A. Land Use Consistency and Compatibility

A.1 Introduction

This section describes the existing and planned land uses in the project area, identifies adopted plans that guide the City’s land use and planning decisions, and evaluates land use impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed Alameda Point project.

A.2 Environmental Setting

Regional and Local Setting

The City of Alameda is located in western Alameda County, adjacent to the City of Oakland and the San Francisco Bay (see Figure 3-1).

The City of Alameda spans 12.4 square miles and extends over two islands (Alameda Island and Coast Guard Island) and a portion of a peninsula connected to the mainland (Bay Farm Island). Alameda Island consists of the original City and the former Naval Air Station Alameda (Alameda Point), which is the western end. Coast Guard Island, located in the Oakland Estuary between Alameda Island and the City of Oakland, is home to the U.S. Coast Guard’s Integrated Support Command. Bay Farm Island is adjacent to Oakland International Airport. The topography of the City is predominantly flat.

The Alameda Point project site is a portion of the former Naval Air Station (NAS Alameda) and consists of approximately 878 acres of uplands and 1,229 acres of submerged lands (total of 2,107 acres). Former NAS Alameda is located west of Main Street at the western end of Alameda. It is bounded by the Oakland-Alameda Estuary on the north, Main Street on the east, and the San Francisco Bay on the south and west. The project site are bounded on the south and west by a 624-acre area of former runways that is proposed for transfer by the Navy to the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), and is therefore not a part of the project site.

Existing Land Uses

Approximately 925 buildings and structures from the former military base remain on the project site. The residential portion of the former NAS Alameda in the north portion of the project site has single family and multiple family structures and large historic single family residences (“Big Whites”). The former NAS Alameda Bachelors’ Officers Quarters and former Bachelors’ Enlisted Quarters, which once housed the majority of Navy personnel, are both vacant. Two hundred units currently provide supportive housing for formally homeless, mean, women, and children, and veterans in transition.

Approximately 1,838,300 square feet of existing buildings are occupied by non-residential uses through the City NAS Interim Lease Program. Table 4.A-1 and Figure 4.A-1 indicate the location of tenant uses across the site.
### TABLE 4.A-1
APPROXIMATE SQUARE FOOTAGE OF EXISTING TENANT USES BY CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Use Category</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts / Entertainment / Recreation</td>
<td>272,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-Related Storage</td>
<td>198,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic &amp; Non Profit</td>
<td>262,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film / Event Production</td>
<td>82,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing / Repair (Light)</td>
<td>53,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing / Repair (Midsize)</td>
<td>187,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>306,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Cellular &amp; Utility)</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, &amp; Technical</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Storage</td>
<td>70,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Beverage and Food</td>
<td>127,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>234,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Occupied Space</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,838,300</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant – Available</td>
<td>476,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant – Unavailable</td>
<td>1,833,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Vacant Space</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,309,700</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Controlled</td>
<td>1,148,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* May not total due to rounding


### Land Uses in the Vicinity

Approximately 624 acres of land to the west of the project site is owned by the Navy, and will be transferred to the United States Department of Veteran Affairs (VA) as part of a separate project. The proposed VA transfer property and project site includes most of the former runways of the old naval air station, and also includes wetlands and a seasonal colony of California least terns, which is an endangered species under the federal Endangered Species Act.

Directly north of the project site is the Oakland Estuary, across which operates the Port of Oakland container terminal, including roadways, railroad facilities, shipping cranes, and container storage areas. The Estuary is a 7-mile long, approximately 1,000-foot-wide water body separating Oakland and Alameda. It receives boat traffic from both commercial and recreational users. The Alameda Main Street Ferry Terminal is located on the Estuary northeast of the project site. To the west,

---

1 A draft Environmental Assessment, prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, was issued for the VA project in January 2013. Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of the Navy, *Transfer of Excess Property and Development of an Outpatient Clinic, Offices, and National Cemetery at the Former Naval Air Station Alameda, California.* Available on the internet at: http://www.northerncalifornia.va.gov/planning/Alameda/ea-toc.asp.
adjacent to the ferry terminal is a ship and boat repair yard, a marine services and equipment company, and a winery. Moving southward, a self-storage facility is on the north side of Singleton Avenue, slightly east of Main Street.

East of Alameda Point is a mix of residential neighborhoods and schools. North of Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway is a development consisting of detached single-family homes known as Bayport, and the Alameda Unified School District (AUSD) Ruby Bridges Elementary School. South of Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway is the West End Neighborhood, which is made up of both single-family homes and duplexes. South of the residential neighborhoods, on the south side of Main Street and adjacent to Alameda Point is AUSD’s Encinal High School.

A.3 Regulatory Framework

Applicable plans and major policies and regulations that pertain to the project site are presented below, followed by a discussion of the project’s overall consistency (or inconsistency) with each plan. Several land use plans, policies, and regulations apply to the project site. Consistent with CEQA, not every policy that could apply to the project is included here. Rather, the focus of this analysis is on potential conflicts with policies that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigation and environmental effect and could result in significant adverse physical effects on the environment.

Federal

**U.S. Army Corp of Engineers**

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act regulates activities that involve a discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. USACE is responsible for issuing permits for discharges covered by Section 404, including, most notably, the filling of wetlands. USACE requires avoiding and minimizing impacts to wetlands where feasible. When impacts to wetlands cannot be avoided, compensatory mitigation is generally required as part of the Section 404 permit process to ensure there is no net loss of wetlands values and functions. USACE owns and controls the partially underwater strip of land at the edge of the Oakland Estuary within the site boundary.

**USFWS 2012 Biological Opinion and Navy Declaration of Restrictions**

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) issued a Biological Opinion in 2012 for the purpose of protecting the endangered California least tern nesting colony while at the same time allowing for development of surrounding areas. As a condition of the transfer of the property to the City, the Navy has recorded a Declaration of Restrictions based on the Biological Opinion that will serve as enforceable covenants, codes, and restrictions on subsequent development at Alameda Point (see Appendix D). Because these restrictions are intended to avoid and minimize impacts on least terns by controlling, to some degree, the amount and nature of development in the project area, they are discussed here. Different restrictions apply to different parts of the project area (see Figure 3-3).
Biological Opinion Avoidance Measures incorporated into the Declaration of Restrictions

The following is a list of avoidance measures from the 2012 Biological Opinion that are applicable to the project site and incorporated into the Navy’s Declaration of Restrictions.

BO-AMM-7  Lighting shall be allowed as long as the cumulative increase in ambient nighttime light levels within 750 feet of the least tern colony, from VA and City sources, do not increase by more than 10 percent of pre-conveyance levels, as set forth in the Alameda Point California Least Tern Colony Existing Lighting Study, attached hereto as Exhibit 5, with full development of the Northwest Territories (“NWT”), Civic Core, and Marina areas, including VA development. The City shall perform a design review for all proposed development within the NWT to ensure that the cumulative increase in ambient nighttime light levels from VA and City sources will not violate this condition, and shall provide lighting requirements to all project applicants. (Applies to Areas A through K)

BO-AMM-8c  No artificial features greater than 20 feet in height shall be constructed with the exception of 25 feet in the Veteran’s memorial plaza area. (Applies to Area A)

BO-AMM-8c  No tree species capable of growing to greater than 20 feet in height shall be planted in the Regional Park area. Tree and shrub density shall not exceed one tree or shrub per 10,000 square feet. The City shall prepare a palette of shrub and herbaceous vegetation species proposed for planting throughout the Regional Park area. The palette shall be reviewed and approved by the Service prior to the planting of any vegetation in this area. (Applies to Area A)

BO-AMM-8c  The final Regional Park design/configuration, herbicide/pesticide drift control plan, and landscaping and management plans shall be developed in coordination with the Service. The plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Service prior to any new development in this area. (Applies to Area A)

BO-AMM-8d  The Sports Complex fields shall not be lighted for nighttime play from April 1 through August 15, unless proposed lighting in these areas can be designed to ensure that light levels within 750 feet of the least tern colony, from VA and City sources, do not increase by more than 10 percent of pre-conveyance levels. (Applies to Area B)

BO-AMM-8f  No artificial features greater than 20 feet in height shall be constructed. (Applies to Area B)

BO-AMM-8f  The cumulative square footage of buildings associated with the Sports Complex shall not exceed 7,500 square feet or be greater than 20 feet in height. All buildings associated with the Sports Complex area shall be located greater than 200 feet from the southern boundary of the east-west runway. (Applies to Area B)

BO-AMM-9a  No new buildings, light posts, vegetation greater than 4 feet in height, landscape turf, or other structures greater than 4 feet in height shall be constructed in this area without prior approval from the Service. The Service shall review all proposed plans to ensure compliance with the 2012 Biological Opinion. (Applies to Area D)
BO-AMM-9b  Any new buildings constructed or extensions of existing buildings shall not exceed the height of the existing buildings. (Applies to Areas E and F)

BO-AMM-9b  No palm trees shall be allowed in this zone. Within line-of-sight of the existing least tern colony, landscaping shall be restricted to vegetation less than 4 feet in height. In areas outside of the line-of-sight of the existing least tern colony, no tree species capable of growing to greater than 20 feet in height shall be planted and shrubs shall be managed as to not exceed 6 feet in height. The density of trees and shrubs in this area shall not exceed one tree or shrub per 550 square feet. The City shall prepare a palette of tree and shrub species proposed for planting in this area. The palette shall be reviewed and approved by the Service prior to the planting of any trees or shrubs in this area. (Applies to Areas E and F)

BO-AMM-9b  Light posts in this area 20 feet or greater in height shall contain anti-perching devices, which will be maintained in perpetuity. (Applies to Areas E and F)

BO-AMM-9c  If Building 19 or the fire house is replaced with a new building, the new building shall not exceed 20 feet in height, not extend farther west and east than the western and eastern most point of the existing building, and not exceed the existing width of the building as measured from north to south. (Applies to Area G)

BO-AMM-9c  A new building, not to exceed 20 feet in height, may be constructed just east of Building 19 or may be added on to the fire house provided that the new building/extension is not in direct line-of-sight of any portion of the existing least tern colony. (Applies to Area G)

BO-AMM-9c  New buildings may have an additional 5 feet of height to accommodate heating/conditioning/ventilation units as long as these units are not within the line of sight of the least tern colony or the units are placed as far back and away from the side of the building facing the tern colony as possible and avian predator perch deterrents are installed and maintained on these units in perpetuity. (Applies to Area G)

BO-AMM-9d  Sporting fields within the Civic Core Area shall not be lighted for nighttime play from April 1 through August 15, unless proposed lighting in these areas can be designed to ensure the cumulative increase in ambient nighttime light levels within 750 feet of the least tern colony, from VA and City sources, do not increase by more than 10 percent of pre-conveyance levels. (Applies to Areas C through G)

BO-AMM-10a  No new buildings, light posts, vegetation greater than 4 feet in height, landscape turf, or other structures greater than 4 feet in height shall be constructed. The Service shall review all proposed plans to ensure compliance with the 2012 Biological Opinion. (Applies to Area I)

BO-AMM-10b  Building 25 may be reconstructed within the footprint of this zone, but any new building in this zone cannot exceed the height of the existing building (55 feet). (Applies to Area J)

Any reference to “existing” refers to the date that the 2012 Biological Opinion was issued – August 29, 2012.
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BO-AMM-10b Landscaping shall be restricted to vegetation less than 4 feet in height (no palm trees) within the current line-of-sight portion of the northeast corner of this zone. Within line-of-sight of the existing least tern colony, landscaping shall be restricted to vegetation less than 4 feet in height. In areas outside of the line-of-sight of the existing least tern colony, no tree species capable of growing to greater than 20 feet in height shall be planted and shrubs shall be managed as to no exceed 6 feet in height. The density of trees and shrubs in this area shall not exceed one tree or shrub per 550 square feet. The City shall prepare a palette of tree and shrub species proposed for planting in this area. The palette shall be reviewed and approved by the Service prior to the planting of any trees or shrubs in this area. (Applies to Area J)

BO-AMM-10b Newly constructed buildings and any artificial structures 20 feet or greater in height shall contain anti-perching devices which will be maintained in perpetuity. (Applies to Area J)

BO-AMM-10c No new buildings greater than 20 feet in height shall be constructed in this zone. (Applies to Area K)

BO-AMM-10c New buildings may have an additional 5 feet of height to accommodate heating/conditioning/ventilation units as long as these units are not within the line of sight of the least tern colony or the units are placed as far back and away from the side of the building facing the tern colony as possible and avian predator perch deterrents are installed and maintained on these units in perpetuity. (Applies to Area K)

BO-AMM-10c No palm trees shall be allowed in this area. Within line-of-sight of the existing least tern colony landscaping shall be managed as to not exceed 4 feet in height. In areas outside of the line-of-sight of the existing least tern colony no tree species capable of growing to greater than 20 feet in height shall be planted and shrubs shall be managed as to no exceed 6 feet in height. The density of trees and shrubs in this area shall not exceed one tree or shrub per 550 square feet. The City shall prepare a palette of tree and shrub species proposed for planting in this area. The palette shall be reviewed and approved by the Service prior to the planting of any trees or shrubs in this area. (Applies to Area K)

BO-AMM-10c Newly constructed buildings and any artificial structures 20 feet or greater in height shall contain anti-perching devices which will be maintained in perpetuity. (Applies to Area K)

BO-AMM-55 Fireworks displays will not be authorized from April 1 to August 15. (Applies to Areas A through V)

BO-AMM-56 The portion of the potential future Bay Trail that surrounds the western, southern, and eastern sides of the VA Fed Transfer Parcel will be closed from April 1 to August 15, and no public access to those areas will be allowed during that time. Such public access will be restricted by a secure fence, at least 8 feet in height. Signage shall be placed at Bay Trail entrances describing the purpose of the annual trail closure. Enforcement of the potential future Bay Trail annual closure restrictions and access to the VA Undeveloped Area will be conducted by East Bay Regional Park District or other Service-approved entity. (Applies to Areas A through L, U, and V)
BO-TC-1C  Within line of sight of the VA Undeveloped Area:

1. The number of new lights shall be limited to the minimum number required for building security.
2. All lights shall be directed away and/or screened from the VA Undeveloped Area. Tinting of windows, with non-reflective tinting material, within the line of sight of the VA Undeveloped Area shall be required. (Applies to Areas A through K, U, and V)

Memorandum of Agreement By and Between the US, Acting By and Through the Department of Veterans Affairs and the City of Alameda

A Memorandum of Agreement between the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and the City of Alameda contains an agreement between the VA and City to implement the applicable lighting AMMs and T&Cs. The two major provisions of the MOA involve coordinating to monitor nighttime lighting levels on an annual basis and take any corrective actions necessary to reduce nighttime lighting levels; and implementing lighting mitigation measures for new improvements and development at the former NAS Alameda, as applicable.

State

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission’s Plans and Policies

BCDC is a state agency with permit authority over the Bay and its shoreline. Created by the McAteer-Petris Act in 1965 (Title 7.2, commencing with Section 66000, of the California Government Code), BCDC regulates filling, dredging, and changes in use in San Francisco Bay. The creation of BCDC was a legislative response to address environmental damage created by years of extensive and unmanaged filling, by developing policies and regulations that recognize and protect San Francisco Bay, an invaluable natural resource of the Bay Area region.

Of primary concern to BCDC is the placement of new “fill” (generally defined as any material in or over the water surface, including pilings, structures placed on pilings, and floating structures) in the Bay. The McAteer-Petris Act imposes very strict standards for the placement of new fill. Placement of fill may be allowed only for uses that are (1) necessary for public health, safety or welfare of the entire Bay Area; (2) water-oriented uses, such as water-related industry, water-oriented recreation, and public assembly and the like; or (3) minor fill to improve shoreline appearance and public access. Fill must be the minimum necessary for the purpose and can be permitted only when no alternative upland location exists.

In addition, BCDC regulates new development within 100 feet of the shoreline to ensure that maximum feasible public access to and along the Bay is provided. BCDC is also charged with ensuring that the limited amount of shoreline property suitable for regional high-priority water-oriented uses (e.g., ports, water-related industry, water-oriented recreation, airports, and wildlife areas) is reserved for these purposes. Land-side uses and structural changes are governed by policies regarding public access. BCDC can require, as conditions of permits, shoreline public
access improvements consistent with a proposed project, such as, but not limited to, pathways, observation points, bicycle racks, parking, benches, landscaping, and signs.

BCDC planning documents applicable to San Francisco’s waterfront are described below.

**San Francisco Bay Plan**

The San Francisco Bay Plan (Bay Plan) was prepared by BCDC from 1965 through 1969 and amended through 2007 in accordance with the McAteer-Petris Act (California Government Code Sections 66600-66682). The Bay Plan guides the protection and use of the Bay and its shoreline within the nine Bay Area counties. BCDC has permit jurisdiction over shoreline areas subject to tidal action up to the mean high tide line and including all sloughs, tidelands, submerged lands, and marshlands lying between the mean high tide and 5 feet above mean sea level, and the land lying between the Bay shoreline and a line drawn parallel to and 100 feet from the Bay shoreline which is known as the 100-foot shoreline band. Under the McAteer-Petris Act, the Bay Plan provides policy direction for BCDC’s permit authority regarding the placement of fill, extraction of materials, determining substantial changes in use of land, water, or structures within its jurisdiction, protection of the Bay habitat and shoreline, and maximizing public access to the Bay.

Part IV of the Bay Plan contains findings and policies that pertain to development of the Bay and shoreline. These findings and policies address the many facets that comprise the uses, needs and design issues associated with balancing the environmental, ecological, economic, recreational and social objectives of development within or along the shoreline of the Bay. The categories of policies include: climate change; safety of fills; shoreline protection; dredging; water-related industry; ports; airports; transportation; commercial fishing; recreation (including marinas); public access; appearance, design and scenic views; salt ponds; managed wetlands; other uses of the Bay and shoreline; fill for various uses; mitigation; Public Trust; and navigational safety and oil spill prevention.

The Bay Plan policies with which the proposed project or variants may pose a potential conflict are listed below. The physical effects associated with the potential conflicts with these policies are discussed in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures, under the appropriate resource topic. The compatibility of the project with policies that do not relate to physical environmental issues will be considered by decision-makers as part of their decision whether to approve or disapprove the proposed project.

**Bay Plan, Development of the Bay and Shoreline, Public Access Policies**

**Policy 4**

Structures and facilities that do not take advantage of or visually complement the Bay should be located and designed so as not to impact visually on the Bay and shoreline. In particular, parking areas should be located away from the shoreline. However, some small parking areas for fishing access and Bay viewing may be allowed in exposed locations.

**Policy 14**

Views of the Bay from vista points and from roads should be maintained by appropriate arrangements and heights of all developments and landscaping between the view areas and the water. In this regard, particular attention should
be given to all waterfront locations, areas below vista points, and areas along roads that provide good views of the Bay for travelers, particularly areas below roads coming over ridges and providing a “first view” of the Bay.

**Bay Plan, Development of the Bay and Shoreline, Other Uses of the Bay Shoreline Policies**

**Policy 1** Shore areas not proposed to be reserved for a priority use should be used for any purpose (acceptable to the local government having jurisdiction) that uses the Bay as an asset and in no way affects the Bay adversely. This means any use that does not adversely affect enjoyment of the Bay and its shoreline by residents, employees, and visitors within the site area itself or within adjacent areas of the Bay or shoreline.

**Public Trust Lands**

Portions of the project site that are presently or were formerly tide lands or submerged lands (i.e., lands below the historic mean high tide line) within the former NAS Alameda are subject to the Public Trust for commerce, navigation and fisheries (“Public Trust” or “Trust”). In California, the Public Trust doctrine gives the state title to tidelands and submerged lands that existed at the time of statehood in 1850. Lands subject to the Public Trust (“Trust Lands”) are held in trust by the State of California on behalf of the public and are to be used to promote Public Trust purposes. The State may grant Trust Lands to local entities as trustees. Granted Trust Lands are subject to Public Trust restrictions on their use, as well as any limitations set forth in the granting statute. In 1913, the Legislature granted Trust Lands within the limits of the City of Alameda to the City as trustee. The Trust Lands within former NAS Alameda were later acquired by the United States by deed or by condemnation.

Pursuant to the 2000 NAS Alameda Public Trust Exchange Act (Statutes of 2000, Chapter 734), the California State Lands Commission was authorized to effectuate a land exchange that would remove the Public Trust from certain lands, allowing them to be used for residential and other non-Trust uses, and impose the Public Trust on certain other lands that are not currently subject to the Trust, including a substantial portion of the waterfront lands within the project site. The State Lands Commission approved the Public Trust Exchange in October 2012, authorizing removal of approximately 304 acres in the center of the former base from the Public Trust, while adding approximately 121 acres to the Public Trust along the northern and southeastern edges of Alameda Point.

Navigation, fisheries, maritime uses, hotels, water-oriented recreation, restaurants, visitor-serving retail, parks and open space are among the activities generally permitted on Trust Lands. Housing and general office are examples of uses generally not permitted on Trust Lands. Areas of Alameda Point that will be subject to the Public Trust following the exchange (excluding federally-retained lands) are shown in Figure 4.A-2.
Figure 4.A-2
State Lands Exchange
Post-Exchange
Regional

Plan Bay Area and NAS Alameda PDA

The Plan Bay Area, which sets forth the region’s proposed Sustainable Communities Strategy, was formally adopted by ABAG and MTC in July 2013.

The Plan Bay Area provides housing and employment projections for the San Francisco Bay Area, as well as counties, cities, and priority development areas (PDAs). In contrast to previous trends where new development primarily occurred on raw rural lands, the Plan Bay Area directs development to PDAs. According to ABAG, “this allows the region to reduce the emission of GHGs, house our population in a wide range of neighborhoods, preserve our natural resources, and support the creation of and greater access to new employment opportunities” (ABAG and MTC, 2013).

The project site is included in Plan Bay Area as the NAS Alameda PDA, which also includes Bayport, Alameda Landing, and the North Housing areas. The Plan Bay Area describes its vision for this PDA as follows:

This area includes substantial acres of underutilized land. The overall vision for the redevelopment of the Alameda’s former Naval Air Station lands and Fleet Industrial Supply Center is to create a transit-oriented, mixed-use, sustainable development that provides homes for a variety of family sizes and income levels, jobs for the region to replace those lost by the closure of the base, as well as parks and open spaces for conservation and regional recreation.

According to the Plan Bay Area, the Bay Area is expected to “experience more modest growth than in past decades.” Even so, ABAG still projects “healthy economic growth of 1.1 million jobs and 2 million people by 2040 as the Bay Area continues to attract cutting-edge, high technology companies, talent, and investment from around the world.” This regional projection “assumes a full-employment economy with unemployment rates returning to normal levels within a successful national economy. The forecast also recognizes the challenges with building new housing in the region that is largely multi-family and in infill locations, and the impact that has on our ability to capture potential job growth. Achieving this growth will require that the region respond to an aging and diversifying population, polarizing wages, high housing and transportation costs, and other issues affecting our quality of life” (ABAG and MTC, 2013).

San Francisco Bay Trail

ABAG administers the San Francisco Bay Trail Plan (Bay Trail Plan). The Bay Trail is a multi-purpose recreational trail that, when complete, would encircle San Francisco Bay and San Pablo Bay with a continuous 500-mile network of bicycling and hiking trails; to date, 330 miles of the alignment have been completed. The trail would connect the shoreline of all nine Bay Area counties, link 47 cities, and cross the major bridges in the region.

3 PDAs are areas where future growth within the Bay Area is intended to be concentrated. Within PDAs, “new development will support the day-to-day needs of residents and workers in a pedestrian-friendly environment served by transit” (ABAG and MTC, 2013).
Local Plans

City of Alameda General Plan

The City of Alameda General Plan is the principal policy document for guiding future development within the City. It is the framework on which the City must base decisions regarding growth, public services and facilities, and protection and enhancement of the community.

The General Plan establishes comprehensive, long-term land use policies for the City. Consistent with state law, the General Plan includes a Land Use Element; City Design Element; Transportation Element; Open Space and Conservation Element; Parks and Recreation, Shoreline Access, Schools and Cultural Facilities Element; Airport Environ Element (relates to Metropolitan Oakland International Airport); Health and Safety Element; and Housing Element; along with specific elements pertaining to Alameda Point and the Northern Waterfront. Each of the General Plan elements is discussed below, except for the Airport Environ Element and Northern Waterfront chapter, because the project site is not located in those planning areas.

The General Plan, by its comprehensive nature, contains policies that could sometimes conflict with one another, depending on the nature of a particular project. City decision-makers must determine whether, on balance, a project is consistent (i.e., in general harmony) with the General Plan. The fact that a specific project does not meet all General Plan goals, policies, and objectives does not inherently result in a significant effect on the environment, because a significant effect must be related to a significant adverse physical change. To the extent that a General Plan policy that is adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect is used as a significance criterion or contains a regulatory threshold that the project must meet, the project’s consistency with such policies is addressed within the relevant impact analysis discussions throughout Chapter 4.

The NAS Alameda Community Reuse Plan was adopted by the former Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority in 1996 as a roadmap for the conversion of the NAS to civilian use. The plan proposed several land uses that would be considered as part of preparation of the General Plan Amendment, and it contained the community’s general goals and policies to guide redevelopment. The City considered the Reuse Plan in preparing the Alameda Point General Plan Amendment that resulted in the current land use designations across the project site.

Site-Specific Land Use Designations

As shown in Figure 3-10, most of the project site is currently designated for Mixed Use Development. Nine areas of the City shown in the General Plan Diagram are designated to allow for mixed uses specific to implement General Plan Policies. These Mixed-Use areas are subject to limitations on development intensity as described in the General Plan. Three of these Mixed-Use areas are located in the project site and are described below:

- **AP1: Alameda Point Civic Core.** This designation encompasses most of the NAS Historic District and many of the historic buildings. The core is envisioned to provide public-serving and civic-serving uses, and business park, office, civic, residential, public/institutional, parks, commercial, and other supporting uses are permitted.
• **AP2: Alameda Point Inner Harbor.** This area is designated as a mixed-use area with a focus on research and development and light industrial uses. Light industry, office, retail, commercial, and residential uses are permitted.

• **AP3: Alameda Point Marina.** This designation permits marine-related industry, office, commercial, residential, recreational, and supporting retail uses. Waterfront activity is promoted.

The northeastern portion of the project site is designated for a mix of residential uses, as follows:

• The area of “Big Whites” officer housing is designated for Low-Density Residential areas designated for single-family detached units, typically on 5,000-square-foot (or larger) lots, or in planned unit developments not exceeding 8.7 units per acre. Secondary dwelling units are permitted and are not limited by the 8.7 units per acre density range.

• Most of the remainder of the northeast portion of the project site—which comprises a mix of 200 units of supportive housing for formerly homeless populations, an urban farm, a and a commercial nursery—is designated for Medium-Density Residential use.

• A small portion of the northeast portion of the site is designated for Neighborhood Business uses. These areas are intended to meet the shopping needs of nearby residents, and activities during business hours would be controlled to maintain compatibility with residential neighborhoods. Residential use would be encouraged on the second floor and permitted elsewhere. The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) is 0.6.

The three blocks directly south of the mall—bounded by Second Street to the west and Saratoga Street to the east—are designated for Public / Institutional / School uses. Such areas are designated for schools and city facilities that have unique public character. The mall itself, as well as the athletic fields in the northwest corner and southeast corners of the project site, is designated for Parks & Open Space. This designation allows for outdoor recreational uses, including City parks, golf courses, beaches, and public and private land committed to or proposed as permanent space for public access. This designation also applies to parcels along the northern edge of the project site, across from the Estuary, and in the southeastern portion of the site, north of the existing recreational fields.

**Site-Specific Policies**

Because the entirety of the General Plan Element is applicable to the project site, only guiding land use policies are listed here.4

• Create a series of neighborhoods, each with a central focus of mixed-use development, including local serving commercial and recreational uses and a mixture of housing types and densities serving all income levels. *(Policy 9.2.a)*

**Civic Core**

• Develop the Civic Core as a major new center of the City, and a focus of the Alameda Point district. *(Policy 9.3.a)*

---

4 The entirety of the Element is available for review on the City’s website: http://alamedaca.gov/city-hall/general-plan.
Inner Harbor
- Foster cohesion between development of this new mixed-use area and existing surrounding
  neighborhoods and the City of Alameda. (Policy 9.3.f)

Marina
- Create a mixed-use area that is sensitive to the restrictions and recommendations regarding
  the neighboring Wildlife Refuge. (Policy 9.3.k)
- Foster development of residential, commercial, and retail uses that promote vitality and
  pedestrian activity along the waterfront. (Policy 9.3.l)

West Neighborhood
- Guide further development of this primarily residential area to improve quality of life for
  residents, accessibility for pedestrians, and supporting uses to promote a balanced
  neighborhood. (Policy 9.3.s)
- Consider the need for workforce housing and childcare. (Policy 9.3.t)
- Preserve the Big Whites for their historical significance, and encourage surrounding
  development that is complementary (Policy 9.3.x).

Northwest Territories
- Preserve the Northwest Territories for parks and open space, which may include a golf
  course/hotel-resort, pedestrian and bicycle trails, and public access. (Policy 9.3.cc)
- Incorporate recommendations and regulations regarding the Wildlife Refuge into
  development in the Northwest Territories. (Policy 9.3.dd)

Wildlife Refuge
- Help maintain a Wildlife Refuge that balances natural conservation with public access,
  education, and ship navigation. (Policy 9.3.kk)

Other Relevant General Plan Policies
The Alameda General Plan includes policies relating to several CEQA topics. Each section of
Chapter 4 includes a Regulatory Setting that describes General Plan policies applicable to that
resource topic. The General Plan Elements relating to land use are described below, and
applicable land use policies are listed.

Land Use Element Policies
- Maintain and enhance the residential environment of Alameda’s Neighborhoods.
  (Policy 2.4a)
- Where a suitable residential environment can be created, give priority to housing on land to
  be developed or redeveloped in order to meet the qualified objectives of the Housing
  Element (Policy 2.4c)
- Expand housing opportunities for households in all income groups. (Policy 2.4.e)

5 The potential wildlife refuge would be on federal land; however, a refuge that is owned and operated by the
USFWS is not currently proposed. The VA will oversee the least tern colony following transfer of the 624-acre
proposed VA transfer parcel and project site from the Navy to the VA. The City Council recently affirmed its
support for a wildlife refuge.
4. Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures
A. Land Use Consistency and Compatibility

- Provide enough retail businesses and services space to enable Alameda to realize its full retail sales potential and provide Alameda residents with the full range of retail business and services (Policy 2.5a)
- Maximize opportunities for retail development at Alameda Point to support creation of a mixed use, transit oriented community at Alameda Point as envisioned in the Alameda Point General Plan policies. (Policy 2.5j)
- Develop a pedestrian oriented town center at Alameda Point with community retail shops and services in close proximity to transit, ferry, and other transportation facilities. (Policy 2.5x)

City Design Element Policy
- Work with BCDC staff to prepare a schematic plan for development of the 100-foot-wide strip above mean high tide on properties likely to require BCDC development approval. (Policy 3.2.g)

Transportation Element Policy
- Encourage development patterns and land uses that promote the use of alternate modes and reduce the rate of growth in region-wide vehicle miles traveled. (Policy 4.2.4.b)
- Encourage mixed use development that utilizes non-single occupancy vehicle transportation modes. (Policy 4.2.4.c)

Open Space and Conservation Element
- Preserve buffers between wetlands and urban areas. (Policy 5.1.c)

Parks and Recreation, Shoreline Access, Schools and Cultural Facilities Element
- Expand Alameda’s park system. (Policy 6.1.a)
- Require shoreline access where appropriate as a condition of development approval regardless of whether development occurs within the area of BCDC regulation. (Policy 6.2.h)

Health and Safety Element
Health and Safety Element policies regarding seismic and geologic hazards are discussed in Section 4.H, Geology and Seismicity. With respect to flooding, the General Plan’s Alameda Point Element contains policies specific to the project site; these policies are discussed in Section 4.I, Hydrology and Water Quality.

Housing Element
Housing Element goals, objectives and/or policies that apply to the project land use are listed below:

- Provide Housing to Meet the City’s Needs: Within the limits of available resources, seek to meet the City’s fair share housing needs, increase affordable housing opportunities, and provide for groups with special needs. (Goal a)
- Promote the conservation and rehabilitation of the City’s existing housing stock. (Policy a, i)
- Preserve and expand the City’s supply of affordable rental and ownership housing for extremely low, very low, low and moderate income households. (Policy a, ii)
- Maintain the integrity of existing residential neighborhoods by protecting and enhancing the historic architecture and ensuring that new development respects the density, physical, and aesthetic character of the neighborhood and surrounding areas. (Policy a, vi)
Ensure that new neighborhoods seamlessly integrate with older residential neighborhoods by designing new housing developments that complement the historic, architectural, aesthetic, and physical qualities of existing neighborhoods. (*Policy a, vi*)

Support efforts to increase the homeownership rate in Alameda to 60 percent by promoting homeownership opportunities for Alameda residents and employees of all income groups, including lower income renters and newly formed households. (*Policy b, i*)

Create rental and homeownership opportunities for people of all incomes, ethnic origins, cultures, gender, family structures, and special needs populations such as the elderly and physically and mentally challenged persons. (*Policy b, iii*)

Designate an adequate amount of land for residential use to encourage housing development that will meet the needs of all income groups. (*Policy c, i*)

Encourage development that offers residents easy access to goods, services, jobs, transportation, education and recreation. (*Policy c, iii*)

Encourage development of homeownership units priced to meet the needs of families with incomes between 80 percent and 120 percent of area median income. (*Policy c, vi*)

Consider and evaluate the viability of providing housing on non-residential, publicly owned property that becomes available or is deemed surplus (*Policy c, ix*)

**City of Alameda Zoning Ordinance**

The Zoning Ordinance is a primary tool for implementing the policies of the General Plan, and addresses the physical development standards and criteria for the City. One of the purposes of zoning is to implement the land use designations set forth in the General Plan.

The entirety of the project site is zoned General Industrial (Manufacturing) District and Special Government Combining District (M-2-G), reflecting the Navy’s prior industrial uses on the project site. The current zoning designation is not consistent with the General Plan and would be amended as part of this project.

**A.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**Significance Criteria**

This analysis evaluates the proposed project’s impacts on land uses based on the criteria identified in the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G. A land use impact is considered significant if implementation of the project would result in any of the following:

1. Physically divide an established community.

2. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.
The evaluation of land use impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed project is based on: 1) a review of planning documents pertaining to the project site, including the City of Alameda General Plan and City of Alameda Zoning Ordinance; 2) a field review of the project site; 3) a review of planning documents pertaining to lands adjacent to the proposed project site; and 4) consultation with appropriate agencies. Changes in land use are not, in and of themselves, adverse environmental impacts.

**Impact Analysis**

This following impact analysis focuses on potential impacts of the proposed project related to land use changes and policy conflicts

**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)**

For the purpose of this impact analysis, physically dividing an established community means the creation of barriers that prevent or hinder the existing flow of people or goods through an established community, or the placement of a development in such a manner that it physically separates one portion of an established community from the remainder of that community. For example, a freeway or other limited access roadway or a rail line would be considered such a barrier, as could a fence or wall or, potentially, a system of discontinuous streets, depending on wayfinding guidance provided.

The project site is physically separated from nearby properties by fences and streets. To the west, a fence separates the site from the land owned by the Navy, which will be transferred to the United States Department of Veterans Affairs. To the east, the site is separated from the Bayport neighborhood by Main Street and a Class 1 bicycle path. A fence marks the boundary of Encinal High School. Fences line the eastern side of Alameda Point along Main Street, although access is available at each roadway intersection, including W. Midway Avenue, W. Atlantic Avenue, Avenue K, and Avenue L.

The proposed project would reduce barriers and improve connections between Alameda and the site. The draft Master Infrastructure Plan (MIP) establishes the street system for the project site, as shown in Figure 3-7. The proposed project’s onsite circulation system would be designed to provide connectivity to the outside street network (along the eastern and northern edges of the project site) and onsite transit facilities and services. Combined with the proposed bicycle and pedestrian network, the onsite street and trail system would join the existing City street and trail system on the eastern edge and northern edges of the project site. Although some of the larger existing parcels on the project site would be subdivided by this new street system, these vacant or underutilized parcels do not currently accommodate an established community. The project proposes a grid-like street system that would provide ready connections between sub-areas and between the project site and other developed areas of Alameda. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community but would improve connections. The impact would be less than significant.
Mitigation: None required.

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)

Project Consistency with the San Francisco Bay Plan

Because a portion of the project site lies within BCDC jurisdiction, development would be subject to the San Francisco Bay Plan. Buildout of the proposed shoreline improvements and seaplane lagoon marina—including dredging, piers, and piling for the marina—would require BCDC review and permit approval. The project would also be subject to BCDC review to ensure that adequate public access to and along the shoreline has been incorporated. BCDC would rely upon information in the EIR but would make separate consistency findings with respect to its own plan.

In accordance with Policy 1 Fills in Accord with the Bay Plan, improved shoreline appearance and public access would be provided. Additionally, in accordance with Policy 1, Bay-Oriented Commercial Recreation and Bay-Oriented Public Assembly on Privately-owned Property, Bay-oriented commercial recreation and public assembly are proposed. The onsite fill in the redevelopment area and berms in the adaptive-reuse area (Figure 3-11) would provide long-term sea-level rise protection to the project site.

Dredging would be necessary to support expanded maritime uses, which would be considered a permissible water-oriented use according to the Bay Plan. The new marina must be consistent with Fills in Accord with the Bay Plan Policy 1, which requires that fill and dredging be for Bay-related activities. Also, consistent with Policy 2 of Other Uses of the Bay and Shoreline, most of the fill that would comprise the marina would consist of docks on piles over water that would provide boat slips.

The development facilitated by the proposed project must be consistent with Bay Plan polices related to public view corridors and waterfront access. Ensuring consistency with Bay Plan policies is part of the BCDC permitting process. The proposed project would be consistent with the San Francisco Bay Plan in that it would provide recreational access to the Bay and would not result in new fill beyond those allowed for under the Plan (i.e., Bay-oriented commercial recreation and improved shoreline appearance and public access to the Bay).

Project Consistency with the Public Trust Doctrine

Upon completion of the land exchange approved by the California State Lands Commission, approximately 1,599 acres of both filled land and present tide and submerged land within the project site will be subject to the Public Trust. The proposed Northwest Territories Open Space District, the proposed Open Space District south of W. Hornet Avenue, and the shoreline adjacent to the Seaplane Lagoon will be subject to the Public Trust. The Public Trust also will remain on
the corridor bounded by Saratoga and Second streets, extending north to the Oakland Inner Harbor and south to the Seaplane Lagoon.

Navigation, fisheries, maritime uses, hotels, water-oriented recreation, restaurants visitor-serving retail, parks and open space are among the activities generally permitted on Trust Lands. Housing and general office are examples of uses generally not permitted on Trust Lands. Buildout of the proposed project consistent with the proposed Zoning Amendment would adhere to these requirements and would be consistent with the Public Trust.

Project Consistency with Plan Bay Area

The project site is included in Plan Bay Area as the NAS Alameda Priority Development Area (PDA), which also includes Bayport, Alameda Landing, and the North Housing areas. Plan Bay Area describes its vision for this PDA as follows:

This area includes substantial acres of underutilized land. The overall vision for the redevelopment of the Alameda’s former Naval Air Station lands and Fleet Industrial Supply Center is to create a transit-oriented, mixed-use, sustainable development that provides homes for a variety of family sizes and income levels, jobs for the region to replace those lost by the closure of the base, as well as parks and open spaces for conservation and regional recreation (ABAG and MTC, 2012).

The proposed project is consistent with the description of the PDA in the Plan Bay Area, and the projected growth in housing and employment opportunities on the site. For further discussion refer to Section 4.B, Population and Housing.

Project Consistency with the Bay Trail

The proposed recreational trail will pass through the undeveloped portion of the old runways, and would be consistent with the Bay Trail Plan policies for protecting existing trail segments and expanding proposed trail links along the San Francisco Bay.

Project Consistency with the Alameda General Plan

According to The General Plan Guidelines published by the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR), a general rule for consistency determinations can be stated as follows: “An action, program, or project is consistent with the general plan if, considering all its aspects, it will further the objectives and policies of the general plan and not obstruct their attainment.”

The City Council, as the legislative body of the City of Alameda, is ultimately responsible for determining whether an activity is consistent with the Alameda General Plan. Perfect conformity with a general plan is not required. Instead, the City Council must balance various competing considerations and may find overall consistency with the General Plan despite potential inconsistencies with some individual provisions. The potential inconsistencies with General Plan goals, objectives, and policies do not themselves create a significant environmental impact under the thresholds established in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, because not all land use goals and policies at issue are “adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.” These policies are, instead, expressions of community planning and organization preferences, and
the City of Alameda may modify these preferences without necessarily creating a significant adverse impact on the environment. However, project policy consistency is discussed below.

**Project Consistency with Land Use Element Policies.** The policies from the Land Use Element encourage development of a balance of uses in the City of Alameda, including residential development for various income levels, a range of retail businesses and services, mixed-use areas, public open spaces, and pedestrian-oriented districts. As stated in Chapter 3, Project Description, the proposed project divides the site into four sub-areas to ensure that new development is appropriately designed to fully achieve policy goals for job generation, transit development, housing diversity, mixed-use development, historic preservation and water-oriented design. Development intensities currently envisioned for each sub-area can be moved from one sub-area to another to optimize development opportunities, and the mix of development types (land use categories) is flexible. Development of the sub-areas—Enterprise, Adaptive Reuse, Town Center and Waterfront, Main Street Neighborhood—would further the goals of the Land Use Element policies listed above. The proposed project also would include Zoning Ordinance and General Plan amendments, which would ensure consistency with the Land Use Element.

**Project Consistency with City Design Element Policies.** The policies from the City Design Element seek to maximize public enjoyment of the waterfront, as well as ensure that development is compatible with its surroundings. As stated in Section 4.K, *Aesthetics*, the proposed project would not substantially or adversely affect scenic views or scenic resources, and the changes in visual character of the project site would meet the objectives of the General Plan and not result in adverse visual impacts. As stated above and in Chapter 3, Project Description, development located within 100 feet of the shoreline would require the approval of BCDC, and structural development would be reviewed by BCDC’s Design Review Board in accordance with Bay Plan findings and policies. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the City Design Element.

**Project Consistency with Transportation Element Policies.** The proposed project would be consistent with the policies from the Transportation Element because it would encourage development of mixed-use districts with transit access, as well as buildout of the bicycle and pedestrian network in the Draft MIP. The proposed project’s potential impacts to vehicular traffic, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation and safety are discussed in Section 4.C, *Transportation and Circulation*.

**Project Consistency with Open Space and Conservation Element Policies.** The consistency of the proposed project with the requirements of the 2012 Biological Opinion is discussed in Section 4.E, *Biological Resources*.

The project site is adjacent to the Oakland Estuary and the San Francisco Bay. Onsite vegetation and stormwater best-management practices would be included in the project, and the proposed project would be consistent with the Open Space and Conservation Element policies. Please see Sections 4.E, *Biological Resources* and 4.H, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, for further discussion of these measures.
Project Consistency with Parks and Recreation, Shoreline Access, Schools and Cultural Facilities Element Policies. The proposed project would expand access to the shoreline and provide new public open spaces by creating a passive and active open spaces on the project site, including the Sports Complex and the extension of the Bay Trail. As described in Section 4.L, Public Services and Recreation, the City of Alameda Fiscal Neutrality Policy requires that development projects at Alameda Point pay for the cost of municipal services and public infrastructure improvements, and payment of the development fees for schools would ensure less than significant impacts related to the provision of school facilities. The proposed project would therefore be consistent with the Parks and Recreation, Shoreline Access, Schools and Facilities Element.

Project Consistency with Health and Safety Element Policies. The proposed project would be required, through existing City and State health and safety regulations, codes and ordinances, to comply with the Health and Safety Element policies. The proposed project would, therefore, be consistent with the Health and Safety Element. Noise impacts are addressed in Section 4.D. Impacts related to seismic events, flooding, and hazardous materials are discussed in Sections 4.H, 4.I, and 4.J, respectively.

Project Consistency with Housing Element Policies. Buildout pursuant to the General Plan would provide up to 1,425 units of housing intended for households at a range of income levels, including 200 units of supportive housing and an additional new residential units available for lower-income households. As stated in Section 4.B, Population and Housing, development that would occur under the proposed project would help Alameda accommodate anticipated growth as opposed to substantially increasing population, and the residential development that would occur under the proposed project would help to meet housing demands from projected population growth in the City and the region.

Project Consistency with Site-Specific General Plan Policies in the Alameda Point Element. The proposed project appears consistent with the following site-specific policies:

- Create a series of neighborhoods, each with a central focus of mixed-use development, including local serving commercial and recreational uses and a mixture of housing types and densities serving all income levels. (Policy 9.2.a)

  Buildout of the proposed project would adhere to development controls of four sub-areas, described in the Project Description, which would result in mixed-use development and housing types for various income levels.

- Develop the Civic Core as a major new center of the City, and a focus of the Alameda Point district. (Policy 9.3.a)

  The proposed project’s Zoning and General Plan Amendments envision a Waterfront Town Center Sub-District with a mix of residential, commercial, and recreational uses included in the proposed Town Center and Waterfront Area Precise Plan.

- Foster cohesion between development of this new mixed-use area and existing surrounding neighborhoods and the City of Alameda. (Policy 9.3.f)
As described under Impact 4.A-1, above, the project would enhance physical connectivity between the project site and existing developments to the east by creating an expanded street network and bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

- Create a mixed-use area that is sensitive to the restrictions and recommendations regarding the neighboring Wildlife Refuge. (Policy 9.3.k)
  
  The project’s consistency with policies protecting the neighboring proposed nature reserve is discussed in Section 4.E, Biological Resources.

- Foster development of residential, commercial, and retail uses that promote vitality and pedestrian activity along the waterfront. (Policy 9.3.l)
  
  The project site’s waterfront areas are proposed to be zoned for Open Space along the northern and southern shoreline and Maritime-Visitor Serving uses along the Seaplane Lagoon. The Open Space areas would provide lands for recreation and public assembly. The Maritime-Visitor Serving District would encourage a variety of commercial, visitor-serving, and other Public Trust-complaint uses. Both the Open Space and Maritime-Visitor Serving use areas would be adjacent to other districts that would complement the active and passive use of these areas, including the Enterprise, Adaptive Reuse, Town Center, and Main Street Neighborhood Sub-Districts.

- Guide further development of this primarily residential area [West Neighborhoods] to improve quality of life for residents, accessibility for pedestrians, and supporting uses to promote a balanced neighborhood. (Policy 9.3.s)
  
  The Main Street Neighborhood (formerly West Neighborhoods) area would provide lands for a variety of housing types and densities with complementary small-scale, neighborhood-serving commercial and service uses, urban agriculture and parks uses.

- Consider the need for workforce housing and childcare. (Policy 9.3.t)
  
  The variety of housing types to accommodate a mix of income levels would partially meet the need for workforce housing, and, childcare would be a permitted use in several of the sub-areas under their applicable zoning designations.

**Northwest Territories**

- Preserve the Northwest Territories for parks and open space, which may include a golf course/hotel-resort, pedestrian and bicycle trails, and public access. (Policy 9.3.cc)
  
  This area would be zoned for Open Space uses consistent with this provision.

- Incorporate recommendations and regulations regarding the Wildlife Refuge into development in the Northwest Territories. (Policy 9.3.dd)
  
  The project’s consistency with policies projecting the neighboring Wildlife Refuge is discussed in Section 4.F, Biological Resources.

**Wildlife Refuge**

- Help maintain a Wildlife Refuge that balances natural conservation with public access, education, and ship navigation. (Policy 9.3.kk)
The project’s consistency with policies projecting the neighboring Wildlife Refuge, or proposed nature reserve, are discussed in Section 4.F, Biological Resources.

The General Plan is currently in substantial compliance with the Reuse Plan due to a 2003 comprehensive GPA and EIR to incorporate the Reuse Plan goals and policies into the General Plan. (See General Plan Chapter 9: Alameda Point.) The proposed General Plan amendments are designed to harmonize the General Plan with the Reuse Plan by increasing the square footage of permitted non-residential uses at Alameda Point from 2.3 million square feet to 5.5 million square feet and reduce the number of permitted housing units from 1,928 to 1,425 consistent with the Reuse Plan.

Project Consistency with the Alameda Zoning Ordinance

The existing M-2-G zoning designation for the project site is not consistent with the majority of the land use designations in both the existing General Plan and the proposed Amendments to the General Plan. As described in the Project Description, the proposed project would involve amending the Zoning Ordinance in a manner that implements the Reuse Plan and General Plan, as shown in Figure 3-10. The Zoning Map Amendment would replace the M-2/G with a new zoning designation. As illustrated in Figure 3-10, the Zoning Ordinance Amendment proposes seven sub-districts to regulate the variety of new uses and improvements envisioned for Alameda Point. The seven sub-districts include:

Enterprise (AP-E). The Sub-district would provide lands for high quality industrial and office park development to accommodate employment generating research and development, manufacturing, engineering, and sales and administration businesses. Generalized development standards in this district are intended to ensure high quality, well designed new buildings that are appropriately buffered from sensitive nearby residential and open space uses. Allowed uses are limited to prevent intrusion of uses that would limit or constrain future use of these lands by manufacturing, research, and other preferred uses.

Adaptive Reuse (AP-AR). The Sub-district would provide lands for a broad range of uses that create employment opportunities, support reinvestment in the existing buildings within the NAS Alameda Historic District, and support the adjacent Sub-districts. As noted above, the emphasis would be on reuse of existing buildings, particularly those that are contributory to the National Register and City Historical Monument historic district. However, demolition of identified historical resources would not be prohibited, and in instances where existing buildings are not readily adaptable to new uses, it is anticipated that some historic buildings and resources would be demolished over time.

Town Center (AP-TC). Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance and Town Center and Waterfront Precise Plan, this Sub-district would provide lands for a mixed-use, waterfront town center that serves as a retail, entertainment, lodging, recreational, visitor-serving and transit center for Alameda Point. Medium to high-density residential uses are appropriate in Town Center to support a transit and pedestrian-friendly mixed-use neighborhood. Portions of this sub-district fall within the NAS Alameda Historic District.
Main Street Neighborhood (AP-MS). The Sub-district would provide lands for a variety of housing types and densities with complementary small-scale, neighborhood-serving commercial and service uses, urban agriculture and parks uses. This area would be subject to a subsequent precise plan to ensure that it is carefully designed to allow for a mix of residential densities compatible with the adjacent Main Street Ferry Terminal, open space and waterfront lands, and former officer family housing, commonly referred to as the “Big Whites.” Portions of this sub-district fall within the NAS Alameda Historic District.

Maritime (AP-M). The Sub-district would provide lands for primarily waterfront, Public Trust compliant uses, including a variety of maritime and visitor-serving uses, concessions related to maritime activities, hotels, restaurants and other Public Trust compliant commercial uses.

Open Space (AP-OS). The Sub-district would provide lands for parks, recreation, trails, and large-scale public assembly and event areas.

Nature Reserve (AP-NR). The Sub-district would provide land for long-term protection of habitat primarily for the endangered California Least Tern, but also for other wildlife.

The proposed zoning would provide a foundation for more detailed planning efforts for certain sub-districts. For example, the “Town Center” and the “Main Street Neighborhood” sub-districts would require additional, detailed development standards. These areas would be guided by detailed form-based design and development standards (i.e., master plans or precise plans) which would provide more detailed standards and requirements to ensure that the ultimate development of these areas would reflect the transit-oriented, pedestrian-friendly, environmentally sustainable, mixed-use vision described in the Reuse Plan and General Plan. As noted, the Town Center and Waterfront Precise Plan is being prepared and is analyzed in this EIR as part of the proposed project. The City anticipates future preparation of a precise plan for the Main Street Neighborhood Sub-district.

In contrast, other sub-districts and/or activities would not have as detailed or prescriptive standards, but instead would be more general in nature. The proposed site-wide zoning would be sufficiently clear in identifying the types of permitted and conditional uses that are appropriate, and the development standards that are required for the “Enterprise,” “Adaptive Reuse,” and “Maritime” sub-districts.

While the immediate opportunities within the “Enterprise” sub-district, due to the NAS Alameda Historic District, would be directed towards adaptive reuse opportunities for new business, the “Enterprise” sub-district would focus on new job-generating construction opportunities that become available similar to the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) 2nd Campus process.

Conclusion

Conflicts with a General Plan or other relevant plans do not necessarily result in a significant effect on the environment within the context of CEQA. Section 15358(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states that “effects analyzed under CEQA must be related to a physical change.” Appendix G of the
CEQA Guidelines makes explicit the focus on physical environmental policies and plans, asking whether the project would “conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation… adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect” (emphasis added). Hence, the project’s conflict or inconsistency with the policy could indicate that an environmental threshold has been exceeded. To the extent that the project exceeds an environmental threshold and significant physical impacts may result from a policy conflict or inconsistency, such physical impacts have been identified and fully analyzed in the relevant topical sections of this EIR.

The physical environmental effects of the proposed General Plan amendment and rezoning, and associated increases in development, such as increased traffic, noise, air emissions, habitat degradation, visual resources effects and hydrologic impacts, are discussed in their respective sections in this EIR. Assuming approval and adoption of the General Plan Amendment and Zoning designation described above, the project would be consistent with the applicable land use plans and policies and there would be a less-than-significant land use impact.

**Mitigation:** None required.

---

**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)**

The San Francisco Estuary Project (SFEP) is a federal-state-local partnership established under the Clean Water Act’s National Estuary Program. It is a cooperative effort working to promote effective management of the Bay-Delta Estuary, and to restore and maintain its water quality and natural resources while maintaining the region’s economic vitality. The SFEP oversees and tracks implementation of its Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) goals, objectives and actions to protect and restore the Estuary. The CCMP serves as a roadmap for restoring the Estuary’s chemical, physical, and biological health and was adopted in 1993, with an updated CCMP adopted in 2007.

The San Francisco Baylands Habitat Goals and Subtidal Habitat Goals Reports, provide a scientific foundation and approach for the conservation and enhancement of the baylands and submerged areas of San Francisco Bay. The Baylands Habitat Goals establish a long-term vision for a healthy and sustainable baylands ecosystem. The Goals Project was recommended by the Governor’s “California Wetlands Conservation Policy” and by the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s San Francisco Estuary Project. The Subtidal Habitat Goals were prepared as a collaboration among BCDC, California Ocean Protection Council/California State Coastal Conservancy, NOAA, and the San Francisco Estuary Partnership (Goals Project 2010). These reports contain recommended conservation goals for Bay habitats potentially affected by project activities that can be used by permitting agencies when evaluating proposed projects within their jurisdiction. Although the Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Goals Project are not regulatory documents they are
supported by most of the agencies and non-governmental groups with major planning, operational, or regulatory interests in Bay Area wetlands and any adverse effects on wetlands, shorelines, and subtidal habitats would also have potential negative effects on special-status species, critical habitat for federal listed species, managed fish species Essential Fish Habitat, or habitat for protected marine mammals.

Further, implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures contained in the USFWS Biological Opinion for Alameda Point and embodied in the Navy’s Declaration of Restrictions, which place restrictions on Alameda Point development protective of biological resources. It would also help ensure that development facilitated by the proposed project would be implemented in a manner intended to maintain consistency with the Comprehensive Conservation Management Plan (CCMP) for the San Francisco Bay Estuary.

Mitigation: None required.

Cumulative Impact

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)

The geographic context considered for the cumulative land use, plans, and policy impacts includes the surrounding area that, when combined with the proposed project, could result in cumulative land use, plans, and policy impacts. Past projects are included in the existing setting described in this section and in the introduction for this chapter. Present projects would include any projects currently under construction and reasonably foreseeable future projects are those that could be developed or occur in the project site area by 2035.

As concluded in this section, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts resulting from physically dividing an established community or conflicting with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The proposed project site is primarily self-contained, because it is bounded by roadways, the Oakland Estuary, federal land, and San Francisco Bay.

Land use impacts from the proposed project are local and limited to the project site. The area immediately east of the project site is generally built out pursuant to the General Plan with a mix of residential, institutional and commercial land uses. Although redevelopment of the project site would increase the intensity of commercial, industrial, residential, and recreational uses, these uses would not combine with the developments above to result in cumulative impacts related to physical division of an established community. To the contrary, the cumulative effect of these development projects would be to integrate existing underutilized sites into the larger city fabric,
and the projects would improve land use compatibility compared to existing conditions. The cumulative impact would be less than significant.

Regarding consistency with plans and policies, future development within the project must be consistent with the City’s General Plan and other applicable land use plans and requirements. The cumulative projects also would be subject to the General Plan, Specific Plan (if applicable) and the Zoning Ordinance to ensure land use compatibility. Further, implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures contained in the USFWS Biological Opinion for Alameda Point and embodied in the Navy’s Declaration of Restrictions, which place restrictions on Alameda Point development protective of biological resources. It would also help ensure that development facilitated by the proposed project would be implemented in a manner intended to maintain consistency with the Comprehensive Conservation Management Plan (CCMP) for the San Francisco Bay Estuary, as discussed under Impact 4.A-3. The proposed project would not combine with other developments to result in a significant cumulative land use impact associated with conflicts with plans and policies. As described above, the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance would be amended under the proposed project to ensure consistency with applicable policies.

Therefore, it is not anticipated that the proposed project, together with other past, present or reasonably foreseeable future development in the area, would result in a cumulative impact with respect to conflicts with land use, plans and policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Thus, the proposed project would not result in a significant cumulative land use impact.

**Mitigation:** None required.

---
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