

**TABLE 5-1
SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT**

	Broadway Valdez Development Program	No Project Alternative 1	Partially Mitigated Alternative 2 (including the Historic Preservation Sub-Alternative)	Maximum Theoretical Buildout Alternative 3
Residential Units	1,800	1,400	1,800	5,400
Office (sq. ft.)	700,000	120,000	300,000	2,090,000
Retail (sq. ft.)	1,100,000	140,000	150,000	1,670,000
Hotel Rooms	180	0	0	540
<i>Non-Residential Development (sq. ft.)</i>	<i>1,800,000</i>	<i>260,000</i>	<i>600,000</i>	<i>3,760,000</i>
Estimated Daily Trip Generation	40,301	12,908	17,293	65,953
Service Population				
Employees	4,500	650	1,210	10,400
Residents	3,230	2,500	3,230	9,690
Total	7,740	3,160	4,440	20,090
GHG Emissions				
Total Emissions (CO ₂ e)	38,116 MT/yr	<u>12,648 MT/yr</u>	<u>17,943 MT/yr</u>	77,693 MT/yr
GHG Emissions by Service Population (CO ₂ e)	4.9 MT/yr	<u>4.0 MT/yr</u>	<u>4.0 MT/yr</u>	<u>3.9 MT/yr</u>
Average Daily Construction Emissions (lb/day) (Worst Case Year)				
ROG	120 pounds per day (lb/day)	<u>72 lb/day</u>	<u>75 lb/day</u>	691 lb/day
NOx	55 lb/day	<u>40 lb/day</u>	<u>42 lb/day</u>	75 lb/day
Average Daily Operational Emissions (lb/day)				
ROG	181 pounds per day (lb/day)	<u>73 (lb/day)</u>	<u>99 (lb/day)</u>	404 (lb/day)
NOx	197 (lb/day)	<u>66 (lb/day)</u>	<u>90 (lb/day)</u>	348(lb/day)
PM ₁₀	253(lb/day)	<u>87(lb/day)</u>	<u>119 (lb/day)</u>	443(lb/day)
Maximum Annual Operational Emissions (ton/year)				
ROG	31 tons per year (ton/yr)	<u>13 ton/yr</u>	<u>17 ton/yr</u>	70 ton/yr
NOx	36 ton/yr	<u>12 ton/yr</u>	<u>16 ton/yr</u>	63 ton/yr
PM ₁₀	37 ton/yr	<u>13 ton/yr</u>	<u>17 ton/yr</u>	65 ton/yr

Bold and underlined formatted text indicates value is less than would occur with the Specific Plan.

SOURCE: Detailed tables for each of the data in this table are provided in Appendix I, *Alternatives Technical Background*, to this Draft EIR.

**TABLE 5-5
SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS: SPECIFIC PLAN AND ALTERNATIVES**

	Specific Plan (Broadway Valdez Development Program)	No Project Alternative 1	Partially Mitigated Alternative 2 (including the Historic Preservation Sub-Alternative)	Maximum Theoretical Buildout Alternative 3
Environmental Impact				
Aesthetics, Shadow and Wind				
Impact AES-1: Adoption and development under the Specific Plan would not adversely affect scenic public vistas or views of scenic resources (Criteria 1 and 2). (Less than Significant)	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact AES-2: Adoption and development under the Specific Plan would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings (Criterion 3). (Less than Significant)	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact AES-3: Adoption and development under the Specific Plan would result in new sources of light or glare which would not substantially and adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area (Criterion 4). (Less than Significant)	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact AES-4: Adoption and development under the Specific Plan could result in substantial new shadow that would shade solar collectors, passive solar heaters, public open spaces, or historic resources or otherwise result in inadequate provision of adequate light (Criteria 5 through 9). (Conservatively Significant and Unavoidable)	Conservatively SU	Conservatively SU	LS	Conservatively SU↑
Impact AES-5: Adoption and development under the Specific Plan has the potential to result in adverse wind conditions (Criterion 10). (Conservatively Significant and Unavoidable)	Conservatively SU	LS	LS	Conservatively SU↑
Impact AES-6: Adoption and development under the Specific Plan, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects within and around the Plan Area, would result in significant cumulative wind, and shadow impacts. (Conservatively Significant and Unavoidable)	Conservatively SU	Conservatively SU	LS	Conservatively SU↑
Air Quality				
Impact AIR-1: Construction associated with adoption and development under the Specific Plan would result in average daily emissions of 54 pounds per day of ROG, NO _x , or PM _{2.5} or 82 pounds per day of PM ₁₀ (Criterion 1). (Conservatively Significant and Unavoidable)	Conservatively SU	Conservatively SU↓	Conservatively SU↓	Conservatively SU↑
Impact AIR-2: Adoption and development under the Specific Plan would result in operational average daily emissions of more than 54 pounds per day of ROG, NO _x , or PM _{2.5} or 82 pounds per day of PM ₁₀ ; or result in maximum annual emissions of 10 tons per year of ROG, NO _x , or PM _{2.5} or 15 tons per year of PM ₁₀ (Criterion 2). (Conservatively Significant and Unavoidable)	Conservatively SU	Conservatively SU↓	Conservatively SU↓	Conservatively SU↑

Legend

LS Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LSM Less than significant impact, after mitigation

SU Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation or standard conditions

N No impact

↑↓ Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation, but with no change in impact determination; **Changes from proposed project impact determination shown in bold**

TABLE 5-5 (Continued)
SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS: SPECIFIC PLAN AND ALTERNATIVES

Environmental Impact	Specific Plan (Broadway Valdez Development Program)	No Project Alternative 1	Partially Mitigated Alternative 2 (including the Historic Preservation Sub-Alternative)	Maximum Theoretical Buildout Alternative 3
Biological Resources (cont.)				
Impact BIO-6: Adoption and development under the Specific Plan could fundamentally conflict with the City of Oakland Creek Protection Ordinance (OMC Chapter 13.16) intended to protect biological resources (Criterion 7). (Less than Significant)	LS	LS ↓	LS ↓	LS ↑
Impact BIO-7: Construction activity and operations of adoption and development under the Specific Plan, in combination with past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the Plan Area, would not result in impacts on special-status species, sensitive habitats, wildlife movement corridors, wetlands, and other waters of the U.S. (Less than Significant)	LS	LS ↓	LS ↓	LS ↑
Cultural Resources				
Impact CUL-1: Adoption of and development under the Specific Plan could result in the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of historical resources that are listed in or may be eligible for listing in the federal, state, or local registers of historical resources (Criterion 1). (Significant and Unavoidable)	SU	SU ↓	LS	SU ↑
Impact CUL-2: Adoption of and development under the Specific Plan could result in significant impacts to unknown archaeological resources (Criterion 2). (Less than Significant)	LS	LS ↓	LS ↓	LS ↑
Impact CUL-3: Adoption of and development under the Specific Plan could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature (Criterion 3). (Less than Significant)	LS	LS ↓	LS ↓	LS ↑
Impact CUL-4: Adoption of and development under the Specific Plan could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (Criterion 4). (Less than Significant)	LS	LS ↓	LS ↓	LS ↑
Impact CUL-5: Adoption of and development under the Specific Plan, combined with cumulative development in the Plan Area and citywide, including past, present, existing, approved, pending, and reasonably foreseeable future development, would contribute considerably to a significant adverse cumulative impact to cultural resources. (Significant and Unavoidable)	SU	SU ↓	LS	SU ↑

Legend

LS Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LSM Less than significant impact, after mitigation

SU Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation or standard conditions

N No impact

↑↓ Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation, but with no change in impact determination; **Changes from proposed project impact determination shown in bold**