmental effect, and

3) Would not conflict with applicable Habitat Conservation Plan.

The land use impacts from all the alternatives would also be expected to be less than significant. No additional significant land use impacts would result and no additional land use mitigations would be needed for adoption of these alternatives.

F.2 Population and Housing

The analysis presented in Section 4.B, *Population and Housing*, found less than significant impacts associated with development of the proposed project.

The population and housing impacts from all of the alternatives would also be expected to be less than significant. All the alternatives (with the possible exception of the No Project Alternative) are designed to allow for the redevelopment of the former Naval Air Station in a manner that:

1) Would not induce substantial population or housing growth, and

2) Would not displace a substantial number of people or housing.

Although two of the alternatives (the Transit Mixed Use and the High Density) are designed to allow a larger number of housing units, the increase in population would not be considered a substantial increase from an environmental or regional perspective. In fact the two higher density alternatives would be better than the project at addressing regional housing needs as identified in *Plan Bay Area*. (The transportation impacts are discussed below.)

No additional significant land use impacts would result and no additional land use mitigations would be needed for adoption of any of the alternatives.

F.3 Transportation and Circulation

The analysis presented in Section 4.C, *Transportation and Circulation*, found that the proposed project would result in significant impacts that could be mitigated and significant impacts that could not be mitigated because the possible mitigation measures were not feasible, are within the responsibility or jurisdiction of another agency, or would result in significant impacts on other modes of transportation.

As described in Section 4.C, *Transportation and Circulation*, the impacts to vehicular, pedestrian, transit, and bicycle riders would be caused by increases in traffic volumes generated by the project. The increased traffic volumes are generated by the project generated trips. Because each alternative has a different development program, the trips generated by each alternative differ. **Table 5-1** summarizes the estimated peak-hour trips from each alternative.

TABLE 5-1
PEAK HOUR VEHICLE TRIP GENERATION BY PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Alternative	Total AM Trips	Total PM Trips
No Project	722	703
Preservation/Less Development	1,560	1,921
Project	2,928	3,294
Existing General Plan[a]	2,704	2,911
Multifamily[b]	2,631	2,950
Transit Oriented Mixed Use	3,521	4,255
High Density[c]	6,370	5,967

[a] SOURCE: 2002 General Plan EIR.
[b] SOURCE: 2008 Station Area Plan Transit Oriented Development Alternatives Study.
[c] SOURCE: 2009 Initiative Report.

No Project Alternative

None of the transportation impacts associated with the proposed project would occur under the No Project Alternative; however, it should be noted that, as described in Section 4.C, *Transportation and Circulation*, many of the impacted intersections are expected to be impacted under Cumulative No Project conditions because of other development projected in Alameda and the region. Therefore, although the No Project Alternative does not create impacts, the unacceptable conditions would continue to occur at a number of locations.

Automobile Impacts: As described in Section 4.C, *Transportation and Circulation*, the following intersections are either already at or would be at an unacceptable level of service in the No Project Alternative.

Alameda Intersections

- Main Street and Singleton Avenue in the a.m. (#3)
- Park Street and Clement Avenue in the a.m. and p.m. (#12)
- Park Street and Encinal Avenue in the p.m. (#14)
- Broadway and Otis Street in the a.m. (#18)
- Tilden Way and Blanding Avenue in the a.m. and p.m. (#19)
- High Street and Fernside Boulevard in the a.m. and p.m. (#20)
- High Street and Otis Drive in the a.m. and p.m. (#21)
- Island Drive and Otis Drive in the a.m. (#22)
- Fernside Boulevard and Otis Drive in the a.m. and p.m. (#25)
- Park Street and Blanding Avenue in the a.m. and p.m. (#26)
- Challenger Drive and Atlantic Avenue in the a.m. and p.m. (#27)

Oakland Intersections

- Jackson Street and Seventh Street in p.m. (#33
- Jackson Street and Sixth Street in a.m. and p.m. (#34)
- Jackson Street and Fifth Street in a.m. (#35)
- Webster Street and Eighth Street in a.m. and p.m. (#39)
- Broadway and Fifth Street in a.m. (#43)
- Brush Street and 11th Street in a.m. (#55)
- Brush Street and 12th Street in a.m. (#44)
- High Street and Oakport Street in a.m. and p.m. (#45)
- High Street and Coliseum Way in a.m. and p.m. (#46)
- Fruitvale Avenue and Ninth Street in a.m. and p.m. (#47)
- 29th Avenue and Ford Street in p.m. (#51)

Pedestrian Impacts: As described in Section 4.C, *Transportation and Circulation*, the following intersections would operate at worse than the LOS B standard in 2035 in the No Project Alternative due to regional and other development over the next 20 years.

- Main Street and Navy Way in the a.m. and p.m. (#1)
- Main Street and Ferry Terminal Way in the a.m. and p.m. (#2)

- Main Street and Pacific Avenue in the a.m. and p.m. (#6)
- Fifth Street and Willie Stargell Avenue in the a.m. and p.m. (#7)
- Webster Street and Atlantic Avenue in the a.m. and p.m. (#9)
- Constitution Way and Atlantic Avenue in the a.m. and p.m. (#12)
- Constitution Way and Lincoln Avenue in the a.m. and p.m. (#13)
- Eighth Street and Central Avenue in the a.m. and p.m. (#14)
- Challenger Drive and Marina Village Parkway in the a.m. and p.m. (#15)
- Challenger Drive and Atlantic Avenue in the a.m. and p.m. (#16)
- Park Street and Blanding Avenue in the a.m. and p.m. (#19)
- Park Street and Clement Avenue in the a.m. and p.m. (#20)
- Park Street and Encinal Avenue in the a.m. and p.m. (#23)
- Park Street and Otis Drive in the a.m. and p.m. (#24)
- Tilden Way and Blanding Avenue in the a.m. (#25)
- Broadway and Tilden Way in the a.m. and p.m. (#26)
- Broadway and Otis Drive in the p.m. (#28)
- High Street and Fernside Boulevard in the a.m. and p.m. (#29)
- High Street and Otis Drive in the a.m. and p.m. (#30)
- Island Drive and Otis Drive in the a.m. and p.m. (#32)

Transit Impacts: All of the transit routes would operate below the LOS B standard under existing and 2035 No Project Alternative with the exception of Willie Stargell Avenue between Main Street and Webster Street. As described in Section 4.C, *Transportation and Circulation*, the following transit routes would be below the LOS B standard and result in an increase of more than 10 percent in travel speed with the project.

- Main Street at Willie Stargell Avenue to Pacific Avenue at Webster Street in the a.m.
- Park Street from Blanding Avenue to Otis Drive in the a.m.

Bicycle Impacts: Under 2035 No Project conditions, all of the analysis locations would operate at worse than LOS B with the exception of Pacific Avenue between Main Street and Third Street. As described in Section 4.C, *Transportation and Circulation*, the following locations would be worse than the LOS B standard for bicycle impacts where the proposed project resulted in a project impact due an increase of 10 percent or more to the score.

- Willie Stargell Avenue between Main Street and Webster Street
- Main Street between Appezzato Parkway and Pacific Street
- Central Avenue between Main Street and Fourth Street
- Oak Street between Santa Clara Avenue and Central Avenue

The Preservation/Less Development Alternative

With fewer automobile trips, the Preservation/Less Development Alternative would have fewer transportation impacts than the project but more than the No Project Alternative.

Under the Less Development Alternative, all of the No Project impacted locations (listed above) would continue to occur and the addition of housing and jobs at Alameda Point would either cause the following additional impacts or cause a significant increase in severity of an impact that would occur in the No Project Alternative.

The Preservation/Less Development Alternative would result in impacts to following intersections. To adopt this alternative, the City should adopt the mitigations recommended for the project for these impacted locations.

- Park Street and Clement Avenue in the p.m. (#12)
- Park Street and Encinal Avenue in the p.m. (#14)
- High Street and Fernside Boulevard in the a.m. and p.m. (#20)
- High Street and Otis Drive in the p.m. in the a.m. (#21)
- Island Drive and Otis Drive in the a.m. (#22)
- Fernside Boulevard and Otis Drive in the a.m. (#25)
- Park Street and Blanding Avenue in the a.m. (#26)
- Challenger Drive and Atlantic Avenue in the a.m. and p.m. (#27)
- Webster Street and Eighth Street in a.m. and p.m. (#39)
- High Street and Oakport Street in a.m. (#45)
- High Street and Coliseum Way in p.m. (#46)
- 29th Avenue and Ford Street in a.m. and p.m. (#51)
- 23rd Avenue and Seventh Street in p.m. (#56)

Table G4-1 in Appendix G identifies the locations where pedestrian impacts would occur in the Preservation/Less Development Alternative. This alternative is projected to have pedestrian impacts at fewer locations than the project. As shown in the table, the impacted locations represent a subset of the locations for the project. The mitigations for each of these locations would be the same mitigation as recommended for the location in the project analysis in Section 4.C, *Transportation and Circulation*.

- Main Street and Pacific Avenue (#6)
- Constitution Way and Atlantic Avenue (#24)

Table G4-2 in Appendix G displays the results for bicycle LOS for the Preservation/Less Development Alternative conditions for both a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Similar to pedestrian and vehicle impacts, this alternative is projected to have fewer locations with impacts to bicycle than the project. None of the impacted locations under the Preservation/Less Development Alternative conditions would be new beyond those that would be impacted under the project. Furthermore, the same mitigations for the project would be prescribed for those locations impacted under Preservation/Less Development Alternative conditions.

- Willie Stargell Avenue between Main Street and Webster Street
- Main Street between Singleton Avenue and Willie Stargell Avenue
- Central Avenue between Main Street and Webster Street

Transit Impacts: Table G4-3 in Appendix G displays the results for transit LOS for the Preservation/Less Development Alternative conditions for both a.m. and p.m. peak hours. As with the other modes, the impacts to transit are a subset of the locations identified for the project. Likewise, the necessary mitigation would be the same as that recommended for the project.

- Park Street between Blanding Avenue and Otis Drive

Existing General Plan Alternative

This alternative would generate 200 to 300 fewer peak-hour vehicle trips than the proposed project. The differences, which are relatively small, can be attributed to the fact that although the proposed project includes approximately 500 more residential units, the increases in trips generated by the additional units are offset by the substantial reduction in jobs under the Existing General Plan Alternative. Given that the differences in vehicle trips are so small, it can be expected that the impacts anticipated with the proposed project would also occur in this alternative. Although the locations would be the same, it may be expected that the significant unavoidable a.m. peak period vehicle impacts associated with the proposed project would be slightly less severe in this alternative, but that the p.m. peak hour vehicle impacts would be slightly more severe due to the slight increase in p.m. peak trips. However, the change in severity would not even be noticeable to the average driver due to the daily and seasonal variety in transportation conditions that normally occur, as typical traffic volumes vary by approximately five percent on a daily basis.

To reduce impacts of the General Plan Alternative, the City should adopt all of the mitigation measures recommended for the proposed project. No new mitigations would be needed.

The Multifamily Alternative

This alternative includes the same amount of residential and non-residential use as the proposed project, but the residential component of the alternative is limited to multifamily housing. In 2009, the City of Alameda conducted a study examining the transportation benefits of multi-family housing as compared to single family housing. The Alameda Point Station Area Plan – Transit Oriented Development Alternatives, which was funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, found that a plan that provided all of the new housing at Alameda Point in a multifamily configuration would:

- Allow the alternative to use less land and concentrate the homes in smaller area, which would create a more pedestrian friendly, transit supportive development;
- Increase transit use and reduce automobile use; and
- Result in reduction in a.m. and p.m. peak hour vehicle trips.

Based upon these findings, the Multifamily Alternative would generate approximately 2,631 a.m. peak hour trips and 2,950 p.m. peak hour trips, or a reduction in trips of 297 during the a.m. peak hour and 344 during the p.m. peak hour, relative to the project.

Similar to the General Plan Alternative, the project-wide reduction in trips under the Multifamily Alternative would reduce the severity of the impacted locations but these reductions would not necessarily reduce an impact to a less than significant level. It would be expected that impacts associated with the proposed project would be slightly less severe in this alternative, due to the trip reductions and the increased transit use. However, transportation impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, as with the proposed project.

Although adoption of this alternative would require the adoption of the same mitigation measures as the proposed project, the reduction in trips would increase the likelihood that the first mitigation (Transportation Demand Management) would be successful in reducing the severity of the impact to the extent that the secondary recommended physical improvements at each location would or may not be necessary, at least at certain locations. As described in Section 4.C, the mitigation program is designed to require TDM as a first tier mitigation. The City will then monitor the success of the TDM program to determine whether the forecasted impact in fact occurs at the location. (The traffic analysis did not assume trip reductions from TDM.) If the monitoring proves that the physical improvement is still needed, then the project will fund the physical improvement.

In the multifamily alternative, it may be expected that although the City adopts the same package of mitigations, the number of physical improvements that will be necessary will be less than the project, because the Multifamily Alternative generates less trips and the residents of multifamily housing are more likely to take advantage of transit, car share, shuttles and other TDM program components.

The Transit Oriented Mixed Use Alternative

This alternative would generate more trips than the proposed project, as it would involve a total of 3,230 households and 8,408 employees. As a result of the increased trips, this alternative does cause an increase in the number of transportation impacts and required mitigations. Mitigation Measures for this alternative are presented in **Appendix G4**.

Table G4-4 in Appendix G4 includes the a.m. and p.m. peak hour levels of service for vehicles. As shown in Table G4-4, in addition to the locations impacted in the project scenario, this alternative would add the following locations to the list of intersections that would be impacted:

- Ralph M. Appazzatto Memorial Parkway and Webster Street in the p.m.(#7).
- Central Avenue and Eighth Street in the p.m. (#9)
- Broadway and Tilden Avenue in the p.m. (#16)
- Constitution Way and Atlantic Avenue in the p.m. (#24)

Appendix G, Table G4-5 identifies pedestrian impacts for the alternative. As shown in the table additional pedestrian impacts would occur at:

- Main Street and Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway (#5)
- Broadway and Tilden Way (#16)

- Broadway and Otis Drive (#18)
- High Street and Otis Drive (#21)
- Island Drive and Otis Drive (#22)
- Park Street and Blanding (#26)
- Challenger Drive and Atlantic Avenue (#27)

Appendix G, Table G4-6 includes the results for transit LOS under Cumulative Plus Project and Transit Oriented Mixed Use Alternative conditions for both a.m. and p.m. peak hours. One additional impact would occur at Willie Stargell Avenue between Main Street and Webster Street.

Appendix G Table G4-7 displays the results for bicycle LOS for this alternative. As shown in the table, one additional location would experience Bicycle level of service impacts on Pacific Avenue between Main Street and Webster Street.

In conclusion, to adopt this alternative, the City would adopt the transportation mitigations recommended for the project and the additional mitigations described for the additional impacts caused by this alternative. The additional mitigations are included in Appendix G.

High Density Alternative

A comprehensive quantitative multimodal analysis of the High Density Alternative was not completed. In 2009; however, a detailed quantitative analysis of this alternative was completed, but that analysis did not consider bicycle, pedestrian, and transit impacts (see **Appendix M**). Therefore, the following analysis represents a qualitative analysis based upon the quantitative work that was done for the proposed project, and the other alternatives.

Based upon the previous analyses, it can be assumed that the number of locations impacted and the severity of the impacts at those locations will be more severe in the High Density Alternative than in any of the other alternatives and that additional mitigations would be necessary at those locations.

F.4 Cultural Resources

The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural resources as a result of activities to redevelop, reuse, and re-design the former naval air station for civilian use. Other potential impacts to archeological, paleontological, and human remains that might occur as the result of redevelopment could be mitigated to a level of less than significance with mitigation.

No Project Alternative

The cultural resource impacts from the No Project Alternative would also be expected to be less than significant, due little or no actual physical improvements being made to the property. However, as described above, the No Project Alternative would also not correct the ongoing and current deterioration of the NAS Historic District that has been occurring since the Navy's

departure in 1997. 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 increases the costs to adaptively reuse and rehabilitate existing buildings and facilities. As these costs increase over time, the feasibility for economically viable reuse and rehabilitation becomes less thereby increasing the likelihood that the buildings stay vacant and deteriorate.

Preservation/Less Development Alternative

The Preservation Alternative is specifically designed to avoid the potential cultural impacts associated with the proposed project. Due to the need to repair, maintain, and/or replace subsurface infrastructure supporting the Historic District, the less than significant impacts to archeological, paleontological, and human remains could still occur and would need to be mitigated to avoid significant impacts.

As designed, this alternative would attempt to avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural resources that might result from activities to redevelop, reuse, and re-design the former naval air station for civilian use. For example, proposals described in the 1996 Community Reuse Plan such as plans to re-purpose the seaplane taxiways for mixed use development and public spaces would not be proposed. Buildings that could not be feasibly repurposed and rehabilitated would be mothballed and preserved. As described above, the alternative may fail to meet a number of project objectives, but it would avoid the potential significant and unavoidable impacts to the Historic District that might occur under the proposed project.

Adoption of this alternative would avoid the need for Historic Preservation impact mitigations, but the City would still need to adopt the mitigations related to archeological, paleontological, and human remains that might be discovered as the result of excavation for infrastructure improvements elsewhere on the property.

Other Alternatives

The cultural resource impacts from these alternatives would be expected to be the same as the proposed project. No additional significant impacts would result and no additional mitigations would be needed for adoption of these alternatives.

F.5 Biological Resources

The analysis presented in Section 4.E, *Biological Resources*, found less than significant impacts with mitigation associated with development of the proposed project during both construction and occupation.

In all alternatives, the project site includes some level of human occupation and some construction activities. Even in the No Project Alternative, the site would continue to require some construction work to maintain and repair existing facilities, and buildings adjacent to the

sensitive wildlife areas would, remain occupied. The Preservation Alternative would assume no reuse of the Seaplane Lagoon; therefore, it would have less impact on marine biological resources.

Therefore, all of the alternatives, with the exception of the Preservation Alternative, could be expected to result in similar biological impacts, and the recommended mitigations would be required under each alternative to reduce the potential biological impacts to a level of less than significant. Furthermore, the design of the mitigation measures is such that they would not need to be adjusted to reflect the different development programs within the different alternatives, specifically because they are tied to the 2012 Biological Opinion and Memorandum of Agreement between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the City requirements on the site.

F.6 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases

The analysis presented in Section 4.F, *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases*, found that the proposed project would result in significant impacts that could not be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Specifically, the proposed project could have significant and unavoidable impacts related to construction emissions, depending on the phasing of construction. Additionally, the proposed project would generate a variety of emissions from sources, such as 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. Even with mitigation, the proposed project would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to emissions of ROG and PM10, and potentially for PM2.5. Similarly, the proposed project would have a significant cumulative impact on criteria air pollutant air quality. However, effects related to exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants would be less than significant, with mitigation, as would effects related to consistency with the Clean Air Plan. Odor and carbon monoxide impacts would be less than significant.

No Project Alternative

None of the air quality impacts associated with the proposed project would occur under the No Project Alternative, as no construction would occur and no additional trips would be generated from the project site.

The Preservation/Less Development Alternative

With less overall construction and fewer automobile trips, the Less Development Alternative would have fewer emissions impacts than the proposed project, but more than the No Project Alternative. Operational emissions would be significant and unavoidable, as with the proposed project, and the mitigation measures required under the proposed project would also be required of this alternative. However, depending on the timing of development, construction-related emissions could be less than significant, unlike the project, especially because this alternative would result in greater reuse of existing structures.

The General Plan Alternative

This alternative would generate 200 to 300 fewer peak-hour vehicle trips than the proposed project, and the number of daily vehicle trips would also be lower. As such the criteria pollutant emissions would be somewhat less than those of the proposed project, but would also be significant and unavoidable with mitigation. With more residential units and less non-residential development, construction under this this alternative would be comparable in magnitude to that with the proposed project, and construction emissions would remain significant and unavoidable depending on the phasing of construction. Operational and construction mitigation measures required under the proposed project would also be required of this alternative.

The Multifamily Alternative

This alternative includes the same amount of residential and non-residential use as the proposed project, but the residential component of the alternative is limited to multifamily housing. Vehicle trip generation would be similar to that of the General Plan Alternative. Therefore, while this alternative would also generate fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed project and operational emissions would be slightly less severe in this alternative, the mitigation measures required for this alternative would be the same as required by the proposed project, and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Similarly, construction emissions would also remain significant and unavoidable depending on the phasing of construction. The mitigation measures required under the proposed project would also be required of this alternative.

The Transit Oriented Mixed Use Alternative

This alternative would generate more trips than the proposed project, as it would involve a total of 3,230 households and 8,408 employees. As a result of the increased trips, this alternative would result in an increase in operational emissions, compared to those of the project. The significant and unavoidable impacts associated with operation and construction would be more severe under this alternative. The mitigation measures required under the proposed project would also be required of this alternative, and impacts would be significant and unavoidable, as with the project.

It is noted that, to the extent that an alternative develops greater density and transit accessibility, that alternative could result in an incremental regional benefit with respect to criteria air pollutants. This is because it can be assumed that the amount of regional growth in population and employment will not change as a result of development patterns at Alameda Point and, as shown in the recently certified Final EIR for *Plan Bay Area* (ABAG and MTC, 2013; DEIR, p. 3-1.24), development scenarios that increase density and focus development near transit can incrementally reduce regional vehicle trips for the same number of households and jobs, particularly if increased transit service is provided. However, at the level of an individual project, even one as large as the proposed Alameda Point project, it would be speculative to try to determine whether additional new housing and employment at Alameda Point would offset an equal number of households and jobs that might otherwise be developed in a less transit-friendly part of the Bay Area and to determine the regional benefit of such a locational swap.

Table 5-2 and **Table 5-3** summarizes the average daily and annual emissions of criteria pollutants that would be generated by the Transit Oriented Alternative in 2035 and compares them with BAAQMD thresholds. As indicated in the tables, net operational emissions of ROG, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5 would exceed the BAAQMD thresholds. Unlike the project, this alternative would result in significant emissions of NOx (before and after mitigation) and PM2.5 (after mitigation) on a daily and annual basis.

TABLE 5-2
TRANSIT ORIENTED MIXED USE ALTERNATIVE:
AVERAGE DAILY OPERATIONAL-RELATED POLLUTANT EMISSIONS (pounds/day)[a]

Scenario	ROG	NOx	PM10	PM2.5
Unmitigated Emissions – Year 2035	627	107	244	75
BAAQMD Operational Threshold	54	54	82	54
Significant Impact?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**
Mitigated Emissions – Year 2035	591	98	235	67
BAAQMD Operational Threshold	54	54	82	54
Significant Impact?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**

NOTES:
[a] Emissions include results modeled with CalEEMod for Alternative operations. Additional data and assumptions are in Appendix I.
[b] Mitigated Emissions are based on incorporation of Mitigation Measure 4.F-4 into the CalEEMod model.

TABLE 5-3
TRANSIT ORIENTED MIXED USE ALTERNATIVE:
ANNUAL OPERATIONAL-RELATED POLLUTANT EMISSIONS (tons/year)[A]

Scenario	ROG	NOx	PM10	PM2.5
Unmitigated Emissions – Year 2035	114	20	44	14
BAAQMD Operational Threshold	10	10	15	10
Significant Impact?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**
Mitigated Emissions – Year 2035	108	18	43	12
BAAQMD Operational Threshold	10	10	15	10
Significant Impact?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**

NOTES:
[a] Emissions include results modeled with CalEEMod for Alternative operations. Additional data and assumptions are in Appendix I.
[b] Mitigated Emissions are based on incorporation of Mitigation Measure 4.F-4 (for area and energy sources) into the CalEEMod model.

Roadway Toxic Air Contaminants. 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). Upon review, the streets with the greatest increase of traffic from this alternative with receptors in the vicinity are at Main and Atlantic (Alameda) and Jackson and 7th (Oakland) and Harrison and 8th (Oakland). Cancer risk and PM2.5 concentrations were estimated for these streets using the BAAQMD Surface Street

Screening Tables for Alameda County. The incremental health risk and PM2.5 concentrations from increased traffic on these roadways for existing and/or potential future sensitive receptors after Cumulative development and Alternative development would be 3.1 in a million and 0.1 ug/m^3 (Main and Atlantic), 0.4 in a million and 0.01 ug/m^3 (Jackson and 7th), 0.3 in a million and 0.01 ug/m^3 (Harrison and 8th). These incremental risk and PM2.5 concentrations from Alternative traffic would be fractionally greater than the comparable risk and concentration values for the proposed project, owing to greater traffic volumes, would be considerably below the respective BAAQMD thresholds of significance. Therefore, roadway TAC values, while slightly greater than those for the project, would be less than significant.

Greenhouse Gases. The CalEEMod model, version 2013.2, was used to estimate GHG emissions increases in motor vehicle trips, grid electricity usage, solid waste, and other sources (including area sources, natural gas combustion, and water/wastewater conveyance). **Table 5-4** presents a gross estimate of unmitigated operational CO_2e emissions in a buildout horizon year of 2035 resulting from these sources for this alternative.

TABLE 5-4
ESTIMATED EMISSIONS OF GREENHOUSE GASES (2035)

Source[a]	Emissions (metric tons of CO_2e per year)
Construction (Amortized)	814
Area	288
Energy	18,241
Motor Vehicle Trips	58,600
Solid Waste	4,523
Water	2,542
Total GHG Emissions (Construction + Operations)	85,008
Total Net Unmitigated GHG Emissions (Alternative – Existing)	59,952
Operational GHG Emissions per Increase in Service Population (7,408 jobs + 7,516 population = 14,924)[b]	4.0
BAAQMD Efficiency Threshold	*4.6*
Significant (Yes or No)?	***No***

NOTES:

[a] GHG emissions were calculated using the CalEEMod model for the alternative development, for the Existing scenario and for 2035 buildout. Additional assumptions and data are included in Appendix I,

[b] The net service population of represents the incremental increase in jobs and population within the alternative site due to development. The value does not include jobs and population associated with the Existing scenario.

Table 5-4 indicates that the net GHG emissions associated with this alternative would be below BAAQMD's "efficiency threshold" of 4.6 metric tons of CO_2e per service population per year. This would represent a cumulatively less-than-significant GHG impact. Although this alternative would result in greater overall emissions of GHGs than the project, the emissions per increase in service population would be less than the project since the alternative includes substantially more residential population.

In conclusion, adoption of this alternative would result in additional local air quality impacts, but the mitigation measures recommended for the project are the same measures that would be recommended for this alternative. Given the limitations on the types of mitigations that can be feasibly implemented to address air quality impacts, there are no additional feasible mitigations that could be implemented to further reduce air quality impacts.

The High Density Alternative

This alternative would generate approximately twice the number of vehicle trips as the proposed project, as it would involve more construction. Therefore, the number of air quality impacts associated with this alternative would be the highest of all the alternatives. The significant and unavoidable impacts associated with operation and construction would be more severe under this alternative. The mitigation measures required under the proposed project would also be required of this alternative.

F.7 Noise

The analysis presented in Section 4.G, *Noise*, found that the proposed project would result in both significant impacts that could be mitigated and significant impacts that could not be mitigated because the mitigations could not reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Specifically, the proposed project could have significant and unavoidable related to construction noise, depending on the phasing of construction.

The proposed project would generate a significant amount of traffic, and therefore increase noise associated with traffic. The mitigation measure which requires the implementation of a TDM program cannot be certain to work sufficiently to reduce traffic noise; therefore, the impact would be significant and unavoidable. Similarly, the proposed project would have a cumulative impact on noise related to automobile traffic, even with the implementation of mitigation.

No Project Alternative

None of the noise impacts associated with the proposed project would occur under the No Project Alternative, as no construction would occur and no additional trips would be generated from the project site.

Preservation/Less Development Alternative

With less overall construction and fewer automobile trips, the Less Development Alternative would have fewer noise impacts than the proposed project, but more than the No Project Alternative. The mitigation measures required under the proposed project would also be required of this alternative.

The General Plan Alternative

This alternative would generate 200 to 300 fewer peak-hour vehicle trips than the proposed project. As such the noise associated with the alternative's traffic would be incrementally less than with the proposed project. Although slightly fewer locations would experience a significant increase in noise, traffic noise would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation, as with the project. Similarly, construction noise would also remain significant and unavoidable depending on the phasing of construction. The mitigation measures required under the proposed project would also be required of this alternative.

The Multifamily Alternative

This alternative includes the same amount of residential and non-residential use as the proposed project, but the residential component of the alternative is limited to multifamily housing. The project-wide reduction in trips by 10 percent under the Multifamily Alternative would reduce the severity and number of the impacted noise locations but these reductions not to a less-than-significant level. Thus, the significant unavoidable impacts associated with the proposed project related to traffic noise would be slightly less severe in this alternative, due to the trip reductions and the increased transit use. However, given that the differences in trips are relatively small, the mitigation measures required for this alternative would be the same as required by the proposed project, and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Similarly, construction noise would also remain significant and unavoidable depending on the phasing of construction. The mitigation measures required under the proposed project would also be required of this alternative.

The Transit Oriented Mixed Use Alternative

This alternative would generate more trips than the proposed project, as it would involve a total of 3,230 households and 8,408 employees. As a result of the increased trips, this alternative does cause an increase in the number noise impacts and required mitigations related to automobile traffic noise. The significant and unavoidable impacts associated with operation and construction would be more serve under this alternative. The mitigation measures required under the proposed project would also be required of this alternative.

As for the project, the major source of noise associated with this alternative development would be from traffic on the street network, which would result in cumulative noise increases created by the Transit Oriented Alternative together with existing traffic and traffic from the development of other projects in the area through the year 2035. Development facilitated by this alternative would result in cumulatively considerable noise if the cumulative noise increase with the alternative results in a 5 dBA permanent increase in ambient noise levels along analyzed streets (i.e., the cumulative condition including the alternative compared to the existing scenario) and a 3 dBA permanent increase is attributable to the alternative (i.e., the cumulative condition including the alternative compared to the cumulative no alternative scenario).

As shown in **Table 5-5** below, this alternative would result in the same incremental cumulative noise increases as described for the project along the streets in Oakland with the greatest increase in future traffic volumes—Harrison Street, Eighth Street, and Jackson Street. Accordingly, the alternative would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact with respect to traffic noise in Oakland.

In Alameda, based on the increased traffic for this alternative, it was assumed that similar cumulatively considerable impacts would occur as for the project on segments 1, 2, and 12, so these roadways were not included in the modeling. As shown in Table 5-6, unlike the project, this alternative would result in a greater than 5 dBA cumulatively significant noise level increase (shown in the column labeled "D-A") along segment 13 (Atlantic Avenue west of Main Street). In addition, this alternative would result in greater than 3 dBA cumulatively considerable noise increases (shown in the column labeled "D-C") along segment 8 (Main Street south of West Midway Avenue) and segment 13 (Atlantic west of Main), which were not considered significant under the project. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.G-3 would reduce the alternative's cumulatively considerable impact, but not to a less-than-significant level.

High Density Alternative

This alternative would generate more trips than the proposed project, as it would involve more construction. As such, the High Density Alternative would increase in the number of noise impacts and required mitigations. The significant and unavoidable impacts associated with operation and construction would be more serve under this alternative. The mitigation measures required under the proposed project would also be required of this alternative.

F.8 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The analysis presented in Section 4.H, *Geology, Soils, and Seismicity*, found less than significant impacts with mitigation associated with development of the proposed project during both construction and occupation.

In all alternatives, the property includes some level of human occupation and some construction activities. Even in the No Project Alternative, the site would continue to require some construction work to maintain and repair existing facilities and infrastructure, upgrade obsolete infrastructure, and certain buildings would continue to be occupied.

Therefore, all of the alternatives could be expected to result in similar geology, soils, and seismicity impacts, and the recommended mitigations would be required to reduce the potential impacts to a level of less than significant. Furthermore, the design of the mitigation measure is such that they would not need to be adjusted to reflect the different development programs within the different alternatives.

TABLE 5-5
TRANSIT ORIENTED ALTERNATIVE: EXISTING AND PROJECTED PEAK-HOUR TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS ALONG STREETS IN THE PROJECT VICINITY

Street Segment	Peak-Hour Noise Level, dBA, Leq[1]						
	Existing [A]	Cumulative 2035 [C]	Cumulative 2035 Plus Alternative [D]	Incremental Increase vs Existing [D-A]	Cumulatively Significant? (Yes or No)[3]	Incremental Increase vs Cum. 2035 [D-C]	Cumulatively Considerable? (Yes or No)[3]
3. Main St south of Ferry Terminal	64.7	64.6	67.4	2.7	No	2.9	No
4. Main St north of Singleton Ave	65.2	67.2	69.3	4.1	No	2.1	No
5. Main St south of Singleton Ave	66.3	70.8	71.8	5.5	Yes	1.0	No
7. Main St north of W Midway Ave	66.2	70.8	71.8	5.6	Yes	1.0	No
8. Main St south of W Midway Ave	65.1	68.1	71.2	6.1	Yes	3.1	**Yes**
9. Willie Stargell Ave east of Main St	58.7	61.7	64.1	5.4	Yes	2.4	No
10. Main St north of Atlantic Ave	62.2	65.1	67.7	5.5	Yes	2.6	No
11. Main St south of Atlantic Ave	62.9	64.3	67.8	4.9	No	3.5	No
13. Atlantic Ave west of Main St	59.1	59.2	64.5	5.4	**Yes**	5.3	**Yes**
14. Main St north of Pacific Ave	63.2	64.5	67.7	4.5	No	3.2	No
15. Main St south of Pacific Ave	65.9	67.2	70.4	4.5	No	3.2	No
17. High St south of Otis Dr	60.7	64.0	64.9	4.2	No	0.9	No
18. Atlantic Ave west of Constitution	57.8	62.1	63.8	6.0	Yes	1.7	No
19. Willie Stargell Ave west of 5th St	60.0	62.7	64.6	4.6	No	1.9	No
20. Seventh St west of Jackson St (O)	70.0	72.1	72.2	2.2	No	0.1	No
21. Eight Street west of Harrison (O)	65.3	70.5	70.7	5.4	Yes	0.2	No

NOTES"

O – Intersection located in Oakland

1 Noise levels were determined using FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA RD-77-108). As a general rule, in areas where the noise environment is dominated by traffic, the Leq during the peak-hour is generally equivalent to the CNEL at that location. Notably, a 4 dBA reduction was assumed for Willie Stargell Ave to account for existing rubberized asphalt and a 6 dBA reduction was assumed for Atlantic to account for existing noise walls around nearest homes.

2 Traffic noise is considered significant if the incremental increase in noise is 4 dBA or more if the resulting noise level would exceed that described as normally acceptable for the affected land use (60 dBA DNL or less for residential uses) or if the noise level increased by 6 dBA in any noise environment.

3 Road noise is assumed to be cumulatively significant if the Cumulative + Alternative minus the Existing scenario is 5 dBA or greater, and the alternative would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulatively significant impact if the Cumulative + Alternative minus the Cumulative scenario is 3 dBA or greater.

Bold-face indicates impact that would not occur with proposed project.

F.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

The analysis presented in Section 4.I, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, found less than significant impacts with mitigation associated with development of the proposed project during both construction and occupation.

In all alternatives, the property would experience some level of human occupation and some construction activities. Even in the No Project Alternative, the site would continue to require some construction work to maintain and repair existing facilities and infrastructure, upgrade obsolete infrastructure, and certain buildings would continue to be occupied.

Therefore, all of the alternatives could be expected to result in similar hydrology and water quality impacts, and the mitigation measures required of the proposed project would also be required to reduce the potential impacts to a level of less than significant of each of the alternatives. Furthermore, the design of the mitigation measures is such that they would not need to be adjusted to reflect the different development programs within the different alternatives.

F.10 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The analysis presented in Section 4.J, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, found less than significant impacts with mitigation associated with development of the proposed project during both construction and occupation.

The hazards and hazardous materials impacts under all the alternatives would also be expected to be less than significant with mitigation as remediation of the site would be required under all scenarios. No additional significant impacts would result and no additional mitigations would be needed for any of these alternatives beyond what would be required of the proposed project. It should be noted that under the No Project Alternative and possibly under the Less Development and Preservation Alternatives portions of the property may not have to be cleaned-up to residential standards which could entail less clean-up effort. Nonetheless, remediation activities and mitigation measures outlined in Section 4.J would be required of all the alternatives.

F.11 Aesthetics

The analysis presented in Section 4.K, *Aesthetics*, found less than significant impacts associated with development of the proposed project during both construction and occupation.

The aesthetic impacts from all the alternatives would also be expected to be less than significant. No additional significant impacts would result and no additional mitigations would be needed for adoption of these alternatives. It should be noted that under the No Project Alternative and possibly under the Less Development Alternative portions of the property could experience significant deterioration and blight over the years. Although these problems would detract from

the visual appearance of the property and could cause serious problems, they would not be considered significant aesthetic impacts under CEQA.

F.12 Public Services and Recreation

The analysis presented in Section 4.L, *Public Services and Recreation*, found less than significant impacts associated with development of the proposed project during both construction and occupation.

The public service and recreation impacts from all the alternatives would also be expected to be less than significant. No additional significant impacts would result and no additional mitigations would be needed for adoption of these alternatives. As described above, each of the alternatives except the No Project Alternative is designed to provide the full range of services needed to support the amount of development in each alternative. As described in Section 4.L, *Public Services and Recreation*, the City's fiscal neutrality policy ensures that the redevelopment of Alameda Point funds the operations and services needed to support the development.

F.13 Utilities and Service Systems

The analysis presented in Section 4.M, *Utilities and Service Systems*, found less than significant impacts with mitigation associated with development of the proposed project during both construction and occupation.

In all alternatives, the property would experience some level of human occupation and some construction activities. Even in the No Project Alternative, the site would continue to require some construction work to maintain and repair existing facilities, and certain buildings would continue to be occupied.

Therefore, all of the alternatives could be expected to result in similar utilities and service systems impacts, and the mitigation measures required of the proposed project would also be required to reduce the potential impacts to a level of less than significant of each of the alternatives. Furthermore, the design of the mitigation measures is such that they would not need to be adjusted to reflect the different development programs within the different alternatives.

It should be noted however that under the No Project Alternative and possibly under the Less Development Alternative, the current substandard storm water systems and storm water runoff areas would likely remain and continue to contribute and/or increase existing water quality issues at Alameda Point. Therefore, it is possible that the worst alternative from a utilities and service systems perspective is the No Project Alternative.

G. Environmentally Superior Alternative

Based on the evaluations above and the thresholds of significance used for each environmental topic in Chapter 4, the environmentally superior alternatives would be the No Project Alternative and the Preservation/Less Development Alternative.

The "No Project" alternative would avoid all of the environmental impacts associated with the redevelopment of Alameda Point, but would not meet any of the project objectives.

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 proposed project.

Based upon the thresholds of significance used in Chapter 4, and recommended by the CEQA Guidelines, and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the Transit Mixed Use Alternative and the High Density Alternative would result in greater traffic, air quality, noise, and climate change environmental impacts. 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 recently approved this year by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments argues 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 within the in the Bay Area. *Plan Bay Area* argues that increasing density and the number of jobs and housing in locations like Alameda Point will decrease pressures to develop in the outer Bay Area communities, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and generally improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gases.

Despite the potentially conflicting conclusions regarding transportation, air quality, and greenhouse gases, the Preservation/Less Development Alternative would still avoid or lessen impacts related to cultural resources and noise that are associated with the project, Therefore, in compliance with CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6, this analysis finds that the Preservation/Less development Alternative would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the purpose of this analysis.

References – Alternatives

ABAG and MTC, 2013. *Plan Bay Area Environmental Impact Report*. July 2013. http://onebayarea.org/regional-initiatives/plan-bay-area/plan-elements/environmental-impact-report.html

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	-1	1	2
Investing in improvements to adapt to sea-level rise and climate change over time.	0	-2	-1	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	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	-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 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.	0	-2	-1	+1	+1	0	0

TABLE 5-6 (Continued)
QUALITATIVE COMPARISON OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Objectives	Project	No Project	Preservation	Existing Gen Plan	Multi family	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
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	-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	-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	-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	-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⇧

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

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

TABLE 5-7 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
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⇧
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⇧

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

TABLE 5-7 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
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 levels identified under 2020 Baseline Conditions. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
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

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

TABLE 5-7 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
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 project vicinity. (Significant)	N	SU	LSM	SU	SU	SU	SU
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

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

TABLE 5-7 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
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
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⇧

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

TABLE 5-7 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
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, which may lead to adverse health effects. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
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⇧

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

TABLE 5-7 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
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⇧
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

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

TABLE 5-7 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
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 would potentially result in a discharge, which if contaminated would adversely affect the receiving water quality. (Significant)	N	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
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

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

TABLE 5-7 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
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 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)	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

TABLE 5-7 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
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 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

TABLE 5-7 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
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⇧

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

TABLE 5-7 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
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 not require new or physically altered school facilities to maintain acceptable performance objectives. (Less than Significant)	N	LS	LS⇩	LS	LS	LS⇧	LS⇧
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

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

TABLE 5-7 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

	No Project	Proposed Project	Preservation/ Less Development	Existing General Plan	Multifamily	Transit Oriented Mixed Use	High Density
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
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