CHAPTER 4
Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

4.0 Introduction to the Environmental Analysis

This chapter presents the environmental analysis of the proposed Project and its Maritime Reservation Scenario, prepared in accordance with CEQA, as described in Chapter 1, *Introduction*, of this Draft EIR. This chapter consists of Sections 4.1 through 4.17, which present the technical analysis of each environmental topic or factor (e.g., Section 4.1, *Aesthetics, Shadow and Wind*) addressed in this document. This section, Section 4.0, *Introduction to the Environmental Analysis*, describes key environmental analysis terms used in this document and analysis, including the impact classifications; the organization of each technical section of this chapter; and the cumulative analysis approach and setting.

The Project variants are analyzed in Chapter 5, *Project Variants*, of the Draft EIR, and the protocols described in this section generally apply to the Project variants analysis presented in that chapter. Also, the variants analysis refers to the Project analysis in this chapter where appropriate to avoid repetition; the analyses for each variant in Chapter 5 are largely stand-alone assessments, although the impacts of one or both of the variants would be added to impacts of the Project if the variant(s) are selected for implementation and receive all required approvals.

4.0.1 Environmental Analysis Approach and Terms Used in This Draft EIR

Environmental Setting and Baseline

An environmental setting establishes the baseline physical conditions or point of reference from which the environmental impacts of the proposed Project, its Maritime Reservation Scenario, variants, and the alternatives to the Project are measured to determine whether an impact would be significant. Each section describes an *environmental setting* and a *regulatory setting*. The environmental setting addresses the conditions that exist prior to implementation of the Project and defines relevant scientific terms associated with the environmental topic addressed in the section. The regulatory setting presents relevant information about federal, State, regional, and/or local laws, regulations, and plans or policies that pertain to the environmental topic addressed in the section. Relevant regulations of both the City of Oakland and the Port of Oakland are often discussed due to existing and potential future jurisdictional responsibilities. (See further discussion under *Oakland Standards and Conditions of Approval*, below.)

Generally, the environmental setting or baseline conditions are described as they existed when the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this Draft EIR was published.[1] However, CEQA also allows that, when necessary, the environmental setting and/or baseline conditions may be described by historic conditions, conditions expected when the project becomes operational, or projected future conditions when supported by substantial evidence (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(a)(1)). To the extent that this occurs in this Draft EIR, it is described within the particular environmental topic analysis in this chapter. Examples include baseline noise levels obtained in spring 2019 for the existing Oakland Coliseum ballfield and specific sensitive receptors near the Project site, supplemented by baseline noise levels obtained in fall 2019, in addition to reconnaissance-level biological surveys of the Project site obtained in February 2019.

COVID-19

Since publication of the NOP, the COVID-19 pandemic has introduced a substantial amount of uncertainty to human lives. The pandemic has directly affected human behavior, requiring people to shelter in place, implement social distancing, and make other changes to the manner in which they live. Indirectly, COVID-19 has affected the economy by resulting in reduced consumer spending, business closures, and widespread unemployment. Some of these trends are considered short-term and are expected to reverse; however, there likely will be more permanent changes in the ways people live and behave in the post-pandemic world. Some EIR sections note the recent changes to behavior and the economy resulting from COVID-19 for informational purposes; however, the EIR analysis is based on an environmental baseline without COVID-19, and it would be speculative to identify long-term consequences of the pandemic at this time.

Oakland Thresholds of Significance

The City of Oakland has established local *CEQA Thresholds of Significance Guidelines* (commonly referred to in this EIR as "thresholds"), which have been in general use by the City since at least 2002, and parts of which were most recently updated in October 2016. The thresholds are intended to help clarify and standardize analysis and decision-making in the environmental review process in the City of Oakland. The thresholds are offered as guidance in preparing all environmental review documents and are intended to implement and supplement provisions in the State CEQA Guidelines for determining the significance of environmental effects, including Sections 15064, 15064.4, 15064.5, 15065, and 15382 and Appendix G. (The classifications of levels of environmental impact significance in this Draft EIR are described in Section 4.0.2 below.) The thresholds are used to evaluate the potential primary and secondary environmental effects of the proposed Project, including potential effects of mitigation measures.

Revisions to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines became effective December 28, 2018, and were intended to reflect recent changes to the CEQA statutes and court decisions. Many of these recent changes and decisions are already reflected in the City's adopted thresholds, which have been used to determine the significance of potential impacts in this Draft EIR. To the extent that the topics or questions in the 2018 revised Appendix G are not reflected in the City's thresholds, these topics and questions have been taken into consideration in the impact analysis in

[1] The City issued the NOP for this EIR on November 30, 2018.

this chapter. Where specific changes made to Appendix G are relevant and material to the analysis, they are discussed within the technical analysis of the applicable section in this chapter.

Environmental Impacts

CEQA requires the analysis of the proposed Project's potentially significant impacts on the environment. The significance levels of impacts that the Project may have on the environment, as analyzed in this Draft EIR, are described in Section 4.0.2 below (following the description of key factors related to the level of impact classifications).

The analysis in this chapter of the Draft EIR addresses the potential effects of the proposed Project and the Maritime Reservation Scenario; and Chapter 5 addresses the potential effects of the Project variants, to the extent they are different from those identified in Chapter 4 for the proposed Project. All the analysis is conducted to address each Project phasing scenario: Phase 1 (ballpark and partial mixed-use development), Project Buildout (Phase 1 plus remaining mixed-use development), and 2040 Cumulative (Project Buildout and cumulative development, discussed in Section 4.0.4 below). Sometimes the Phase 1 and Project Buildout analysis for an environmental topic or particular significance criterion are discussed under a shared heading where it is more efficient, logical, and clear for the reader. Generally, the impact analysis is conducted at a level of detail commensurate with the level of detail available for the Project components. The analysis also identifies impacts for potential secondary effects of recommended mitigation measures (described under *Mitigation Measures,* below).

As required by Section 15126.2(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the impact analysis addresses direct, indirect, short-term, long-term, on-site, and as applicable, off-site impacts. Under CEQA, economic or social changes by themselves are not considered to be significant impacts, but may be considered in linking a project to a physical environmental change, or in determining whether any physical changes caused by a project are significant.

This Draft EIR addresses potential adverse effects of the Project on the environment pursuant to CEQA. Potential effects of the environment on a project are generally not required to be analyzed or mitigated under CEQA standards (see *California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District* (2015) 62 Cal.4th 369). However, if a proposed project impact exacerbates an existing environmental hazard or condition, an agency must analyze the potential impact of such hazards on the project (such as future residents or users). Nevertheless, in some instances, this document analyzes potential effects of the environment on the Project that are not required to be analyzed under CEQA, solely to provide information to the public and decision-makers.

Impact statements have an alphabetic designation that corresponds to the environmental topic, such as Impact "AES" for aesthetics. A number follows the alphabetic designation to designate the sequence of the impact. For example, "Impact AES-1" is the first aesthetics impact identified. All impact statements are in bold text; the impact statements also indicate the number of the significance threshold/criterion number to which the impact statement refers, and then states the level of impact classification, as discussed in Section 4.0.2 below.

Oakland Standard Conditions of Approval

The City adopted Standards and Conditions of Approval (SCAs) on November 3, 2008 (Ordinance No. 12899 C.M.S), and revised the SCAs through November 5, 2018, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 (and now Section 15183.3). The SCAs address three aspects of a project: (1) General administrative aspects of the project approval; (2) environmental protection measures that are incorporated into a project and are designed to, and will, substantially mitigate environmental effects; and (3) other SCAs containing requirements to substantially reduce non-environmental effects of a project.

Typically, in City CEQA documents, applicable SCAs are identified during the CEQA analysis of a project, and applied to projects as regulatory requirements when they receive discretionary planning-related approval. Moreover, the applicable SCAs that reduce environmental impacts are considered requirements of a project imposed under the City's regulatory authority and are not mitigation measures.

However, in this Draft EIR, applicable SCAs or portions thereof (sometimes modified to address this particular Project) that reduce environmental impacts are imposed and will be enforced as mitigation measures on the Project where necessary for the following reasons:

- As explained in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, the Project site includes parcels that are, in accordance with the Oakland City Charter (Charter), jurisdictionally controlled, in separate parts, by the Port and the City. The Port is a department of the City with the exclusive authority to control and manage certain lands of the City, referred to as the Port Area, in conformity with the Charter and the City's General Plan. Approximately 50 acres of the 55-acre Project site lie within the Port Area, with the remainder located within the Estuary Policy Plan area.
- The Port and City, without waiving any of their respective authorities and jurisdiction over lands within the Port Area and consistent with Article VII of the Charter, have entered into a nonbinding Memorandum of Understanding that describes a contemplated shared regulatory framework that, if ultimately approved, would apply to the Project. SCAs are part of the City's regulatory requirements (as discussed above), but not the Port's; therefore, they are being applied to and enforced against the Project as mitigation measures in whole or in part when required to address significant environmental impacts, to create a uniformly consistent process for mitigating Project impacts across jurisdictional authorities. SCAs are also applied as mitigation measures in this Draft EIR when it is necessary to describe how an existing regulatory requirement will be implemented (for example, the Project sponsor's drafting of a remediation work plan required to comply with the oversight agency's requirements).
- The proposed Project also includes a unique use – a major league baseball stadium – that will exist in only one location of the City. Even if the SCAs were applied to the Project, the unique nature of a major league baseball stadium and the mixed-use development would necessitate that certain SCAs be modified through mitigation measures applicable to the Project to appropriately address Project-specific issues not covered by the general nature of the SCAs.

Accordingly, due to the shared regulatory framework between the City and Port and the Project's unique nature, this Draft EIR identifies mitigation measures to reduce or avoid potentially significant environmental impacts rather than relying on application of the City's SCAs as conditions of Project approval. Note that the use of mitigation measures rather than SCAs is a

change in the City approach only for this particular Project and its Draft EIR for the reasons set forth above. This approach does not establish a modification to the SCAs and their use in CEQA documents for other projects subject to the City's regulatory authority, or establish a precedent to be applied to the processing of other projects in the City.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are identified throughout the environmental analysis and are actions to be taken to avoid or reduce the magnitude of a significant impact. All mitigation measures will be (1) included as part of the design, construction, and/or operation of the proposed Project; (2) adopted as conditions of approval for the proposed Project; and (3) subject to monitoring and reporting requirements of CEQA and the terms of the discretionary approvals for the Project. In cases where a mitigation measure may have secondary environmental effects resulting from its implementation, those effects are also disclosed, including any measures to reduce its potential environmental impact.

Mitigation measures are formatted in the same manner described above for impact statements, and the numbering of each mitigation corresponds with its impact. Where multiple mitigation measures are identified for a particular impact, they are numbered sequentially. For example, Mitigation Measures AES-1a and AES-1b both address Impact AES-1. Generally, all mitigation measures are indented with the main titles and headings in bold text. The level of Project impact after the incorporation of identified mitigation measures is stated following all mitigation measures.

Non-CEQA Improvement Measures

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4, mitigation measures are not required for environmental impacts that are not found to be significant. Therefore, non-CEQA *Improvement Measures* are included in this Draft EIR to suggest improvements that are not necessary to mitigate any CEQA environmental impacts of the Project. The improvement measures are identified by City staff or in technical studies or reports for the Project. They are recommended because they relate closely to a particular environmental topic, Citywide goal, or non-CEQA consideration, and would benefit the Project. Examples include improvement measures identified in this Draft EIR to address certain non-CEQA aesthetics topics (e.g., general light and glare effects) and impacts of the environment on the Project, such as an improvement measure to address the effect of existing groundborne vibration from nearby trains on future occupants of the Project. Some of these measures are recommended because they would further lessen the Project's already less-than-significant impacts. Decision makers for the Project will consider all recommended improvement measures during the course of Project review and may impose one or more of them as Project-specific conditions of approval.

City staff designates certain improvement measures to be *necessary* rather than recommended, although they are not required to address CEQA environmental impacts of the Project. Like the recommended improvement measures described above, *Necessary Improvement Measures* may be closely related to a particular environmental topic and Citywide goals, but are specifically required by a City agency, such as the Fire Department, Police Department, and Department of Transportation for the proposed Project to address a non-CEQA impact or need. Decision makers

for the Project will consider the necessary improvement measures prior to imposing them as Project-specific conditions of approval.

The transportation analysis of the Project in this Draft EIR also specifies numerous *Non-CEQA Recommendations* for consideration. They also are not required to address a CEQA impact, but would help facilitate the efficient movement of multiple transportation modes and the flow of people and goods to the Project site. As discussed in Section 4.15, *Transportation and Circulation*, these non-CEQA recommendations are recommended to be incorporated into the Project's Conditions of Approval.

4.0.2 Impact Classifications

The following classifications of levels of impact significance are used throughout this Draft EIR:

- **Less than Significant –** The impact of the Project does not reach or exceed the defined threshold of significance, or would be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with existing local, State, and federal laws and regulations. No mitigation measure is required.
- **Less than Significant with Mitigation –** The impact of the Project before implementation of feasible mitigation measures is expected to reach or exceed the defined threshold of significance. Feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the significant impact to a less-than-significant level.
- **Significant** – The impact of the Project, before or after implementation of feasible mitigation measures, is expected to reach or exceed the defined threshold of significance. Feasible mitigation measures may or may not be available to reduce the significant impact to a less-than-significant level.
- **Significant and Unavoidable** – The impact of the Project reaches or exceeds the defined threshold of significance. Feasible mitigation measures may be available to *reduce* the impact (**Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation**), but not to a less-than-significant level.
- **No Impact** – The Project would not cause a noticeable effect on the environment, as measured by the defined threshold of significance. No mitigation would be required. (As discussed below in Section 4.0.3, in this Draft EIR, environmental topics that are considered to have "No Impact" are either discussed briefly in each analysis section of this chapter under *Topics Considered and Determined to Have No Impact*, or in Section 4.17, *Effects Found Not to Be Significant*, in this chapter.)

4.0.3 Organization of Each Technical Analysis Section in This Chapter

This chapter consists of Sections 4.1 through 4.17, which present the technical analysis of each environmental topic or factor under CEQA, as specified in Oakland's CEQA thresholds. Each of the components below are described in Sections 4.0.1 and 4.0.4, and each section in this chapter (Sections 4.1 through 4.16) is generally organized in the following sequence, except Section 4.17, *Effects Found Not to Be Significant*, which is presented in a concise narrative format by applicable topic.

- **Environmental Setting –** The initial discussion in each section is an overview of the conditions that exist prior to implementation of the Project and defines relevant scientific terms associated with the environmental topic addressed in the section. As previously stated, the baseline environmental setting for this Draft EIR is generally the time that its NOP was released, on November 30, 2018.

- **Regulatory Setting** – Following the *environmental setting* in each section, this part of each section discusses the regulatory setting and presents relevant information about federal, State, regional, and/or local laws, regulations, plans, or policies associated with the environmental topic addressed in the section.

- **Significance Criteria –** This part of each section lists the Oakland significance criteria associated with the environmental topic addressed in the section and as specified in the *Oakland Thresholds of Significance* document. Any specific changes made to the updated State CEQA Guidelines Appendix G thresholds that are relevant and material to the analysis are discussed in this section. This section also discusses the *Approach to Analysis*, which presents the analytical methods and key assumptions used in the evaluation of effects of the proposed Project. Where applicable, this section also summarizes *Topics Considered and Determined to Have No Impact* because a particular issue (significance criterion) would not be affected by the Project or does not pertain to the Project or its setting.

- **Impacts of the Project** – This part of each section presents and discusses in detail the environmental impacts analysis for all aspects of the Project and its Maritime Reservation Scenario. For each significance criterion (or groups of related criteria within an environmental topic), the impact statement precedes the discussion of each impact analysis and summarizes the potential for the Project to have an impact. Mitigation measures are identified and detailed. As mentioned above (see *Mitigation Measures*), where applicable, secondary impacts associated with mitigation measures are also identified and discussed. The impact determination after the incorporation of mitigation measures is stated at the close of the impact analysis discussion. This part of each section also includes an analysis of any environmental impacts of the Maritime Reservation Scenario that may differ from that of the proposed Project.

- **Cumulative Analysis** – The cumulative analysis for each environmental topic is included at the end of each section in this chapter, except when the topic is inherently a cumulative effect (e.g., Section 4.7, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*). Each cumulative analysis starts with a description of the geographic and cumulative context specific to the particular environmental topic. Section 4.0.4 below discusses the overall cumulative context applied in this Draft EIR.

  Typically, a single boldfaced cumulative impact statement encompasses all of the significance criteria for the environmental topic addressed in each section, particularly if the cumulative impact would be less than significant. However, more than one cumulative impact statement may be warranted for clarity if certain subtopics have different environmental impact conclusions.

  This part of each section also includes an analysis of any cumulative environmental impacts of the Maritime Reservation Scenario that may differ from those of the proposed Project.

- **Maritime Reservation Scenario Analysis** – As noted above, following the Project and cumulative analysis, at the end of each section of this chapter, is the analysis of the Maritime Reservation Scenario, which focuses on any impacts or mitigation measures pertinent to the section's environmental topic, that are different than those identified for the proposed Project. In some cases, there are supporting Maritime Reservation Scenario exhibits for comparison purposes with Project exhibits.

- **References** – Following the cumulative analysis, at the end of each section of this chapter is a list of *References* identifying all persons and documents consulted or relied on for that analysis. All references cited in this Draft EIR are compiled in the *Administrative References Record* for public reference.

The organization of Chapter 5, which analyzes the potential environmental effects of the Project variants, is described in the introduction to that chapter. Topics are analyzed, and impacts, improvement measures, and mitigation measures are discussed, only to the extent that they differ from the proposed Project analyzed in Chapter 4. The analysis specifies whether the effects of a variant would vary by Project phase or by cumulative effect, and whether any impacts of a variant would change if combined with others.

4.0.4 Cumulative Analysis

Approach and Definitions

In accordance with CEQA and the City's thresholds, this Draft EIR includes a cumulative analysis to evaluate whether the Project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable when combined with other projects causing related impacts. CEQA defines cumulative as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable, or which can compound or increase other environmental impacts." The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment, which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other *closely related past, present, and reasonable foreseeable probable future projects* (referred to collectively in this Draft EIR as "cumulative development").

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130, this Draft EIR analyzes the potential cumulative effects of the proposed Project combined with cumulative development. If a cumulative effect is identified, the analysis then evaluates whether the proposed Project's contribution to the cumulative effect is *cumulatively considerable*, which is a significant impact. Specifically, a cumulatively considerable contribution means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of cumulative development (CEQA Guidelines Section 15065(a)(3)).

Geographic Scope

The geographic scope used to assess cumulative impacts may vary depending on the specific environmental topic being analyzed. For example, considerations for cumulative aesthetics effects are different from those used to assess cumulative air quality. Only development within the vicinity of the viewshed of the Project site could contribute to a cumulative visual effect; on the other hand, all development within the air basin contributes to regional emissions of criteria pollutants. Accordingly, the geographic scope of each cumulative analysis discussion can vary and is described at the start of the cumulative impact analysis.

Cumulative Development and Assumptions

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b)(1) identifies two approaches to cumulative impacts analyses to account for the cumulative development. Consistent with CEQA, the City's adopted thresholds describe a combination of both the *forecast method* (i.e., a projection or model) and the

list method (i.e., a list containing past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects). Both approaches and assumptions are described below.

The cumulative approach used to assess cumulative impacts may also vary depending on the specific environmental topic being analyzed. For example, considerations for cumulative aesthetics effects consider the three-dimensional physical development representative of plans and projects under the list method, whereas the cumulative assessment of population and housing relies on the forecast method. The approach and cumulative assumptions applied is described in the cumulative analysis for each topic.

Cumulative Forecast

Pursuant to the City's thresholds, for transportation-related impacts, the cumulative analysis is based on the Alameda County Transportation Commission's Countywide Travel Model, released May 2018, consistent with Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Plan Bay Area 2040, and includes manual updates to the land use assumptions to ensure they account for projects listed on the City of Oakland's "major projects list" (see *Cumulative Projects List*, below) and the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan (DOSP), which is currently in draft form. Existing and forecasted traffic volumes in the cumulative forecast reflect past, present, and projected future developments expected by year 2040. (See more detail described in Section 4.15, *Transportation and Circulation*, in this chapter.)

Cumulative population and employment growth assumptions rely on MTC's Plan Bay Area 2040. The forecast is a projection and representation of future growth, taking into consideration economic factors as well as City General Plan land use designations and zoning. As noted in Chapter 3, *Project Description*, should the Project satisfy its affordable housing obligation via off-site development at as-yet unidentified sites, that development would require separate entitlement and environmental review, and would fall within the overall cumulative growth forecast.

The Cumulative Baseline (without the proposed Project) condition in this Draft EIR for growth-related considerations addressed by aforementioned regional projections and models (e.g., land use, population, housing, employment, and transportation) was formulated by subtracting the buildout growth of the proposed Project from the 2040 cumulative growth scenario described here. While careful not to "double count" cumulative projects that also may be on the applicable list of major development projects that was updated after the 2018 transportation model and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) land use database update, this approach is appropriately conservative.

The adopted *West Oakland Specific Plan* and the adopted *Lake Merritt Station Area Plan* are previously incorporated in ABAG's cumulative land use database and assumptions. Recently approved and proposed development projects within these plan areas (such as the proposed Lake Merritt Bay Area Rapid Transit [BART] Station Redevelopment Project, the West Oakland BART Redevelopment Project, and the 500 Kirkham Project) are consistent with the applicable aforementioned adopted plans. (Also see *Specific Cumulative Projects Near the Project Site*, below.)

An analysis contained in the West Oakland Community Action Plan (WOCAP), adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) in October 2019, was used to inform the cumulative analysis of health risks due to emissions of air pollutants referred to as toxic air contaminants (TAC).

Regarding future Port of Oakland development, the 2040 cumulative scenario also includes the Port's annual operating capacity assumed to occur by 2040, as documented in the *2019–2050 Bay Area Seaport Forecast,* prepared for the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission on May 22, 2020, by The Tioga Group & Hackett Associates.

Cumulative Projects List

As stated above, the State CEQA Guidelines and the City's thresholds describe a *list method* as one way to account for the cumulative development. The City's list is its current *List of Major Development Projects*, and included as **Appendix DEV**, *Oakland Major Development Projects List – March 2019*, to this Draft EIR. The City's thresholds direct that the cumulative analysis should assume that all projects on the City's major projects list, including projects with pre-application discussions underway and those that are under review, approved, and completed, exist in both the Cumulative Baseline condition (without the proposed Project) and the Cumulative Baseline (with Project) condition. In other words, as stated above, the projects on the major projects list used in this Draft EIR are assumed to already be incorporated into the 2018 transportation model and ABAG land use database, and therefore already embedded in the Cumulative Baseline condition.

The total growth and development reflected on the City's major projects list is not *in addition to* the cumulative growth forecast, and is provided in this Draft EIR for informational purposes and to assist with the analysis of impacts specific to the Project site, where the location and nature of surrounding development projects may be relevant.

Specific Cumulative Projects Near the Project Site

Cumulative projects that are on the City's major projects list and are located closest to the proposed Project site – within approximately one-half mile – include the 500 Kirkham Project; the Jack London Square Redevelopment Project Sites D, F2, and F3; 201 Broadway Project; 532 Union Street Project; and the 377 2nd Street Project.[2] These particular nearby cumulative projects were considered in development of the cumulative air quality and human health risk analyses, given their proximity to the Project site and because they involve sensitive receptors (residents). Certain cumulative projects are also factored into the cumulative aesthetics baseline in this Draft EIR, given their visibility within existing public viewsheds with the proposed Project development; these include the West Oakland BART Redevelopment Project, 500 Kirkham Project, Lake Merritt Station Area Plan, and the Draft

[2] Jack London Square Redevelopment Project Site D is located at Broadway/Embarcadero West; Site F2 is located at Harrison Street and Embarcadero West; and Site F3 is located at Alice Street/Embarcadero.

DOSP.[3] A copy of the City's map showing the locations of the major development projects mentioned above and near the proposed Project site is included in Appendix DEV.

Major projects located in the City of Alameda and in proximity to the Project site include the approved Alameda Landing Mixed Use Development Project under development, the nearest boundary of which is the south shore across from the Project site; and the approved Alameda Point Project, located approximately 1.3 miles southwest of the Project site. Growth from each of these developments is already incorporated in the 2018 transportation model and ABAG land use database. Both projects involve new mixed-use development with residences and shoreline development. These projects are referenced in the cumulative analyses in this Draft EIR where appropriate due to their proximity to the Project site or other characteristics.

Approved Coliseum Area Specific Plan and EIR

The proposed Project involves relocation of existing Oakland A's baseball operations from the Oakland Coliseum to the proposed Project site. Once the ballpark is constructed in Phase 1 of the Project, the Project sponsor would relocate all MLB operations from the existing Oakland Coliseum to the new facility. No physical changes are proposed at the Oakland Coliseum site as part of the Project. The Project sponsor anticipates proposing future redevelopment of the Oakland Coliseum site based on the Coliseum Area Specific Plan and EIR,[4] which was adopted by the City in 2015 to guide future development of the Oakland Coliseum site as a mixed-use district with commercial, residential, and other uses.

Because the Coliseum Area Specific Plan and EIR have been approved by the City, the Oakland Coliseum redevelopment under the Specific Plan is included as a cumulative project in this EIR. The Coliseum Area Specific Plan EIR analyzes the impacts of various scenarios of redevelopment of the Oakland Coliseum site, including an alternative with no sports facilities. Therefore, the impacts of redevelopment of the Oakland Coliseum site (and other cumulative projects) in combination with the Project are disclosed and analyzed for all impact areas as part of the EIR's cumulative analysis.

As noted above, the proposed Project does not include redevelopment or reuse of the Oakland Coliseum site, which is presently owned and operated jointly by the City of Oakland and the A's.[5] Rather, future redevelopment of the Oakland Coliseum will involve resolution of site control and financial issues (which are not environmental impacts under CEQA), and has been, and will continue to be, subject to its own planning and review process. Issues relating to ownership of the Coliseum site and who may control development are economic issues that do

[3] The Draft DOSP circulated for public review in August 2019 included provisions that would allow mixed use development in buildings up to 175 feet in height immediately north of the Project site. This potential is reflected in the cumulative analysis of aesthetics (including wind and shadow). The potential for residential receptors in this area is not included in the cumulative analysis of air quality given the lack of specificity regarding residential development in the area.

[4] City of Oakland, 2015. *Coliseum Area Specific Plan*, Adopted April 21, 2015. Also see City of Oakland, 2015. *Coliseum Area Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2013042066 and City Case #ER13-0004)*, February 20, 2015.

[5] The Alameda County Board of Supervisors voted on December 23, 2019, to sell and convey their interest in the Oakland Coliseum site to the Coliseum Way Partners LLC, an affiliate of the Oakland A's (County of Alameda, 2019. *Agenda – Board of Supervisors' Meeting*, Monday, December 23, 2019). The transaction was completed in October 2020 (Laura Waxmann, *San Francisco Business Times*, October 5, 2020).

not affect the physical environmental impacts of the proposed redevelopment, which have already been analyzed under CEQA in a certified EIR.

Transportation Infrastructure Improvements

Planned transportation improvements that have obtained (or are in the process of obtaining) environmental clearance and full funding are included in the analysis of future conditions for the Project and cumulative conditions. Those near the Project site and factored in for 2040 in this Draft EIR include the construction of the freight intelligent transportation system and the 7th Street Grade Separation Project (West Segment) – both part of the Global Opportunities at the Port of Oakland (GOPORT) program – and the Oakland-Alameda Access Project (OAAP). (Numerous other planned transportation infrastructure projects near the Project area are presented and discussed in Section 4.15, *Transportation and Circulation*, in this chapter.)