

Energy and Climate Action Plan Addendum

Brief Overview of CEQA Approach and Summary Conclusions

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine whether a Subsequent or Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or (Mitigated) Negative Declaration (MND) is needed to fully assess and evaluate the impacts of adoption and implementation of the City of Oakland's Energy and Climate Action Plan (ECAP). As detailed below, an Addendum is the appropriate California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document and no Supplemental or Subsequent EIR/MND is required. This document constitutes the Addendum. Moreover, this Addendum satisfies the requirements for environmental review contained in State CEQA Guidelines section 15183.5 and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's June 2010 CEQA Guidelines for a "Qualified" Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, as discussed in detail in the ECAP Appendix (see CEQA Review of Future Development Projects). Therefore, future development projects may be able to tier-off/streamline CEQA review related to greenhouse gas emissions.

The City has previously prepared and certified/adopted a: (a) 1998 Land Use and Transportation Element EIR; (b) 1996 Open Space Conservation and Recreation Element Negative Declaration; (c) 2010 Housing Element EIR; (d) 2004 Safety Element Negative Declaration; (e) 1998 Historic Preservation Element EIR; (f) 2005 Noise Element Negative Declaration; (g) 2007 Bicycle Master Plan EIR; (h) 2002 Pedestrian Master Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration; and (i) 1999 Estuary Policy Plan EIR. Collectively these CEQA reviews are known as the "Previous CEQA Documents." No legal actions were filed challenging the Previous CEQA Documents and thus they are presumed valid.

In addition, on November 3, 2008, the City Council adopted Standards Conditions of Approval/Uniformly Applied Development Standards, via Ordinance No. 12899 C.M.S., which were revised, in part, in July 2011, to substantially reduce or eliminate significant environmental impacts.

Since the adoption of the Previous CEQA Documents, there have been no substantial changes in the City's policies that relate to actions in the ECAP; neither has there been new information, or a change of circumstances which would invalidate the Previous CEQA Documents. In addition, the City has adopted new policies/regulations, including a Green Building Ordinance for private development and changes to the City's Standard Conditions of Approval (see Appendix to Energy and Climate Action Plan Addendum), which further mitigate environmental impacts.

The ECAP is a programmatic planning document which catalogues the priorities of the City for reducing energy use and greenhouse gas emissions associated with Oakland. The ECAP does not approve or authorize a project that will alter the environment. Rather, it outlines the need for future work to develop specific plans and programs to advance each of 175 separate actions. Future work on some of those actions may be subject to CEQA, as described in this analysis.

Adoption of the ECAP does not cause any new construction nor directly impose other changes that would create significant environmental impacts. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and at minimum, no more likely to create a significant environmental impact *due to the ECAP*. Regardless, any such construction would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of the City's routine planning and building permit process. Any such construction would also have to comply with existing policies and requirements in the City's General Plan and the City's Conditions of Approval

& Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Specifically, in conducting this CEQA review, the City compared the 175 “actions” in the ECAP against the content of the Previous CEQA Documents to determine which actions had already been analyzed (or “cleared”) under CEQA. The comparison revealed:

1. 97 actions in the ECAP (55% of the total) were referred to in the text of the Previous CEQA Documents; and
2. The remaining 78 actions in the ECAP (45% of the total) were not expressly referenced in the Previous CEQA Documents, though the content of many of these actions is generally consistent with themes and goals included in other adopted City policies and existing practices.

The City considers the 97 ECAP actions that were referred to in the text of the Previous CEQA Documents to have been analyzed (“cleared”) under CEQA. Thus, these 97 actions **do not** represent a substantial change which would warrant further CEQA review, other than this Addendum (See Section IIA below).

Of the remaining 78 ECAP actions that were not expressly analyzed in the Previous CEQA Documents, a large majority are administrative, directing, for example, the City to “replace inefficient City vehicles”, or “enable more services to be accessed online”, or “include climate content in regular community surveys”, or “develop a community green jobs electronic bulletin board”. Upon further review, 69 of these actions have been found to create no new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified impacts (See Section II B below).

Of the remaining nine (9) ECAP actions, the impacts of each action, once it is taken, could vary depending on the specific content of the action. Details of the future plan/action are not known at this time, and thus are speculative and cannot be evaluated in detail, but the City’s intent and goal will be to reduce environmental impacts through taking each action. Further consideration with respect to CEQA would need to be undertaken as the actions are further independently developed. Seven of these nine actions may be subject to future review by the City, and two of these actions may be subject to future review by other lead agencies (See Section IIC below).

Section IID below, presents a narrative discussion of each of the environmental topics in the City’s CEQA Thresholds of Significance as they relate to the ECAP.

This Addendum demonstrates that no further/additional CEQA review is required. None of the circumstances necessitating preparation of additional CEQA review as specified in CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, including without limitation Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163, are present in that:

- 1) there are no substantial changes to the project that would result in new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of significant impacts already identified in the Previous CEQA Documents;
- 2) there are no substantial changes in circumstances that would result in new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of significant impacts already identified in the Previous CEQA Documents; and
- 3) there is no new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the Previous CEQA Documents were adopted, which is expected to result in (a) new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant environmental effects already identified in the Previous CEQA Documents; or (b) mitigation measures which were previously determined not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, or which are considerably different from those recommended in the Previous CEQA

Documents, and which would substantially reduce significant effects of the project, but the City declines to adopt them.

Thus, in considering adoption of the ECAP, the City can rely on the Previous CEQA Documents, and no further/additional CEQA review is required.

Furthermore, as a separate and independent basis, the ECAP is also exempt from CEQA review pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183, as the City finds and determines that:

- a) the project is consistent with the Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE), for which an EIR was certified in March 1998;
- b) feasible mitigation measures identified in the LUTE EIR were adopted and have been, or will be, undertaken;
- c) the EIR evaluated impacts peculiar to the project and/or project site, as well as off-site and cumulative impacts;
- d) uniformly applied development policies and/or standards (City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval) have been adopted and found, when applied to future projects, to substantially mitigate impacts. To the extent that no such findings were previously made, the City hereby finds and determines that the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval imposed on the project substantially mitigate environmental impacts; and
- e) substantial new information does not exist to show that the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval will not substantially mitigate the project and cumulative impacts.

I. INTRODUCTION

This document provides a description of the proposed ECAP, and evaluates it in accordance with CEQA. Because CEQA applies most directly to a project, for the purposes of this analysis, the ECAP is the project under CEQA review. When the “project” is referred to in the analysis below, it is the ECAP being referred to, not any individual City strategy, policy, action or program.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following provides a brief description of the project location and objectives.

Project Location

The ECAP applies citywide.

Project Objectives

The proposed project is the adoption and implementation of a policy document, the Oakland Energy and Climate Action Plan (ECAP).

The ECAP is intended to provide policy direction and guide the development, enhancement and implementation of actions the City and the community can take to significantly reduce energy use and the generation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. These emissions are generally associated with energy use in community buildings, the use of motor vehicles in the community, and the production of waste by the community. The ECAP will assist the City of Oakland in continuing its legacy of leadership on energy, climate and sustainability issues.

The ECAP includes a target to reduce GHG emissions associated with Oakland by 36% from 2005 levels by 2020. This target was established by the Oakland City Council in July 2009.

The ECAP includes the following major elements:

- Description of the types and quantities of GHG emissions associated with Oakland
- Projection of how those emissions could be expected to grow under business-as-usual conditions
- Goals, policies and actions that the City and community can implement to achieve GHG reductions and other community benefits such as increased green job opportunities and improved public health
- Description of how implementation will be coordinated, including a timeline and ideas for identifying existing and potential costs and funding sources
- Description of how the City will track and report on implementation progress, and how the ECAP will be updated in the future as information evolves

The ECAP outlines a ten year plan including 175 actions that will enable Oakland to achieve a 36% reduction in GHG emissions with respect to each of these GHG sources. Oakland can accomplish this goal by 2020 through:

- 20% reduction in vehicle miles traveled annually as residents, workers and visitors meet daily needs by walking, bicycling, and using transit;
- 24 million gallons of oil saved annually due to less driving and more fuel efficient vehicles on local roads;
- 32% decrease in electricity consumption through renewable generation, conservation and energy efficiency;

- 14% decrease in natural gas consumption through building retrofits, solar hot water projects and conservation;
- 62 million kWh and 2.7 million therms annually of new renewable energy used to meet local needs; and
- 375,000 tons of waste diverted away from local landfills through waste reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting.

The ECAP also recommends a Three Year Priority Implementation Plan - a prioritized subset of actions recommended for implementation in the next three years. These priority actions will capitalize on near term opportunities and lay the groundwork for long term progress. Some of the recommended priority actions can be implemented with existing and anticipated resources. Others will require the identification of new, in some cases significant, resources to move forward. Implementation responsibility, status and resource needs are outlined for each recommended priority action.

Achieving Oakland's GHG reduction goals will require a collaborative effort. The ECAP outlines the role that recent State policies are expected to play in reducing GHG emissions, and provides a vision for the role of additional community leadership. The ECAP also recommends steps the City can take to help Oakland adapt to the impacts of climate change and increase community resilience.

Implementing the actions identified in the ECAP has the potential to create a variety of community benefits, including energy cost savings, local green economic development and job creation, reduced local air pollution, improved public health, and other quality of life enhancements throughout Oakland.

Progress in reducing citywide GHG emissions will be reported annually. The ECAP will be updated every three years to review progress, identify new priority actions and maintain momentum.

II. CEQA ANALYSIS

Content of the ECAP is similar to that of several adopted City policy documents which have previously undergone review pursuant to CEQA resulting in adopted environmental documents as listed below:

- a) Land Use and Transportation Element – EIR adopted in 1998 via Resolution 74129 C.M.S. and amended in 2006 via Resolution 80209 C.M.S.
- b) Open Space Conservation and Recreation Element – Negative Declaration adopted in 1996 via Resolution 72723 C.M.S.
- c) Housing Element – EIR adopted in 2010 via Resolution No. 83134 C.M.S.
- d) Safety Element – Negative Declaration adopted in 2004 via Resolution No. 78915 C.M.S. and amended in 2012 via Resolution No. 83939 C.M.S.
- e) Historic Preservation Element – EIR adopted in 1998 via Resolution No. 74403 C.M.S. and amended in 2006 via Resolution No. 80363 C.M.S.
- f) Noise Element – Negative Declaration adopted in 2005 via Resolution No. 79312 C.M.S.
- g) Bicycle Master Plan – EIR adopted in 2007 via Resolution No. 80959 C.M.S.
- h) Pedestrian Master Plan – Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted in 2002 via Resolution No. 77514 C.M.S.
- i) Estuary Policy Plan – EIR adopted in 1999 via Resolution No. 75037 C.M.S. and amended in 2006 via Resolution 79982 C.M.S.

Collectively these CEQA reviews are known as the “Previous CEQA Documents.” No legal actions were filed challenging the Previous CEQA Documents and thus they are presumed valid. In addition, on November 3, 2008, the City Council adopted Standards Conditions of Approval/Uniformly Applied Development Standards, via Ordinance No. 12899, to substantially mitigate environmental effects.

Since the adoption of the Previous CEQA Documents, there have been no substantial changes in the City's policies that relate to actions in the ECAP; neither has there been new information, or a change of circumstances which would invalidate the Previous CEQA Documents. In addition, the City has adopted new policies/regulations, including a Green Building Ordinance for private development and changes to the City's Standard Conditions of Approval (see Appendix to Energy and Climate Action Plan Addendum), which further mitigate environmental impacts.

The City compared the 175 "actions" in the ECAP against the content of the Previous CEQA Documents to determine which actions had already been analyzed (or "cleared") under CEQA. The comparison revealed:

1. 97 actions in the ECAP (55% of the total) were referred to in the text of the Previous CEQA Documents; and
2. The remaining 78 actions in the ECAP (45% of the total) were not referenced in the Previous CEQA Documents, though the content of many of these actions is generally consistent with themes and goals included in other adopted City policies and existing practices.

A. ECAP Actions which were "Cleared" under Previous CEQA Documents

The City considers the 97 ECAP actions that were referred to in the text of the Previous CEQA Documents to have been analyzed ("cleared") under CEQA (see Table 1). Thus, these 97 actions **do not** represent a substantial change which would warrant further CEQA review, other than this Addendum. The following notation keys are used in the "CEQA Consideration" column of the tables below to denote the adopted City policy documents being referenced:

- LUTE: Land Use and Transportation Element
- OSCAR: Open Space Conservation and Recreation Element
- HE: Housing Element
- SE: Safety Element
- HPE: Historic Preservation Element
- NE: Noise Element
- BMP: Bicycle Master Plan
- PMP: Pedestrian Master Plan
- EPP: Estuary Policy Plan

In addition, the following notation key is used for one policy document approved by another lead agency:

- ACT: AC Transit 2012 Final EIR/EIS for its International Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit Project

Table 1. ECAP Actions Analyzed Under Previous CEQA Documents

Action #	ECAP Action	CEQA Consideration
Goal Area: Transportation and Land Use		
Strategy: Institutionalize a More Comprehensive Approach to Transportation and Land Use Planning		
TLU-3	Integrate Land Use and Transportation Planning in Every Project	Previously Analyzed – consistent with LUTE Pol T2.2; LUTE Pol T2.5
Advance Infill, Mixed-Use and Transit-Oriented Development		
TLU-6	Identify and Adopt Priority Development Areas	Previously Analyzed – consistent with LUTE Pol N8.1; LUTE Pol N3.2
TLU-8	Require Transit-Oriented Development Performance for New Development	Previously Analyzed – consistent with LUTE Pol T4.1; LUTE Pol T2.1; LUTE Pol T2.2; OSCAR Pol CO-12.4
TLU-9	Encourage New Housing at Range of Price Levels	Previously Analyzed – consistent with HE Pol 1.3
TLU-11	Promote Vibrant, Safe and Attractive Transit-Oriented Dense Development	Previously Analyzed – consistent with LUTE Pol T2.1; LUTE Pol T2.2; LUTE Pol N8.1; Lute Pol D10.6; Lute Pol D11.1; OSCAR Pol CO-12.1; OSCAR Pol CO-12.2; HE Pol 1.3.2; HE Pol 7.3
TLU-12	Engage Lenders on Infill Development Strategy	Previously Analyzed – consistent with LUTE Pol N3.2; Lute Pol D10.6
Advance the Use of Low-Carbon Transportation Modes		
TLU-13	Launch and Develop a Funding Plan for the Downtown Shuttle	Previously Analyzed – As noted in the ECAP, the Broadway Shuttle launched prior the completion of the ECAP and represents an existing condition. It is estimated that the Shuttle creates net GHG and air pollution reductions. It is assumed that no significant impacts would be created by expansion of shuttle hours or services as long as no new lanes or signals are installed; indeed, a future shuttle expansion would reduce traffic and air quality impacts.
TLU-14	Advance Bus Rapid Transit in Oakland	Previously Analyzed – consistent with ACT Final Environmental Impact Statement/Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIS/FEIR)
TLU-16	Accelerate Completion of Bicycle and Pedestrian Networks	Previously Analyzed – consistent with LUTE Pol T3.5; LUTE Pol T4.5; LUTE Pol T4.10; EPP Pol JL-15; EPP Pol OAK-9; BMP Pol 1A; BMP Pol 1B; BMP Pol 1C; BMP Pol 1D; BMP Pol 3A; BMP Pol 3B; BMP Pol 3C; PMP Pol 1.1; PMP Pol 1.2; PMP Pol 1.3; PMP Pol 2.1; PMP Pol 2.2; PMP Pol 2.3; PMP Pol 3.2; PMP Pol 4.1
TLU-17	Optimize Street Design for Transit, Bicycling and Walking	Previously Analyzed – consistent with LUTE Pol T3.5; LUTE Pol T4.5; LUTE Pol D3.1; LUTE Pol T3.6; LUTE Pol T3.7; EPP Pol OAK-10; BMP Pol 1B; BMP Pol 1C; PMP Pol 1.1; PMP Pol 1.2; PMP Pol 1.3; PMP Pol 2.1; PMP Pol 2.2; PMP Pol 2.3; PMP Pol 3.2
TLU-18	Support Alternative Transportation Strategies by Private Employers	Previously Analyzed – consistent with LUTE Pol T4.1; BMP Pol 2A; BMP Pol 3B; BMP Pol 3C; PMP Pol 4.1; supportive of OSCAR Pol CO12.3
TLU-19	Expand and Enhance Transit Service, Interconnections, Vehicles, and Facilities	Previously Analyzed – consistent with LUTE Pol T3.6; LUTE Pol N1.2; LUTE Pol D13.1; LUTE Pol T2.5; LUTE Pol T4.6; OSCAR Pol CO-12.2; OSCAR Pol REC-8.7; BMP Pol 1C; PMP Pol 2.3; EPP Pol JL-14; EPP Pol OAK-9
TLU-20	Enhance Transit Service on Major Corridors	Previously Analyzed – consistent with LUTE Pol T3.6; LUTE Pol N1.2; LUTE Pol T4.3
TLU-21	Provide Outreach on Alternative Transportation Options	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO12.3; LUTE Pol T4.2

Energy and Climate Action Plan Addendum

TLU-22	Promote Transportation Options Information	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO12.3; LUTE Pol T4.2
TLU-23	Promote Educational Outreach Efforts	Previously Analyzed – consistent with BMP Pol 2A; PMP Pol 4.1; supportive of OSCAR Pol CO12.3; LUTE Pol T4.2
TLU-24	Encourage Bike Sharing Programs	Previously Analyzed – consistent with BMP Pol 1D; BMP Pol 2A; supportive of OSCAR Pol CO12.3
TLU-25	Explore Strategies for Increasing Local Car Share Capacity	Previously Analyzed – consistent with LUTE Pol T4.1; supportive of OSCAR Pol CO12.3
TLU-26	Enforce Transportation Demand Management Measures in New Development	Previously Analyzed – consistent with LUTE Pol T3.6; supportive of OSCAR Pol CO12.3
TLU-27	Reduce Barriers to Transit	Previously Analyzed – consistent with LUTE Pol 3.7; supportive of OSCAR Pol CO12.3
Refine Parking Policies to Encourage Low-Carbon Mobility		
TLU-28	Develop Regulations Allowing Alternatives to Installing Parking	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO12.3
TLU-29	Develop a Dynamic Parking Pricing Strategy	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO12.3
TLU-30	Impose Parking Maximums on New Development	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO12.3
TLU-31	Facilitate Unbundling of Parking Costs from Renting Building Space	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO12.3
TLU-32	Review Opportunities to Expand Residential Permit Parking	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO12.3
Engage the Port of Oakland and Related Industry in Reducing GHG Emissions		
TLU-42	Study Truck Re-routing Options	Previously Analyzed – consistent with LUTE Pol T1.6; LUTE Pol T1.8
Grow Oakland’s Urban Forest		
TLU-45	Develop an Urban Forest Master Plan	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol OS12.1; OSCAR Pol OS12.2; AC CO7.6.1
TLU-46	Conduct an Urban Tree Inventory	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol OS12.1; OSCAR Pol OS12.2; AC CO7.6.1
TLU-47	Provide Preventative Tree Maintenance and Management	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol OS 12.2
TLU-48	Implement a Street Tree Planting Pilot Project	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol OS12.1; AC CO7.6.1
TLU-49	Promote Proper Forest Management and Private Tree Planting	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol OS12.1; OSCAR Pol OS12.2; AC CO7.6.1
TLU-50	Convene Community Tree Maintenance Workshops	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol OS12.1; OSCAR Pol OS12.2; AC CO7.6.1
TLU-51	Collaborate with Local Organizations on Urban Forestry	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol OS12.1; OSCAR Pol OS12.2; AC CO7.6.1
Goal Area: Building Energy Use		
Optimize Energy Efficiency & Consumption in New Buildings		

Energy and Climate Action Plan Addendum

BE-1	Adopt a Green Building Ordinance for Private Development	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3; HE Pol 7.1; HE Pol 7.4; and considered CEQA in adoption of the ordinance itself
BE-2	Enforce Building Energy Codes	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3
Retrofit Oakland’s Existing Building Stock to Reduce Energy Consumption – All Building Types		
BE-3	Adopt a Green Building Ordinance for Private Renovation Projects	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3; did CEQA on the ordinance
BE-4	Offer Property-Based Energy Financing	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3
BE-5	Engage Utilities to Offer On-Bill Financing Options	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3
BE-6	Create New Residential and Commercial Energy Programs	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3
BE-7	Encourage All Community Members to Engage in Energy Conservation	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; process with no impacts
BE-8	Explore Opportunities to Enhance Control of Energy Program Funds	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3; process with no impacts
BE-9	Engage the Lending Community on Energy Project Financing	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3; process with no impacts
BE-10	Promote Energy Upgrades for Historic Buildings	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3; LUTE Pol D3.2; HPE Pol 2.1; HPE Pol 3.6; HPE Pol 3.14
BE-11	Promote Energy Efficiency to Property Owners and Tenants	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3
Retrofit Oakland’s Existing Building Stock to Reduce Energy Consumption – Commercial/Industrial Buildings		
BE-12	Launch a Downtown Commercial Energy Retrofit Program	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3
BE-13	Encourage Participation in Local Energy Efficiency Programs	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3
BE-14	Target Energy Efficiency Outreach to Energy Intensive Businesses	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3
BE-15	Consider Requiring Energy Benchmarking of Commercial Buildings	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3
BE-16	Require Energy-Related Improvements at Time of Lease or Sale	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3; Standard Conditions of Approval would ensure no significant impacts due to controlling noise, air quality, traffic, etc.
BE-17	Develop New Tools to Advance Commercial Building Retrofits	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3
BE-18	Promote Use of Building Energy Feedback Systems	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3
BE-19	Enhance Energy Retrofit Assistance for Small Commercial Properties	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3
BE-20	Launch a Commercial Building Energy Challenge Program	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3
Retrofit Oakland’s Existing Building Stock to Reduce Energy Consumption – Residential Buildings		
BE-21	Launch a Residential Green Retrofit Program	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3; HE Pol 7.2
BE-22	Conduct a Multi-Family Affordable Housing Retrofit Pilot	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3; HE

		Pol 7.2
BE-23	Expand Weatherization Program Delivery	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3; HE Pol 7.2
BE-24	Accelerate Energy Retrofits in Tenant-Occupied Properties	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3; HE Pol 7.2
BE-25	Adopt a Residential Energy Improvement Time of Sale Ordinance	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3; HE Pol 7.2
BE-26	Support Entry-Level Residential Energy Services Programs	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3; HE Pol 7.2
BE-27	Make Energy Related Tools Available at the Tool Lending Library	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; HE Pol 7.2
Increase the Use of Clean Renewable Energy		
BE-28	Launch a Community Solar Program	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.4
BE-29	Encourage PG&E to Offer Green Power	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.4; process – no impact from encouraging
BE-30	Continue to Monitor Community Choice Energy	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.4; process – no impact from monitoring
BE-31	Study Local Renewable Energy Potential	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.4; process – no impact from studying
Promote Water Conservation and Efficiency		
BE-32	Create an Oakland-specific Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-4.2.1
BE-33	Expand Promotion of Water Conservation and Efficiency	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-4.1
BE-34	Support Partners in Promoting Water Conservation and Efficiency	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-4.1
BE-35	Encourage Use of Rainwater Collection Systems in New Development	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-4.1
BE-36	Encourage Use of Rainwater and Greywater Systems	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-4.1
BE-37	Promote Detailed Water Metering	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-4.1
BE-38	Support EBMUD Water Conservation and Efficiency Programs	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-4.1; OSCAR Pol CO-4.3
BE-39	Promote Indoor Water Efficiency in Private Development	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-4.1
BE-40	Landscape Municipal Open Space with Water Efficient Vegetation	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-4.2
BE-41	Require Water Efficiency in City Operations	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-4.1
Optimize Energy Efficiency & Consumption in City Facilities		
BE-42	Implement Advanced Operating Procedures for City Facilities	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2
BE-43	Improve Energy Performance of New City Facilities	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3
BE-44	Retrofit City Facilities to Improve Energy Performance	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2; OSCAR Pol CO-13.3

BE-45	Explore Alternative Energy for City Facilities	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.4
BE-46	Upgrade to Energy-Efficient Streetlights	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2
BE-47	Develop and provide training to City employees on targeted energy and climate issues.	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-13.2
Goal Area: Material Consumption and Waste		
Expand and Improve Waste Reduction, Reuse, Recycling, and Composting		
MW-7	Identify and Retain Industrial Lands for Zero Waste Businesses	Previously Analyzed – consistent with the City’s pre-existing Recycling Market Development Zone program.
Foster More Local Food Production		
MW-18	Evaluate the Potential of Creating Community Gardens on City-Controlled Public Land	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol OS-2.3
Adapting & Increasing Resilience to Climate Change		
Study Potential Local Climate Impacts		
AD-1	Participate in Regional Climate Adaptation Discussions	Previously Analyzed – consistent with SE Pol PS-1; SE Pol FL-3; SE Act FL-4.4
AD-2	Conduct a Study of Local Climate Impacts	Previously Analyzed – consistent with SE Pol PS-1; SE Act FL-4.4
Communicate Climate Impacts to the Community		
AD-3	Communicate Climate Impacts Information to the Community	Previously Analyzed – consistent with SE Pol PS-1; SE Act FL-4.3
Identify and Act on Opportunities to Improve Resilience		
AD-4	Identify and Act on Opportunities to Improve Resilience in City Plans and Policies	Previously Analyzed – consistent with SE Pol PS-1; SE Pol FL-3; SE Pol FL-1; SE Pol FL-2; SE Pol FL-3; SE Act FL-4.3; SE Act FL-4.4
AD-5	Update Community Emergency Preparedness Plans and Capacity	Previously Analyzed – consistent with SE Pol PS-1; SE Pol FL-1; SE Pol FL-2; SE Pol FL-3; SE Act FL-4.3; SE Act FL-4.4
AD-6	Encourage Development of Regional Climate Adaptation Strategy	Previously Analyzed – consistent with SE Pol PS-1; SE Pol FL-1; SE Pol FL-2; SE Pol FL-3; SE Act FL-4.4
AD-7	Develop a Climate Adaptation Plan	Previously Analyzed – consistent with SE Pol PS-1; SE Pol FL-1; SE Pol FL-2; SE Act FL-4.4
AD-8	Require Reflective Surfaces to Reduce Urban Heat Island Effect	Previously Analyzed – consistent with SE Pol PS-1
AD-9	Develop Oakland’s Urban Forest	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol OS-12.1; OSCAR Pol OS-12.2; SE Pol PS-1; SE Pol FL-2
AD-10	Promote Indoor and Outdoor Water Conservation and Efficiency	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-4.1; OSCAR Pol CO-4.2; SE Pol PS-1
AD-11	Install Infrastructure to Reduce Flood Impacts	Previously Analyzed – consistent with SE Pol PS-1; SE Pol FL-1; SE Pol FL-2; SE Pol FL-3; SE Act FL-4.3; SE Act FL-4.4
AD-12	Encourage EBMUD to Deliver Recycled Water to Oakland	Previously Analyzed – consistent with OSCAR Pol CO-4.3; SE Pol PS-1

AD-13	Consider Opportunities to Raise Funds for Adaptation	Previously Analyzed – consistent with SE Pol PS-1; SE Pol FL-2; SE Pol FL-3
AD-14	Train City Staff on Climate Adaptation Issues	Previously Analyzed – consistent with SE Pol PS-1; SE Pol FL-1; SE Pol FL-2
AD-15	Explore Local Food as an Adaptation Strategy	Previously Analyzed – consistent with SE Pol PS-1

B. ECAP Actions Analyzed and Found to Cause No Significant Impacts

There are still remaining 78 actions that were not previously analyzed in the Previous CEQA Documents. A discussion of these 78 actions follows, below.

A large majority of these 78 actions are administrative, directing, for example, the City to “replace inefficient City vehicles”, or “enable more services to be accessed online”, or “include climate content in regular community surveys”, or “develop a community green jobs electronic bulletin board”. Sixty-nine (69) of these actions have been found to create no significant impacts. Brief summaries of these findings are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. ECAP Actions Analyzed and Found to Cause No Significant Impacts

Action #	ECAP Action	CEQA Consideration
Goal Area: Transportation and Land Use		
Strategy: Institutionalize a More Comprehensive Approach to Transportation and Land Use Planning		
TLU-4	Augment Planning Commission Role in Transportation Planning	No Significant Impacts – No impacts would result from enhancing consideration of transportation issues by the Planning Commission.
TLU-5	Prioritize GHG Reductions in Zoning Updates	No Significant Impacts – This action involves considering opportunities to fulfill existing City policies that have already been subject to CEQA as zoning is updated.
Foster the Use of Low Carbon Vehicles and Fuels		
TLU-34	Promote Use of Fuel-Efficient Vehicles and Low Carbon Fuels	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from promoting the use of vehicles with reduced fuel consumption and production of air pollutants. Assuming that these alternative vehicles would be purchased at regular vehicle replacement schedules and manufactured in existing vehicle manufacturing facilities outside of Oakland.
TLU-36	Establish GHG Performance Criteria for Large Vehicle Fleets	No Significant Impacts – There would generally be no impact from promoting the use of vehicles with reduced fuel consumption and production of air pollutants.
TLU-37	Consider Regulations for Fuel-Powered Leaf Blowers	No Significant Impacts – There would generally be no impact from promoting the use of equipment powered by less polluting energy sources which produces no direct local air pollutants.
Engage the Port of Oakland and Related Industry in Reducing GHG Emissions		
TLU-38	Call for Port of Oakland GHG Reduction Goals and Plans	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from calling for unspecified voluntary action.
TLU-39	Call for Climate Action by Port Tenants	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from calling for unspecified voluntary action.
TLU-40	Partner with the Port to Advance GHG Reductions	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from offering to partner with

		the Port.
TLU-41	Advocate With the Port for Tenant Performance Requirements	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from advocating. CEQA would be considered as appropriate by Lead Agencies that might impose new requirements in the future.
TLU-43	Make Planning Decisions With Consideration of Port GHG Impacts	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from considering GHG impacts in planning decisions.
Reduce Transportation Impacts of City Operations		
TLU-52	Replace Inefficient City Vehicles	No Significant Impacts – Continuation of the City’s existing practice to replace inefficient City vehicles would reduce GHGs and air pollution in accordance with the City’s Green Fleet policy.
TLU-53	Provide Subsidized Transit Passes and Commuter Allowances	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact as causing a switch from single occupancy vehicles to other modes would reduce pollution, noise and traffic. This action may increase the use of transit which is not a CEQA impact per the City’s CEQA Guidelines.
TLU-54	Discontinue Providing Parking to City Employees	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact as discontinuing subsidizing parking is expected to reduce the use of single occupancy vehicles in favor of alternative modes, thereby reducing pollution, noise, and traffic. This action may increase the use of transit which is not a CEQA impact per the City’s CEQA Guidelines.
TLU-55	Enable Flexible Work Schedules and Encouraging Telecommuting	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact as reducing the amount of driving would reduce pollution, noise and traffic.
TLU-56	Enable More City Services to be Accessed Online	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact as reducing the amount of driving would reduce pollution, noise and traffic.
TLU-57	Reduce the Size of the City’s Vehicle Fleet	No Significant Impacts – Reducing the size of the City’s fleet by eliminating older and more polluting vehicles would reduce GHGs and air pollution in accordance with the City’s Green Fleet policy.
TLU-58	Perform Preventive Maintenance to Optimize Fuel Efficiency	No Significant Impacts – Continuing to perform preventive maintenance would reduce GHGs and air pollution in accordance with the City’s Green Fleet policy. No new maintenance facilities would be required.
TLU-59	Expand Staff Training on Fuel Efficient Vehicle Operations	No Significant Impacts – Continuing to train staff to operate vehicles efficiently would reduce GHGs, air pollution, traffic, and noise.
TLU-60	Expand Capacity to Support Electric and Alternative Fuel Vehicles	No Significant Impacts – Expanding capacity to support electric and alternative fuel vehicles would result in net reductions in GHGs and air pollution in accordance with the City’s Green Fleet policy. It is not anticipated that conversion of City fleet toward other forms of energy would cause construction of new energy production facilities given the relatively negligible size of the City fleet.
TLU-61	Integrate fuel efficient specialized vehicles into City fleet	No Significant Impacts – Continuing to integrate fuel efficient vehicles into the City’s fleet would result in reductions in GHGs and air pollution in accordance with the City’s existing Green Fleet policy.
Goal Area: Material Consumption and Waste		
Expand and Improve Waste Reduction, Reuse, Recycling, and Composting		
MW-1	Restructure Solid Waste Management System	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impacts from the process of redesigning the solid waste management system, which would reduce the amount of solid waste sent to landfill, and result in related reductions in air and water pollution.

MW-2	Refine Implementation of C&D Recycling Ordinance	No Significant Impacts – This action is supportive of the City’s existing Construction and Demolition Recycling Ordinance (2002), and there would be no impacts from improving the submittal process.
MW-3	Require Waste Reduction at Community Events	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from requiring waste reduction plans.
MW-4	Enforce Statewide and Countywide Bans on Certain Materials	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from enforcement of state policy.
MW-5	Conduct New Social Marketing Campaigns	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from campaigns that encourage actions that cause no significant environmental impacts.
MW-6	Study Options for Deeper Waste Reduction Activities	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from studying options.
MW-8	Adopt Zero Waste Practices in City Operations	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from reducing waste in City operations.
MW-9	Require Reporting on Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Policy	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from reporting on policy implementation.
MW-10	Require Waste Reduction Reporting from State-Recognized Institutions	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from reporting on waste reduction activities.
MW-11	Facilitate Recycling of Organics in Multi-Family Buildings	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from promoting the existing practice of collecting organic material for recycling.
MW-12	Promote Bay Friendly Landscaping Practices	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from promoting practices encouraged in the City’s adopted Bay Friendly Landscaping Ordinance (2009).
Encourage Sustainable Consumption		
MW-13	Support Expanded Producer Responsibility	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from supporting advocacy to encourage changes that would reduce environmental impacts.
MW-14	Promote Local Green Businesses and Expand Green Business Program	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from encouraging participation in the Green Business Program, which helps reduce environmental impacts.
MW-15	Foster Reuse, Repair, Buy Local and Buy Recycled	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from promoting preference for reused, repaired, local and recycled materials.
MW-16	Recruit Businesses Supporting Zero Waste Goals to Oakland	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impacts from businesses moving to Oakland in a manner consistent with adopted City plans.
Foster More Local Food Production		
MW-19	Evaluate Potential for Gardens on City-controlled Land	No Significant Impacts – The City has a pre-existing program and process for evaluating the potential of community gardens. Continuing to implement this program would not result in new environmental impacts.
MW-20	Encourage Gardens in Private Development	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from encouraging the inclusion of gardens in private development, assuming this encouragement would be provided with the City’s adopted Bay Friendly Landscaping Guidelines.
MW-21	Promote Consideration of Land Available for Urban Agriculture	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from promoting consideration of land for urban agriculture.
MW-22	Promote Training on Urban Gardening and Composting	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from continuing existing City programs that provide training on urban gardening and composting.
MW-23	Provide Compost to Community Members	No Significant Impacts – There would be no new transportation impacts assuming that people have been driving potentially longer distances to obtain compost

		previously. There are no water quality impacts because existing City water quality standards and the City's adopted Creek Protection Ordinance would require measures to protect water quality and creeks.
MW-24	Include Preference for Local Food in Evaluating Applications for City Funds & Contracts	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from prioritizing local food, which would have the potential to reduce food transportation, reducing GHGs, air pollution, traffic and noise.
MW-25	Encourage Development of Shared Commercial Kitchens	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from encouraging the use of shared commercial kitchens.
Develop Markets for Local Food		
MW-26	Consider Local Food in Selecting Vendors for City Events and Contracts	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impacts from prioritizing local food, which would have the potential to reduce food transportation, reducing GHGs, air pollution, traffic and noise.
MW-27	Promote Food Impact Consideration in Green Business Certification	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from promoting consideration of food issues by existing Green Business Program.
MW-28	Promote Local Food to Community Partners	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from promoting local food, which would have the potential to reduce food transportation, reducing GHGs, air pollution, traffic and noise.
MW-29	Advance Economic Development Strategies Supporting Local Food Production	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from developing strategies to support local food, which would have the potential to reduce food transportation, reducing GHGs, air pollution, traffic and noise.
MW-30	Review Permitting Requirements for Local Food Distribution Efforts	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from reviewing requirements for food distribution efforts related to local food, which would have the potential to reduce food transportation, reducing GHGs, air pollution, traffic and noise.
Goal Area: Community Engagement		
Encourage Community Energy and Climate Action		
CE-1	Provide Additional Information on Energy and Climate Issues Through Existing City Channels	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from providing information through existing City channels.
CE-2	Expand Outreach on Energy and Climate Issues Through Partnerships with Local Organizations	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from expanding outreach through local organizations.
CE-3	Develop a Community Climate Action Guide	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from developing a guide.
CE-4	Support Local Climate Action Workshops	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from supporting workshops.
CE-5	Create Community Listservs on Climate Related Topics	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from creating electronic listservs.
CE-6	Promote Climate-Related Events	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from promoting events.
CE-7	Create a Community Climate Challenge	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from creating a challenge campaign.
CE-8	Encourage Local Organizations to Integrate Climate Action into Operations	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from encouraging climate actions consistent with the ECAP.
CE-9	Engage Philanthropic Support for Model Projects	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from engaging philanthropies.
Create New Opportunities for Community Engagement		

CE-10	Convene Community Climate Forums	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from convening forums.
CE-11	Establish Opportunities for Ongoing Community Climate Action Input	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from establishing input opportunities.
CE-12	Encourage Community Input on Updates to City Plans and Policy Documents	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from encouraging community input.
CE-13	Include Climate Content in Regular Community Surveys	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from including content in surveys.
CE-14	Engage the Community in Developing a 2050 Vision for Oakland	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from encouraging community input in a 2050 vision for Oakland.
Track and Promote Community Action		
CE-15	Report on Energy and GHG Reduction Progress	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from reporting on progress, primarily through electronic media.
CE-16	Develop an Oakland Climate Action Model Practices Campaign	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from developing a model practices campaign.
CE-17	Expand Energy and Climate Reporting and Outreach Tools	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from expanding reporting and outreach tools, primarily through use of electronic media.
CE-18	Recognize Local Climate Leaders and Model Actions	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from recognizing leaders and actions, primarily through electronic media.
CE-19	Promote Green Community Events	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from promoting events, primarily through electronic media.
Develop the Local Green Workforce to Support Local Green Businesses		
CE-20	Support Local Green Jobs Programs	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from supporting job training or placement programs.
CE-21	Facilitate Hiring of Green Jobs Program Graduates	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from supporting green job program placement efforts.
CE-22	Develop a Community Green Jobs Electronic Bulletin Board	No Significant Impacts – There would be no impact from developing an electronic bulletin board.

C. ECAP Actions Too Speculative to Analyze in Detail Now But Potentially Subject to Future Review

For the remaining nine (9) actions, the impacts of each action, once it is taken, could vary depending on the specific content of the action. Details of each future plan/action are not known at this time, and are too speculative to analyze in detail, but the City's intent and goal will be to reduce environmental impacts through taking each action. Further consideration with respect to CEQA would need to be undertaken as the actions are further independently developed. Seven of these nine actions may be subject to future review by the City, and two of these actions may be subject to future review by other lead agencies. Table 3 provides a summary of these actions.

Table 3. ECAP Actions Potentially Subject to Future Review

Action #	ECAP Action	CEQA Consideration
Goal Area: Transportation and Land Use		
Strategy: Institutionalize a More Comprehensive Approach to Transportation and Land Use Planning		
TLU-1	Participate in Quarterly SB 375 Discussions	Subject to Future Review – No impact would be created by the City’s participation in regional planning discussions. Any regional plans developed by other agencies would be subject to future CEQA review.
TLU-2	Develop a Comprehensive Oakland Transportation Plan	Subject to Future Review – The impacts of this action could vary depending on the contents of this Comprehensive Oakland Transportation Plan, and cannot be estimated at this time. This plan would be subject to CEQA review.
Advance Infill, Mixed-Use and Transit-Oriented Development		
TLU-7	Create a Transportation Impact Fee	Subject to Future Review – The impacts of this action could vary depending on the content and application of the Transportation Impact Fee, and cannot be estimated at this time. This action would be subject to CEQA review.
TLU-10	Develop a Comprehensive Infrastructure Plan	Subject to Future Review – The impacts of this action could vary depending on the contents of this Comprehensive Infrastructure Plan, and cannot be estimated at this time. This plan would be subject to CEQA review.
Advance the Use of Low-Carbon Transportation Modes		
TLU-15	Update Environmental Impact Evaluation Process	Subject to Future Review – The impacts of this action could vary depending on the changes made, and cannot be estimated at this time. These changes would be subject to CEQA review. This action is supportive of LUTE Pol T3.3; LUTE Pol T3.7.
Foster the Use of Low Carbon Vehicles and Fuels		
TLU-33	Engage in Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Planning	Subject to Future Review – There is no impact from participation in planning process. The Lead Agency developing the regional plans will consider CEQA as appropriate.
TLU-35	Encourage Low-Carbon Fuels Production	Subject to Future Review – The impacts of low-carbon fuel production could vary depending on the type of fuel produced and the facilities and processes used, and therefore cannot be estimated at this time. Any new fuel-production facilities would be subject to separate CEQA review in the future.
Engage the Port of Oakland and Related Industry in Reducing GHG Emissions		
TLU-44	Consider Opportunities to Require Port Climate Action via General Plan Update	Subject to Future Review – The impacts of this action could vary depending on the content of the General Plan Update, and cannot be estimated at this time. This action would be subject to CEQA review.
Goal Area: Material Consumption and Waste		
Foster More Local Food Production		
MW-17	Update Zoning Regulations to Better Allow For and Regulate Urban Agriculture	Subject to Future Review – The impacts of this action could vary depending on the contents of this Zoning update, and cannot be estimated at this time. This action would be subject to CEQA review.

D. Narrative discussion of each the environmental topics in the City's CEQA Thresholds of Significance

The ECAP is a programmatic planning document which catalogues the priorities of the City for reducing energy use and greenhouse gas emissions associated with Oakland. The ECAP does not approve or authorize a project that will alter the environment. Rather, it outlines the need for future work to develop specific plans and programs to advance each of 175 separate actions in the future. Future work on some of those actions may be subject to CEQA, as described in this analysis.

Adoption of the ECAP does not cause any new construction nor directly impose other changes that would create significant environmental impacts. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and at minimum, no more likely to create a significant environmental impact *due to the ECAP*. Regardless, any such construction would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of the City's routine planning and building permit process. Any such construction would also have to comply with existing policies and requirements in the City's General Plan and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Below is a narrative discussion of each of the environmental topics in the City's CEQA Thresholds of Significance as they relate to the 78 actions in the ECAP that were not previously analyzed in the Previous CEQA Documents. For the purpose of readability, a general discussion is presented for each of these environmental topics regarding the potential of adoption and implementation of the ECAP to create significant impacts. Further discussion is included where applicable regarding the nine actions described in Section IIC that may be subject to future environmental review.

AESTHETICS

Scenic Vistas, Scenic Highways, Visual Character

Adoption of the ECAP would not create new impacts on public scenic vistas, scenic highways or visual character. The City's existing policies in the General Plan encourage preservation of views and visual character.¹ Actions in the ECAP calling for increased density near transit which may encourage the construction of taller buildings with the potential for aesthetic impacts on scenic vistas are consistent with policies cleared under the Previous CEQA Documents. Adoption of the ECAP would not increase the potential for impacts. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of review. Therefore, impacts to scenic vistas, highways and visual character associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Potential Glare or Shadows

Adoption of the ECAP would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would substantially and adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. In addition, the ECAP alone would not cause an increase in bird strikes due to a potential increase in daylighting. Nor would the ECAP introduce landscape that would cast shadows on existing solar collectors, or cast shadows that substantially impair the function of a building using passive solar heat collection, solar collectors for hot water heating, or photovoltaic solar collectors. In addition, the adoption of the ECAP will not cast a shadow on any public park, lawn, garden, or a historic resource. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely to create glare or cast a shadow due to the ECAP, would need to comply with the Zoning Ordinance and

1 See OSCAR Element Policies, OS-9.1, OS-9.2, OS-9.3, OS-10.1 and OS-10.2; also OS-1.3 and Objective OS-9. See also the Land Use and Transportation Element, Policy W3.4.

City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, including regulations and requirements related to the Building Code which address adequate light and would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of review. Thus, this impact is less than significant.

Conflicts with General Plan, Planning Code, UBC

The Proposed ECAP will not conflict with applicable provisions related to adequate light. While no future construction or development projects are specifically called for in the ECAP, should such a project be proposed, it would need to comply with the Zoning Ordinance and City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, including regulations and requirements related to the Building Code which address adequate light. Thus, there is no impact.

Wind

Adoption of the ECAP will not create winds exceeding 36 mph. While it is possible that future construction might generate wind, this impact is associated with any potential new construction in the City, and would be neither more likely, nor less likely, due to the ECAP. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely to create wind impacts due to the ECAP, would need to comply with the Zoning Ordinance and City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, including regulations and requirements related to the Building Code and would undergo project-specific CEQA review. Wind impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Adoption of the ECAP will not create significant impacts on agricultural land or forest resources. The City of Oakland is an urban community, without any substantial agricultural land or uses, nor any Williamson Act contracts. The City of Oakland General Plan does not contain areas zoned for exclusively for agriculture use. The ECAP would not require rezoning nor conversion of farmland, nor construction of buildings which conflict with zoning for, or causes the rezoning of, forestland, timberland, or Timberland Production lands. Thus, there is no Agriculture or Forest Resources impact.

AIR QUALITY

Adoption of the ECAP does not directly encourage or induce new construction, so there cannot be any **project-level** impacts associated with adoption of the ECAP. Similarly, there are not any project-level **cumulative** impacts, because no air quality impacts associated with the proposed ECAP have been identified as significant or potentially significant. **Plan-level** air quality impacts are an appropriate measure for the ECAP, as it serves as a planning document for the City to reduce energy use and greenhouse gas emissions associated with Oakland.

The City's CEQA thresholds require that a proposed plan be analyzed against the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan (CAP).² The CAP contains 55 control measures designed to reduce ambient concentrations of criteria pollutants and GHG emissions. These control measures generally involve strategies to reduce vehicle trips, vehicle use, vehicle miles traveled, vehicle idling, traffic congestion, stationary combustion, and ambient temperatures.

The CAP was reviewed to determine if the ECAP would be in conflict, or inconsistent, with those measures. Of the 55 control measures contained in the CAP, 30 either directly coincide or closely relate to actions included in the ECAP. The following control measures contained in the CAP are closely aligned with actions in the ECAP:

- 1) SSM 15 Greenhouse Gases in Permitting –Energy Efficiency – Consider greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions during permitting of new or modified stationary sources. This may include (1) adopting GHG CEQA

² Bay Area 2010 CAP Chapter 4 – Overview of CAP Control Strategy

- significance threshold for stationary sources, and (2) requiring GHG reduction measures in ministerial permits.
- 2) MSM A-1 Promote Clean, Fuel Efficient Light & Medium-Duty Vehicles – Expand the use of Super Ultra-low Emission (SULEV) and Partial - Zero emission (PZEV) light-duty passenger vehicles and trucks within the Bay Area.
 - 3) MSM A-2 Zero Emission Vehicles and Plug-in Hybrids – Expand the use of Zero Emission (ZEV) and Plug-in Hybrid (PHEV) passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks within the Bay Area, working in partnership with the Bay Area Electric Vehicle Corridor coalition.
 - 4) MSM A-3 Green Fleets (Light, Medium & Heavy-Duty Vehicles) – Develop a green fleet certification component of the Bay Area Green Business program, promote best practices for green fleets, and evaluate existing grant programs to ensure incentive funding is directed towards fleets and vehicles that meet stringent fuel economy standards.
 - 5) MSM A-4 Replacement or Repair of High- Emitting Vehicles – Enhance the Air District’s Vehicle Buy Back program to increase participation from car owners; e.g., via higher cash payments and/or increased marketing. Consider including motorcycles in the VBB programs, or other potential enhancements, e.g. implementing a vehicle repair program. Pursue improvements to the Air District’s Smoking Vehicle program.
 - 6) MSM B-1 HDV Fleet Modernization – Provide incentives to accelerate the replacement or retrofit of on-road heavy-duty diesel engines in advance of requirements for the CARB in-use heavy-duty truck regulation.
 - 7) MSM C-2 Lawn & Garden Equipment – Reduce emissions from lawn and garden equipment through voluntary retirement and replacement programs.
 - 8) TCM A-1 Improve Local and Areawide Bus Service – Improve transit by providing new Express Bus or Bus Rapid Transit on major travel corridors, funding the replacement of older and dirtier buses, and implementing Transit Priority Measures on key transit routes.
 - 9) TCM A-2 Improve Local and Regional Rail Service – Improve rail service by sustaining and expanding local and regional rail services and by providing funds to maintain railcars, stations, and other rail capital assets.
 - 10) TCM B-2 Improve Transit Efficiency and Use – Improve transit efficiency and use through continued operation of 511 Transit, and full implementation of TransLink® fare payment system and the Transit Hub Signage Program.
 - 11) TCM B-3 Bay Area Express Lane Network – Introduce roadway pricing on Bay Area highways through the implementation of an express lane network, also known as a High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lane network.
 - 12) TCM B-4 Goods Movement Improvements and Emission Reduction Strategies – Improve goods movement and reduce emissions from diesel equipment through implementation of the Bay Area’s Trade Corridors Improvement Fund (TCIF) projects and various funding programs to replace or retrofit diesel equipment.
 - 13) TCM C-1 Support Voluntary Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program – Support voluntary employer trip-reduction programs through the implementation of the 511 Regional Rideshare Program and Congestion Management Agency rideshare programs, the Spare the Air Program, encouraging cities to adopt transit benefit ordinances, and supporting Bay Area shuttle service providers.
 - 14) TCM C-2 Implement Safe Routes to Schools and Safe Routes to Transit – Facilitate safe routes to schools and transit by providing funds and working with transportation agencies, local governments, schools, and communities to implement safe access for pedestrians and cyclists.
 - 15) TCM C-3 Promote Rideshare Services and Incentives – Promote rideshare services and incentives through the implementation of the 511 Regional Rideshare Program and Congestion Management Agency rideshare programs including marketing rideshare services, operating rideshare information call center and website, and providing vanpool support services.
 - 16) TCM C-4 Conduct Public Outreach and Education – Educate the public about the air quality, environmental, and social benefits of carpooling, vanpooling, taking public transit, biking, walking, and telecommuting, through the Spare the Air campaign and Transportation Climate Action Campaign.
 - 17) TCM C-5 Promote Smart Driving/Speed Moderation – Educate the public about the air quality and climate protection benefits of reducing high-speed driving and observing posted speed limits.

- 18) TCM D-1 Improve Bicycle Access and Facilities – Expand bicycle facilities serving transit hubs employment sites, educational and cultural facilities, residential areas, shopping districts, and other activity centers.
- 19) TCM D-2 Improve Pedestrian Access and Facilities – Provide funding for projects to improve pedestrian access to transit hubs, employment sites, educational and cultural facilities, residential areas, shopping districts, and other activity centers.
- 20) TCM D-3 Support Local Land Use Strategies – Promote land use patterns, policies, and infrastructure investments that support mixed-use, transit-oriented development that reduce motor vehicle dependence and facilitate walking, bicycling and transit use.
- 21) TCM E-2 Parking Pricing and Management Strategies – Promote policies to implement market-rate pricing of parking facilities, reduce parking requirements for new development projects, parking “cash-out”, unbundling of parking in residential and commercial leases, shared parking at mixed use facilities, etc.
- 22) TCM E-3 Implement Transportation Pricing Reform – Develop a regional transportation pricing strategy that includes policy evaluation and implementation. Pricing policies to be evaluated include gasoline taxes, bridge tolls, congestion pricing, parking pricing, HOT lanes, VMT or carbon fees, pay-as-you-drive insurance, etc.
- 23) LUM 1 Goods Movement – Reduce diesel PM and GHG emissions from goods movement in the Bay Area through targeted enforcement of CARB diesel ATCMs in impacted communities, partnerships with ports and other stakeholders, increased signage indicating truck routes and anti-idling rules, shifts in freight transport mode, shore-side power for ships, and improvements in the efficiency of engine drive trains, distribution systems (roadways, logistic systems) and land use patterns.
- 24) LUM 2 Indirect Source Review Rule – Develop an indirect source review rule to reduce construction and vehicular emissions associated with new or modified land uses.
- 25) LUM 3 Enhanced CEQA Program – 1) Develop revised CEQA guidelines and thresholds of significance and 2) expand District review of CEQA documents.
- 26) LUM 4 Land Use Guidelines – Provide guidance to local governments re: 1) air quality and greenhouse gases in General Plans, and 2) how to address and mitigate population exposure related to land use development.
- 27) ECM 1 Energy Efficiency – Provide 1) education to increase energy efficiency; 2) technical assistance to local governments to adopt and enforce energy- efficient building codes; and 3) incentives for improving energy efficiency at schools.
- 28) ECM 2 Renewable Energy – Promote distributed renewable energy generation (solar, micro wind turbines, cogeneration, etc.) on commercial and residential buildings, and at industrial facilities
- 29) ECM 3 Urban Heat Island Mitigation – Mitigate the “urban heat island” effect by promoting the implementation of cool roofing, cool paving, and other strategies.
- 30) ECM 4 Tree-Planting – Promote planting of low-VOC-emitting shade trees to reduce urban heat island effects, save energy, and absorb CO₂ and other air pollutants.

None of the 55 control measures conflict with actions in the ECAP. For example, the ECAP would not increase vehicle miles traveled, as no provisions in the ECAP require or induce new construction of buildings which would house residents or employees, or otherwise generate vehicle trips. Rather, the ECAP is designed to reduce annual vehicle miles traveled by 20 percent from 2005 levels, which will also reduce the generation of transportation-related criteria air pollutants. Therefore, the ECAP would not conflict with the 2010 Clean Air Plan.

Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) would be neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would be required to comply with existing policies and requirements related to air quality in the City’s General Plan and with the City’s Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, including conditions related to parking and transportation demand management, dust control, construction emissions, asbestos removal, and air pollution buffering for private open space, which would reduce potential impacts to a less than

significant level. The ECAP actions are also consistent with existing General Plan policies that are considered cleared under the Previous CEQA Documents. Actions that encourage local food production and composting would not cause significant impacts because: 1) it is anticipated that such activities would be performed at small scales that would not be large enough to generate odors affecting substantial amounts of people; 2) the actions would not cause construction of new facilities, and any new facilities related to these actions would be subject to separate CEQA review in the future; and 3) the Bay Area Air Quality Management District enforces regulations of odors and would ensure that odors are not significant. Adoption of the ECAP will not create additional air quality impacts beyond those previously considered, and should create beneficial impacts on local and regional air quality. Therefore, there are no significant air quality impacts which would result from adopting the ECAP.

Potential effects associated with Action TLU-35 (Encourage Low-Carbon Fuels Production) could vary depending on the type of fuel produced and the facilities and processes used, and therefore cannot be estimated at this time. The action would not directly cause construction of new facilities. Any new fuel-production facilities would be subject to separate CEQA review in the future, and would be subject to regulations of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, which enforces regulations of odors and air pollutants.

Likewise, potential effects associated with Action MW-17 (Update Zoning Regulations to Better Allow For and Regulate Urban Agriculture) could also vary depending on the contents of this Zoning update, and therefore cannot be estimated at this time. Any future Zoning update would be subject to separate independent CEQA review.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Habitat Modifications, Special Status species, Riparian Habitat or Other Sensitive Natural Communities, Wetlands

The ECAP would not cause significant habitat modifications, effect special status species, effect riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities, nor wetlands. To the extent that other communities join Oakland in substantially reducing greenhouse gas emissions, the ECAP may have the long term effect of reducing impacts on habitat, species and natural areas such as wetlands by reducing the impacts of global climate change. In addition, actions in the ECAP that encourage water conservation, less vehicular travel, and waste reduction may create beneficial impacts on water quality and habitat by reducing the amount of urban drainage and pollution entering Oakland's waterways and the Bay. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of entitlement. Any such construction would also have to comply with existing policies and requirements related to biological resources in the City's General Plan³ and with the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval related to biological resources, which reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to habitat, sensitive natural communities and species and wetlands associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Fish and Wildlife species, Migratory Corridors or native wildlife nurseries

The ECAP would not would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of entitlement. Any such construction would also have to comply with existing policies and requirements that encourage the

³ See, for example, Action GE2.2 in the Safety Element (require continued enforcement of the grading, erosion, and sedimentation ordinance), and in the OSCAR Element, Objectives CO-1, CO-7, CO-8 and CO-9; Policies CO-1.1, CO-2.4, CO-7.1, CO-7.2, CO-9.1 and OS-1.3.

protection of fish, wildlife and native species in State and federal law, the City's General Plan⁴ and with the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval related to biological resources, which reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to fish and wildlife species, migratory corridors and native wildlife nurseries associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Habitat Plans

The ECAP would not conflict with the City's Open Space Conservation and Recreation Element, which outlines a broad conservation and habitat plan. The ECAP contains a number of actions that directly relate to and reinforce policies contained in the City's OSCAR Element (see pages 7-9 and XX – ECAP action tables). Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of entitlement. Any such construction would also have to comply with existing policies and requirements related to biological resources in the City's General Plan and with the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval related to habitat, which reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Trees and Creeks

The ECAP would not conflict with Oakland's Tree Preservation Ordinance or Creek Protection Ordinance. In fact, the ECAP includes seven actions promoting the growth and health of Oakland's urban forest, and multiple actions that would reduce pollution that might otherwise flow into Oakland's creeks. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of entitlement. Any such construction would also have to comply with existing policies and requirements that encourage the protection of trees and creeks in the City's General Plan⁵ and with the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval related to tree preservation and removal and construction near creeks which reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to trees and creeks associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

Historic Resources

The ECAP would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of entitlement. Any such construction would also have to comply with the City's existing policies and requirements to encourage the protection of historic resources in the City's General Plan⁶ and with the City's Conditions of

⁴ See, for example, in the Safety Element: Actions FL-1.3 and FL 1.5 (stormwater and creek protection), GE 2.2 and GE 2.3 (require continued enforcement of the grading, erosion, and sedimentation ordinance); , in the OSCAR Element: Objectives CO-7, CO-8, CO-9 and CO-11; Policies , CO-7.1, CO-7.2, CO-9.1, and CO 11.1, 11.2,

⁵ See, for example, in the Safety Element: Actions GE 2.3 (require continued enforcement of the creek protection ordinance) and GE 2.6 (fire prevention vegetation management techniques for creek-sides); the OSCAR Element: Objectives CO-6 (Surface Waters protection); CO-7 (Protection of Native Plant communities); CO-8 (Wetlands); CO-9 (Rare, Endangered and Threatened Species); CO-10, (Vegetation management); and CO-11 (Wildlife).

⁶ See, for example, in the Safety Element: Action GE 3.2 (require continued enforcement of the unreinforced masonry ordinance); the Housing Element, Goal 2, Objective 2-3, Policies 2.1, 3.1, 3.5, 3.7, 3.12, and 4.4 in the Historic Preservation Element; Policies I/C2.2, D6.2, N3.6, and N9.9 in the Land Use and Transportation Element; and Action JL-4.1 and Policy JL6 in the Estuary Policy Plan.

Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval related to cultural and historic resources, which would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to historic resources associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Paleontological and Archeological Resources, and Human Remains

The ECAP would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological or archeological resource or disturb any human remains. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of entitlement. Any such construction would also have to comply with the City's existing policies and requirements to encourage the protection of paleontological and archeological resources in the City's General Plan (such as Historic Preservation Element Objective 4, "Archeological Resources") and with the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, related to paleontological and archeological resources, which would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to historic resources associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Seismic Activity and Ground Failure

The city of Oakland is located in a seismically active region. Principal faults in the vicinity include the Hayward Fault, San Andreas Fault, and the Calaveras Fault. Adoption of the ECAP would not create new impacts on seismic activity or ground failure. Actions in the ECAP calling for increased density near transit hubs and along transit corridors are consistent with policies in the City's adopted General Plan and considered cleared by Previous CEQA Documents. Adoption of the ECAP would not increase the potential for impacts. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be required to comply with existing policies and requirements to encourage protection from seismic activity in the City's General Plan⁷ and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development.

Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, related to seismic hazards, would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. The extent to which impacts of specific future development could occur is too speculative currently to be evaluated, but the impacts of the ECAP will not be significant. The new California Building Code addresses these seismic issues in the Efficient Framing Section of Title 24. Furthermore, the City maintains a Geological Hazards Abatement District, whose purpose is to raise funds to make public works improvements to prevent damage from seismic events. Although the potential for injury or damage from catastrophic earthquakes cannot be eliminated, this impact is associated with any potential construction and neither would be more likely, nor less likely, due to the adoption of the ECAP.

Soil Erosion and Loss of Topsoil

Adoption of the ECAP would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil creating substantial risks to life, property, or creek/waterways. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be required to comply with existing policies and requirements to prevent soil erosion and loss of topsoil in the City's General Plan (specifically, Safety Element Action GE 2.2) with the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, which would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to soil erosion and loss of topsoil associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

⁷ See the [Safety Element](#), Geologic Hazards chapter and policies; as well as [OSCAR Element](#) regarding land stability including Objective CO-2 and Policy CO-2.1.

Expansive Soils

Adoption of the ECAP does not specify building site locations or selection on expansive soils. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be required to comply with existing policies and requirements to encourage the protection from expansive soils in the City's General Plan (specifically, the OSCAR Element, Action CO 1.1.3) with the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, related to expansive soils, would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to expansive soils associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Wells, Pits, Swamp, etc

Adoption of the ECAP does not specify a building site location or avoidance of a well, pit, swamp, mound, tank vault, or unmarked sewer line. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be required to comply with existing policies to avoid wells, pits, etc., in the City's General Plan with the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, related to underground structures, which would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, any individual project would need to submit a Phase I Site Assessment Report. The report would identify if any of these features were located on the site and what the recommendations would be address them. Therefore, impacts to wells, pits and swamps associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Landfills or Fill Soils

Adoption of the ECAP does not specify a building site location, or avoidance of a landfill or unknown fill soils. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be required to comply with existing policies and requirements that encourage protection from building on a landfill or on fill soils in the City's General Plan with the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, related to landfills or fills soils, which would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, any individual project would need to submit a Phase I Site Assessment Report. The report would identify if any of these features were located on the site and what the recommendations would be address them. Therefore, impacts to landfills and fill soils associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Soils Incapable of Supporting Septic Tanks or Alternative Wastewater Systems

Adoption of the ECAP does not specify a building site location, nor does it specifically avoid soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. The City of Oakland Municipal Code prohibits construction of septic tanks or systems that are not connected to the wastewater disposal systems. The ECAP would not result in a significant impact.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS / GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Adoption of the ECAP would not increase greenhouse gas emissions. Rather, the ECAP is designed to help achieve a 36 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions associated with Oakland by 2020. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) would be neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would be required to comply with existing policies and requirements to reduce greenhouse gas emissions which are in the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval. These conditions would reduce potential impacts of any potential building project to a less than significant level (i.e., less than 1,100 metric tons of CO₂e, annually or less than 4.6 metric

tons of CO₂e per service population, annually). These thresholds are based on California's adopted "Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006" (AB 32). Actions included in the ECAP are designed to reach a more aggressive GHG reduction target of 36% below 2005 emissions by 2020. Therefore, there are no significant greenhouse gas impacts which would result from adopting the ECAP.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The City's *Safety Element* directly addresses the CEQA thresholds for Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Specifically, Chapters 4 and 5 contain the City's programs and policies to prevent fire hazards, and the release of hazardous materials.

Transport and Disposal, Emissions and Storage of Hazardous Materials

Adoption of the ECAP would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Nor would its adoption create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment or emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The ECAP would not induce the storage or use of acutely hazardous materials near sensitive receptors. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing policies and requirements that discourage the transport and disposal of hazardous materials in the City's General Plan, with the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, related to transport and disposal of hazardous materials, which would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to transport and disposal, emissions and storage of hazardous materials associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Be located on a site which is included on the "Cortese List" of hazardous materials sites.

Adoption of the ECAP would not require the development of any new structures on any sites, nor on sites which are on the "Cortese List." Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with policies to continue the environmental remediation of contaminated sites on the "Cortese List" in the City's General Plan, with the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, which would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to sites included on the "Cortese List" associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Result in less than two emergency access routes for streets exceeding 600 feet in length.

Adoption of the ECAP would not require the development of any new structures on any sites, nor on sites where the design blocks emergency access routes on streets longer than 600 feet. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Location within an Airport Land Use Plan, or near a private Airstrip

Adoption of the ECAP would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area related to an airport or private airstrip. Adopting the ECAP would not require the development of any new structures on any sites, nor on sites which are within the Oakland Airport land use plan. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing policies and requirements about siting new structures with an airport's land use plan, the City's General Plan, and with the City's Conditions of

Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, which would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Evacuation Plan

Adoption of the ECAP would not fundamentally impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Therefore, impacts to emergency response and evacuation plans would be less than significant.

Wildland Fires

Adoption of the ECAP would not cause the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would be required to comply with existing policies and requirements about siting new structures in areas threatened by wildland fires contained in the City's General Plan⁸ and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, which would reduce potential impacts of construction to a less than significant level. In fact, the ECAP encourages development to be concentrated around existing transit hubs and corridors in accordance with policies in the City's General Plan, generally away from wildlands and areas prone to fire. Therefore, impacts to emergency response and evacuation plans would be less than significant.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Water Quality Standards or waste discharge requirements; Groundwater Depletion and Recharge

Adoption of the ECAP would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, because it does not require the construction of any new buildings. Likewise, the adoption of the ECAP would not substantially degrade water quality, nor would it deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume, or a lowering of the local groundwater table level to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing State, regional and local policies and requirements for hydrology and water quality, including those contained in the City's General Plan and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval⁹, which would reduce potential hydrology and water quality impacts to a less than significant level. Chapter 6 of the Oakland Safety Element identifies policies and actions which codify the City's commitment to reducing hazards from flooding, and to protect water quality. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Erosion, siltation or flooding; 100-year flood hazard areas

Adoption of the ECAP would not require the construction of any buildings or structures and therefore its adoption would not have an impact altering the existing drainage pattern of a site or area—either through the

⁸ As noted, see Safety Element Policy FI-3 "Prioritize the reduction of wildfire hazard, with an emphasis on prevention." And also, see the OSCAR Element, Objective CO 10: "Manage vegetation so that risks of catastrophic wildfire is minimized."

⁹ See Safety Element: Action GE2.2, GE2.3, FL-1.4; and the OSCAR Element: Objectives CO-5, CO-6, Policies CO-5.2, CO-5.3, CO-5.3.1, CO-5.4.2 and Action CO-5.1.2.

alteration of the course, or increasing the rate or amount of flow—of a creek, river or stream, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding. While the City of Oakland does have 600 and 1,900 acres mapped as 100-year and 500 year flood hazard areas (respectively), the ECAP would not result in any housing being built within those floodplains, nor would it place any structures within a 100-year flood hazard area which would impede or redirect flood flows. The infill and transit-oriented development patterns encouraged by the ECAP are consistent with the City's adopted General Plan. In fact, the ECAP would create long term beneficial impacts by calling for increased consideration of the potential effects of climate change on sea level rise and flooding issues. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing policies and requirements for reducing risks of erosion, siltation, or flooding, as well as with the City's General Plan,¹⁰ and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Substantial Runoff: Stormwater Drainage Systems and additional source of pollution

Adoption of the ECAP would not create or contribute substantial runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. Nor will adoption of the ECAP create any additional source of runoff or pollution. The infill and transit-oriented development patterns encouraged by the ECAP are consistent with the City's adopted General Plan. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing policies and requirements for preventing runoff, as well as with the City's General Plan,¹¹ and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, which would reduce potential stormwater drainage impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Potential effects associated with Action MW-17 (Update Zoning Regulations to Better Allow For and Regulate Urban Agriculture) could vary depending on the contents of this Zoning update, and therefore cannot be estimated at this time. Any future Zoning update would be subject to separate independent CEQA review.

Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

Adoption of the ECAP would not require the construction of any buildings or structures and would not expose people or structures to substantial risk of loss, injury or death as a result of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The likelihood of flooding from tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows in Oakland is negligible due to geography of the City, where the island of Alameda and the Port of Oakland both act as buffers from the Bay so the likelihood of large scale devastation from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow is not significant. The infill and transit-oriented development patterns encouraged by the ECAP are consistent with the City's adopted General Plan. In fact, the ECAP may create long term beneficial impacts by calling for increased consideration of the potential for climate change to affect the frequency and severity of severe weather events. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing policies and requirements. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Drainage patterns and Creek Protection Ordinance

¹⁰ See, as noted, Chapter 6 of the Oakland Safety Element.

¹¹ See, as noted, Chapter 6 of the Oakland Safety Element, specifically Action FL-1.2; also see Action GE 2.5

Adoption of the ECAP would not fundamentally conflict with Oakland's Creek Protection Ordinance. Because adoption of the ECAP does not require any construction, the drainage patterns to Oakland creeks will not be impacted. The infill and transit-oriented development patterns encouraged by the ECAP are consistent with the City's adopted General Plan. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing policies and requirements for preventing runoff, as well as with the City's General Plan,¹² and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, which would reduce potential drainage pattern impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

Divide an Existing Community, conflict with a Land Use Plan, Policy or Regulation.

Adoption of the ECAP would not physically divide an established community, nor 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, nor conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and the pattern of any such construction would not be altered in any way by the ECAP that would result in dividing an existing community. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing policies and requirements of the City's General Plan and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, which would reduce potential impacts of dividing an existing community to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Potential effects associated with Action TLU-44 (Consider Opportunities to Require Port Climate Action via General Plan Update) could vary depending on the contents of the General Plan update, and therefore cannot be estimated at this time. Any future General Plan update would be subject to separate independent CEQA review.

Conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan

The ECAP would not conflict with the City's Open Space Conservation and Recreation Element, which outlines a broad habitat conservation plan. The ECAP contains a number of actions that directly relate to and reinforce policies contained in the City's OSCAR Element (see Tables 2 and 9). Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of entitlement. Any such construction would also have to comply with existing policies and requirements related to biological resources in the City's General Plan and with the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval related to habitat, which reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

MINERAL RESOURCES

There are no mineral resources in Oakland for the ECAP to conflict with, so there would be no impact on mineral resources if the ECAP is adopted.

¹² See, as noted, Chapter 6 of the Oakland Safety Element, specifically Actions FL-1.3 and 1.5; also see Action GE 2.3

NOISE

The ECAP would not cause a substantial impact related to noise. To the extent that the ECAP includes actions promoting infill and transit-oriented development that may cause noise impacts, these actions are consistent with the City's General Plan and are considered cleared by the Previous CEQA Documents. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of entitlement. Any such construction would also have to comply with the City's existing policies and requirements to reduce noise impacts, the City's Noise Ordinance, the Noise Element of the City's General Plan, and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval. With the application of these policies and standards, potential noise impacts from construction will be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts to historic resources associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Potential impacts associated with Action TLU-44 (Consider Opportunities to Require Port Climate Action via General Plan Update) could vary with respect to noise impacts of changes to land uses at or near the airport depending on the contents of the General Plan update. Due to a lack of detail in the ECAP, these impacts cannot be estimated at this time. Any future General Plan update would be subject to separate independent CEQA review.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Adoption of the ECAP would not induce substantial population growth in a manner not contemplated in the Housing Element of the General Plan, either directly, or indirectly, as it requires no construction of new housing. Similarly, the ECAP would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, nor displace substantial numbers of people, because no housing is required to be built under the ECAP. The infill and transit-oriented development patterns encouraged by the ECAP, and the promotion of energy improvements in existing housing, are consistent with policies contained in the City's adopted General Plan. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing policies and requirements in the City's General Plan, and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, and would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of entitlement. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

PUBLIC SERVICES

The ECAP would not result in the need for nor substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be required to comply with existing policies and requirements in the City's General Plan and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development. The infill transit-oriented development promoted by the ECAP is consistent with the City's General Plan, and public service impacts associated with the City's established development patterns were addressed in the Previous CEQA Documents. Therefore, impacts to recreation resources associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

RECREATION

The ECAP would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities

such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, nor would it require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP, and would be required to comply with existing policies and requirements in the City's General Plan and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development. The ECAP would not increase or change residential development patterns that may be located near recreational facilities from those included in the City's previously adopted Housing Element and Open Space Conservation and Recreation Element. Therefore, impacts to recreation resources associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Project Impacts-- Traffic Load and Capacity

Adoption of the ECAP would not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections) in a manner not contemplated in the Land Use and Transportation Element and Housing Element of the City's adopted General Plan. The infill and transit-oriented development patterns encouraged by the ECAP, and actions designed to advance implementation of the City's adopted Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans, are consistent with General Plan policies covered under the Previous CEQA Documents. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing policies and requirements to reduce transportation and traffic impacts included in the Land Use and Transportation Element of the Oakland General Plan, and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval. The ECAP would not directly induce or create any new development in Oakland, so there could be no new direct transportation or traffic impacts from its adoption. There are no study intersections, because the project would not generate any traffic trips, reduce lanes or otherwise affect traffic congestion, flow, etc., in a manner not already considered under the Previous CEQA Documents. Further, the ECAP is designed to help reduce local vehicle miles traveled by 20 percent while encouraging other modes of travel such as transit, biking and walking. The ECAP should thus help to reduce transportation and traffic impacts in Oakland on a per capita basis, and should have beneficial impacts on regional traffic levels. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Project Impacts-- Traffic Safety Thresholds

Adoption of the ECAP would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks, nor would it substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment), nor would it result in inadequate emergency access. The infill and transit-oriented development patterns encouraged by the ECAP, and actions designed to advance implementation of the City's adopted Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans, are consistent with General Plan policies covered under the Previous CEQA Documents. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing policies and requirements to reduce transportation and traffic impacts, including temporary effects on circulation due to construction. Additionally, any new construction would have to comply with the Land Use and Transportation Element of the Oakland General Plan, and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The ECAP would not induce, or create, any new roadway redesign or development in Oakland in a manner not contemplated in the Land Use and Transportation Element and Housing Element of the City's adopted General Plan. Therefore, the ECAP would not create any new traffic safety impacts, transportation hazards, or reductions in pedestrian, bicyclist or bus-rider safety. The ECAP also does not conflict with adopted City policies, plans, or

programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. The potential hazard of vehicle queuing at at-grade railroad crossings would not be an impact, because adoption of the ECAP would not induce any new population or new residents. There would be no development to change air traffic patterns. Implementation of the CAP will have no additional impacts on emergency access. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Adoption of the ECAP would not cause a cumulative increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, nor exceed a cumulative level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways in a manner not contemplated in the Land Use and Transportation Element and Housing Element of the City's adopted General Plan. The infill and transit-oriented development patterns encouraged by the ECAP, and actions designed to advance implementation of the City's adopted Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans, are consistent with General Plan policies covered under the Previous CEQA Documents. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing policies and requirements to reduce transportation and traffic impacts included in the Land Use and Transportation Element of the Oakland General Plan, and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval. Further, the ECAP is designed to help reduce local vehicle miles traveled by 20 percent while encouraging other modes of travel such as transit, biking and walking. The ECAP should thus help to reduce transportation and traffic impacts in Oakland on a per capita basis, and should have beneficial impacts on regional traffic levels. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Potential effects associated with Action TLU-2 (Develop a Comprehensive Oakland Transportation Plan) could vary with respect to transportation and traffic impacts depending on the content of the Comprehensive Oakland Transportation Plan, and therefore cannot be estimated at this time. Any future Comprehensive Oakland Transportation Plan would be subject to separate independent CEQA review.

Likewise, potential effects associated with Action TLU-7 (Create a Transportation Impact Fee) could vary with respect to transportation and traffic impacts depending on the content and application of the Transportation Impact Fee, and therefore cannot be estimated at this time. Any future Transportation Impact Fee would be subject to separate independent CEQA review.

Likewise, potential effects associated with Action TLU-10 (Develop a Comprehensive Infrastructure Plan) could vary with respect to transportation and traffic impacts depending on the content of the Comprehensive Infrastructure Plan, and therefore cannot be estimated at this time. Any future Comprehensive Infrastructure Plan would be subject to separate independent CEQA review.

Similarly, potential effects associated with two actions wherein external agencies are leading the development of regional transportation planning documents, Action TLU-1 (Participate in Quarterly SB 375 Discussions) and Action TLU-33 (Engage in Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Planning), could vary with respect to transportation, air quality, and traffic impacts depending on the content of the regional plans, and therefore cannot be estimated at this time. Any future regional transportation plans would be subject to separate independent CEQA review.

Planning-related non-CEQA issues

Adoption of the ECAP would not result in inadequate parking capacity, nor would it conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks). ECAP actions that encourage infill and transit-oriented development patterns, implementation of the City's adopted Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans, reductions in the need for installed parking, and improvements in transit service delivery are consistent with General Plan policies covered under the Previous CEQA Documents.

Actions related to parking are consistent with policies of the City's adopted Open Space Conservation and Recreation Element. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing policies and requirements to reduce transportation and traffic impacts included in the Land Use and Transportation Element of the Oakland General Plan, and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Potential effects associated with Action TLU-15 (Update Environmental Impact Evaluation Process) could vary with respect to transportation and traffic impacts depending on the content of the process changes made, and therefore cannot be estimated at this time. Any future update to the environmental impact evaluation process would be subject to separate independent CEQA review. It should be noted that this action is supportive of existing City policies Pol T3.3 and Pol T3.7 in the Land Use and Transportation Element.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Wastewater Treatment/Capacity, Stormwater and Water Supply

Adoption of the ECAP would not exceed local wastewater treatment requirements, nor require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, nor require new or expanded water supplies. The ECAP would also not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The ECAP would not induce substantial population growth or development in a manner not contemplated in the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, either directly, or indirectly, as it requires no construction of new housing. The infill and transit-oriented development patterns encouraged by the ECAP are consistent with policies contained in the City's adopted General Plan. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing policies and requirements to reduce utilities and service systems impacts in the City's General Plan and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, and would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of entitlement. Thus, adoption of the ECAP would create no significant impacts on wastewater treatment and capacity for the East Bay Municipal Utilities District (EBMUD); no requirements for new or expanded stormwater facilities; and no cause for an excessive demand on water supply from EBMUD. Further, the ECAP includes actions designed to encourage water efficiency in indoor and outdoor uses and water conservation, and thus has the potential to create beneficial impacts related to water supplies and treatment and stormwater management. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Landfill Capacity and Solid Waste

Adoption of the ECAP would not create a quantity of solid waste that would conflict with locally permitted capacity or federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The ECAP would not induce substantial population growth or development in a manner not contemplated in the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, either directly, or indirectly, as it requires no construction of new housing. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing policies and requirements to reduce utilities and service systems impacts in the City's General Plan and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, and would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of entitlement. Thus, adoption of the ECAP would create no significant impacts on landfill capacity and no violations of regulations for solid waste. Further, the ECAP includes actions designed to encourage waste reduction, composting and recycling, and thus has the potential to create beneficial impacts related to solid waste management. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Energy Standards and Energy Provider Capacity

Adoption of the ECAP would not violate regulations for energy standards or conservation, nor create an additional load which would reduce energy provider capacity. The ECAP would not induce substantial population growth or development in a manner not contemplated in the Housing Element of the City's General Plan, either directly, or indirectly, as it requires no construction of new housing. Any potential construction which may be affected by adoption of the ECAP (such as the degree to which renovation of an existing building includes energy efficiency improvements) is neither more, nor less, likely due to the ECAP. Any such construction would also be required to comply with existing policies and requirements to reduce utilities and service systems impacts in the City's General Plan and the City's Conditions of Approval & Uniformly Applied Development Standards imposed as Standard Conditions of Approval, and would be evaluated under CEQA at the time of entitlement. While increasing the use of electric vehicles may add demand for electricity, it is assumed that this demand will be less than the reduction in electricity use created by actions in the ECAP designed to reduce energy use in buildings and outdoor lighting, thus avoiding the need for construction of new power plants or transmission lines. The ECAP is designed to achieve a 32% reduction in electricity use. Thus, adoption of the ECAP would create no significant impacts on energy standards or energy service provider capacity (e.g., for Pacific Gas & Electric). Further, the ECAP includes actions designed to encourage energy efficiency and conservation, and thus has the potential to create beneficial impacts related to energy supplies and capacity. Therefore, impacts associated with the ECAP would be less than significant.

Potential effects associated with Action TLU-10 (Develop a Comprehensive Infrastructure Plan) could vary with respect to utilities and service systems impacts depending on the content of the Comprehensive Infrastructure Plan, and therefore cannot be estimated at this time. Any future Comprehensive Infrastructure Plan would be subject to separate independent CEQA review.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The ECAP does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

The ECAP does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

The ECAP does not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

The goals, policies and actions of the ECAP are consistent with the City's General Plan and other adopted policies covered by the Previous CEQA Documents. Adoption of the ECAP should help to create beneficial impacts at both the local and regional level in alignment with existing City environmental goals such as reducing air pollution, conserving water and reducing waste.

E. Conclusions

For the reasons stated above, the City finds and determines that adoption and implementation of the ECAP will **not** have a significant impact on the environment (either by creating new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of significant impacts already identified in the Previous CEQA Documents). The present document, as an Addendum to the Previous CEQA Documents, demonstrates that no additional CEQA review is required to adopt the Energy and Climate Action Plan.

None of the circumstances necessitating preparation of additional CEQA review as specified in CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, including without limitation Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163, are present in that:

- 1) there are no substantial changes to the project that would result in new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of significant impacts already identified in the Previous CEQA Documents;
- 2) there are no substantial changes in circumstances that would result in new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of significant impacts already identified in the Previous CEQA Documents; and
- 3) there is no new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the Previous CEQA Documents were adopted, which is expected to result in (a) new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant environmental effects already identified in the Previous CEQA Documents; or (b) mitigation measures which were previously determined not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, or which are considerably different from those recommended in the Previous CEQA Documents, and which would substantially reduce significant effects of the project, but the City declines to adopt them.

Thus, in considering adoption and implementation of the ECAP, the City can rely on the Previous CEQA Documents. Furthermore, as a separate and independent basis, the City finds and determines that the ECAP is also exempt from further CEQA review pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines section 15183.

This Addendum also satisfies the requirements for environmental review contained in State CEQA Guidelines section 15183.5 and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's June 2010 CEQA Guidelines for a "Qualified" Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy, as discussed in detail in the ECAP Appendix (see CEQA Review of Future Development Projects). Therefore, future development projects may be able to tier-off/streamline CEQA review related to greenhouse gas emissions.

Approved: Scott Miller
Scott Miller
Interim Planning and Zoning Director
Department of Planning, Building and Neighborhood Preservation
Environmental Review Officer

11-13-12
Date

Prepared by: Garrett Fitzgerald
Public Works Agency, Environmental Services Division

Reviewed by: Darin Ranelletti, Planner
Department of Planning, Building and Neighborhood Preservation

Appendix to Energy and Climate Action Plan Addendum

Comparison of ECAP Policies to Policies Contained in other City-Adopted Policy Documents that Were Subject to Previous CEQA Review

A. Review of Adopted City Energy and Climate Policies Covered in Previous CEQA Documents

Below are examples of existing City policies supportive of energy and GHG emission reduction activities in Oakland that were covered in Previous CEQA Documents:

Table 1. Related Policies in the General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE)

Policy	Description
Policy I/C2.2	<p>Reusing Abandoned Buildings</p> <p>The reuse of abandoned industrial buildings by non-traditional activities should be encouraged where the uses are consistent with, and will assist in the attainment of, the goals and objectives of all elements of the Plan.</p>
Policy T1.6	<p>Designating Truck Routes</p> <p>An adequate system of roads connecting port terminals, warehouses, freeways and regional arterials, and other important destinations should be designated. This system shall rely upon arterial streets away from residential neighborhoods.</p>
Policy T1.8	<p>Rerouting and Enforcing Truck Routes</p> <p>The City shall make efforts to re-route truck traffic away from neighborhoods, wherever possible, and enforce truck route controls.</p>
Policy T2.1	<p>Encouraging Transit-Oriented Development</p> <p>Transit-oriented development should be encouraged at existing or proposed transit nodes, defined by the convergence of two or more modes of public transit such as BART, bus, shuttle service, light rail or electric trolley, ferry, and inter-city or commuter rail.</p>
Policy T2.2	<p>Guiding Transit-Oriented Development</p> <p>Transit-oriented developments should be pedestrian oriented, encourage night and day time use, provide the neighborhood with needed goods and services, contain a mix of land uses, and be designed to be compatible with the character of surrounding neighborhoods.</p>
Policy T2.3	<p>Promoting Neighborhood Services</p> <p>Promote neighborhood serving commercial development within one-quarter to one-half mile from established transit routes and nodes.</p>
Policy T2.5	<p>Linking Transportation and Activities</p> <p>Link transportation facilities and infrastructure improvements to recreational uses, job centers, commercial nodes, and social services, (i.e. hospitals, parks, and community centers).</p>
Policy T3.3	<p>Allowing Congestion Downtown</p> <p>For intersections within Downtown and for those that provide direct access to Downtown locations, the City should accept a lower level of service and a higher level of traffic congestion than is accepted in other parts of Oakland. The desired pedestrian-oriented nature of Downtown activity and the positive effect of traffic congestion in promoting the use of transit of other methods of travel should be recognized.</p>

Policy	Description
Policy T3.5	<p>Including Bikeways and Pedestrian Walks</p> <p>The City should include bikeways and pedestrian walks in the planning of new, reconstructed, or realized streets, wherever possible.</p>
Policy T3.6	<p>Encouraging Transit</p> <p>The City should encourage and promote use of public transit in Oakland by expediting the movement of and access to transit vehicles on designated “transit streets” as shown on the Transportation Plan.</p>
Policy T3.7	<p>Resolving Transportation Conflicts</p> <p>The City, in constructing and maintaining its transportation infrastructure, should resolve any conflicts between public transit and single occupant vehicles in favor of the transportation mode that has the potential to provide the greatest mobility and access for people, rather than vehicles, giving due consideration to the environmental, public safety, economic development, health, and social equity impacts. [Note: This is the City’s ‘Transit-First Policy.’]</p>
Objective T4	Increase use of alternatives modes of transportation
Policy T4.1	<p>Incorporating Design Features for Alternative Travel</p> <p>The City will require new development, rebuilding, or retrofit to incorporate design features in their projects that encourage use of alternative modes of transportation such as transit, bicycling, and walking.</p>
Policy T4.2	<p>Creating Transportation Incentives</p> <p>Through cooperation with other agencies, the City should create incentives to encourage travelers to use alternative transportation options.</p>
Policy T4.3	<p>Reducing Transit Waiting Times</p> <p>The City should encourage transit operators to reduce waiting times for users by coordinating schedules and maintaining intervals of fifteen (15) minutes or less between buses during peak daytime periods.</p>
Policy T4.4	<p>Developing Light Rail or Electric Trolley</p> <p>The City supports the development of light rail or trolley bus along Regional Transit Streets in high travel demand on corridors.</p>
Policy T4.5	<p>Preparing a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan</p> <p>The City should prepare, adopt, and implement a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan as part of the Transportation Element of this General Plan.</p>
Policy T4.6	<p>Making Transportation Accessible for Everyone</p> <p>Alternative modes of transportation should be accessible for all of Oakland’s population, including the elderly, disabled, and disadvantaged.</p>
Policy T4.7	<p>Reusing Abandoned Rail Lines</p> <p>Where rail lines (including siding and spurs) are to be abandoned, first consideration should be given to acquiring the line for transportation and recreational uses, such as bikeways, footpaths, or public transit.</p>

Policy	Description
Policy T4.8	<p>Accommodating Multiple Types of Travel on the Bay Bridge</p> <p>The City should encourage the design and engineering for the new Bay Bridge to accommodate multiple means of access and travel by automobiles, trucks, transit, bicycles, pedestrians, and future mass transit.</p>
Policy T4.10	<p>Converting Underused Travel Lanes</p> <p>Take advantage of existing transportation infrastructure and capacity that is underutilized. For example, where possible and desirable, convert underused travel lanes to bicycle or pedestrian paths or amenities.</p>
Policy D3.1	<p>Promoting Pedestrians</p> <p>Pedestrian-friendly commercial areas should be promoted.</p>
Policy D3.2	<p>Reusing Vacant or Underutilized Buildings</p> <p>Existing vacant or underutilized buildings should be reused. Repair and rehabilitation, particularly of historic or architecturally significant structures, should be strongly encouraged. However, where reuse is not economically feasible, demolition and other measures should be considered.</p>
Policy D10.6	<p>Creating Infill Housing</p> <p>Infill housing that respects surrounding development and the streetscape should be encouraged in the downtown to strengthen or create distinct districts.</p>
Policy D11.1	<p>Promoting Mixed-Use Development</p> <p>Mixed use developments should be encouraged in the downtown for such purposes as to promote its diverse character, provide for needed goods and services, support local art and culture, and give incentive to reuse existing vacant or underutilized structures.</p>
Policy D13.1	<p>Coordinating Transportation Options</p> <p>A variety of transportation modes to and within all downtown districts should be coordinated to safely and efficiently move people and goods. Affordability and convenience are primary considerations.</p>
Policy N1.2	<p>Placing Public Transit Stops</p> <p>The majority of commercial development should be accessible by public transit. Public transit stops should be placed at strategic locations in Neighborhood Activity Centers and Transit-Oriented Districts to promote browsing and shopping by transit users.</p>
Policy N3.2	<p>Encouraging Infill Development</p> <p>In order to facilitate the construction of needed housing types, infill development that is consistent with the General Plan should take place throughout the City of Oakland.</p>
Policy N8.1	<p>Developing Transit Village</p> <p>“Transit Village” areas should consist of attached multi-story development on properties near or adjacent to BART stations or other well-used or high-volume transit facilities, such as light rail, train, ferry stations, or multiple-bus transfer locations. While residential units should be encouraged as part of any transit village, other uses may be included where they will not negatively affect the residential living environment.</p>

Table 2. Related Policies in the Open Space Conservation and Recreation (OSCAR) Element

Policy	Description
Action OS-1.2.6	Management of Airport Wetlands Encourage the Port of Oakland to retain wetlands within Oakland International Airport as Resource conservation Areas, where compatible with the FAA.
Policy OS-2.3	Community Gardening Maintain and support a viable community gardening program to foster an appreciation of local ecology, instill a sense of stewardship and community, and provide a multi-ethnic, multi-generational activity open to all.
Policy OS-5.2	Joint Use of Right-of-Way Promote the development of linear parks or trails within utility or transportation corridors, including transmission line rights-of-way, abandoned railroad rights-of-way, and areas under the elevated BART tracks.
Policy OS-5.4	Maintenance of Mid-Block Paths Maintain a network of mid-block paths and stairsteps in Oakland to enhance neighborhood character and provide pedestrian “short-cuts” through developed areas.
Objective OS-12	Street Trees To green Oakland’s residential neighborhoods and commercial areas with street trees.
Policy OS-12.2	Street Tree Maintenance Maintain street trees to promote their natural forms, eliminate hazardous conditions, provide adequate vertical clearance over streets and sidewalks, and abate pest and disease problems.
Policy CO-1.2	Soil Contamination Hazards Minimize hazards associated with soil contamination through the appropriate storage and disposal of toxic substances, monitoring of dredging activities and clean-up of contaminated sites. In this regard, require soil testing for development of any site (or dedication of any parkland or community garden) where contamination is suspected due to prior activities on the site.
Objective CO-4	Water Supply To maintain a water supply sufficient to meet local needs while maintaining the need to develop new water supply facilities.
Policy CO-4.1	Water Conservation Emphasize water conservation and recycling strategies in efforts to meet future demand.
Policy CO-4.2	Drought-Tolerant Landscaping Require the use of drought-tolerant plants to the greatest extent possible and encourage the use of irrigation systems which minimize water consumption.
Action CO-4.2.1	Adoption of a Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance Adopt a revised version of the Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance.
Policy CO-4.3	Use of Reclaimed Water Study the feasibility of amending the Oakland Municipal Code to require the use of reclaimed wastewater for irrigation on development exceeding a certain threshold, or to require that new irrigation systems be designed so that they can be switched over to reclaimed water when it becomes economically feasible.
Policy CO-4.4	Water Conscious Development Process Encourage regional development patterns which make environmentally sound use of water resources.

Policy	Description
Policy CO-7.4	Tree Removal Discourage the removal of large trees on already developed sites unless removal is required for biological, public safety, or public works reasons.
Action CO-7.6.1	Long-Term Tree Replacement Plan and Firestorm Reforestation Develop a long-term plan for maintaining and replacing Oakland's aging trees and reforesting the 1991 firestorm area.
Objective CO-10	Vegetation Management To manage vegetation so that the risk of catastrophic wildfire is minimized.
Objective CO-12	Air Resources To improve air quality in Oakland and surrounding Bay Region.
Policy CO-12.1	Land Use Patterns Which Promote Air Quality Promote land use patterns and densities which help improve regional air quality conditions by: (a) minimizing dependence on single passenger autos; (b) promoting projects which minimize quick auto starts and stops, such as live-work development, mixed use development, and office development with ground floor retail space; (c) separating land uses which are sensitive to pollution from the sources of air pollution; and (d) supporting telecommuting, flexible work hours, and behavioral changes which reduce the percentage of people in Oakland who must drive to work on a daily basis.
Policy CO-12.2	Coordinated Transportation Systems Maintain a coordinated bus, rail, and ferry transit system which provides efficient service to major destinations and promotes alternatives to the single passenger auto.
Policy CO-12.3	Transportation Systems Management Expand existing transportation systems management and transportation demand management strategies which reduce congestion, vehicle idling, and travel in single passenger autos.
Policy CO-12.4	Design of Development to Minimize Air Quality Impacts Require that development projects be designed in a manner which reduces potential adverse air quality impacts. This may include: (a) the use of vegetation and landscaping to absorb carbon monoxide and to buffer sensitive receptors; (b) the use of low-polluting energy sources and energy conservation measures; and (c) designs which encourage transit use and facilitate bicycle and pedestrian travel.
Policy CO-12.7	Regional Air Quality Planning Coordinate local air quality planning efforts with other agencies, including adjoining cities and counties, and the public agencies responsible for monitoring and improving air quality. Cooperate with regional agencies such as the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), and the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency in developing and implementing regional air quality strategies. Continue to work with BAAQMD and the California Air Resources Board in enforcing the provisions of the State and Federal Clean Air Acts, including the monitoring of air pollutants on a regular and on-going basis.
Objective 13	Energy Resources To manage Oakland's energy resources as efficiently as possible, reduce consumption of non-renewable resources, and develop energy resources which reduce dependency on fossil fuels.
Policy CO-13.1	Reliable Energy Network Promote a reliable local energy network which meets future needs and long-term economic development objectives at the lowest practical cost.

Policy	Description
Policy CO-13.2	Energy Efficiency Support public information campaigns, energy audits, the use of energy-saving appliances and vehicles, and other efforts which help Oakland residents, businesses, and City operations become more energy efficient.
Policy CO-13.3	Construction Methods and Materials Encourage the use of energy-efficient construction and building materials. Encourage site plans for new development which maximize energy efficiency.
Policy CO-13.4	Alternative Energy Sources Accommodate the development and use of alternative energy resources, including solar energy and technologies which convert waste or industrial byproducts to energy, provided that such activities are compatible with surrounding land uses and regional air and water quality requirements.
Policy REC-8.7	Transit-Dependent Populations Improve access to parks and recreational services for adults without access to automobiles.

Table 3. Related Policies in the Housing Element

Policy	Description
Policy 1.3	Appropriate Locations and Densities for Housing Consistent with the General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element adopted in 1998, review and revise the residential development regulations with the intent of encouraging and sustaining a diverse mix of housing types and densities throughout the City for all income levels.
Action 1.3.2	Mixed Use Development Consistent with the General Plan Urban Residential land use classification, update the Planning Code and Development Control Map to rezone designated commercial areas along San Pablo Avenue, Telegraph Avenue, MacArthur Boulevard, Foothill Boulevard and International Boulevard to higher density residential uses or to urban residential mixed use zoning districts to allow mixed use developments that include a combination of retail, office, and residential uses in the same project or on the same site. See Action 7.5.1.
Policy 1.6	Adaptive Reuse Encourage the re-use of industrial and commercial buildings for joint living quarters and working spaces.
Policy 7.1	Sustainable Residential Development Programs Develop and promote programs to foster the incorporation of sustainable design principles, energy efficiency and Smart Growth principles into residential developments. Offer education and technical assistance regarding sustainable development to project applicants.
Policy 7.2	Minimize Energy Consumption Encourage the incorporation of energy conservation design features in existing and future residential development beyond minimum standards required by State building code.
Policy 7.3	Foster Low-Carbon Emission and Development Continue to direct development toward existing communities and encourage infill development at densities that are higher than—but compatible with-- the surrounding communities. Encourage development in close proximity to transit, and with a mix of land uses in the same zoning district, or on the same site, so as to reduce the number and frequency of trips made by automobile.

Policy	Description
Policy 7.4	Minimize Environmental Impacts from New Housing Work with developers to encourage construction of new housing that, where feasible, reduces the footprint of the building and landscaping, preserves green spaces, and supports ecological systems.

Table 4. Related Policies in the Historic Preservation Element

Policy	Description
Objective 1	Identifying Properties Potentially Warranting Preservation To adopt an objective, consistent, well-documented, and widely-accepted method for identifying which properties warrant, or may warrant preservation effort and for determining the relative importance of each of these properties so that preservation efforts may be appropriately gauged.
Objective 2	Preservation Incentives and Regulations To develop a system of preservation incentives and regulations for specifically designated significant older properties.
Objective 3	Historic Preservation and Ongoing City Activities To establish administrative procedures and criteria to promote preservation of significant older properties as a routine part of City-sponsored or assisted projects, programs, and regulatory activities.
Policy 3.5	Historic Preservation and Discretionary Permit Approvals For any project involving complete demolition of Heritage Properties or Potential Designated Historic Properties requiring discretionary City permits, the City will make the finding that: (1) the design quality of the proposed project is at least equal to that of the original structure and is compatible with the character of the neighborhood; or (2) the public benefits of the proposed project outweigh the benefit of retaining the original structure; or (3) the existing design is undistinguished and does not warrant retention and the proposed design is compatible with the character of the neighborhood.
Policy 3.6	Historic Preservation and City-Sponsored or Assisted Projects To the extent consistent with other Oakland General Plan provisions, City-sponsored or assisted projects involving an existing or Potential Designated Historic Property, except small-scale projects, will: (a) be selected and designed to avoid or minimize adverse effects on these properties and to promote their preservation and enhancement; (b) incorporate preservation efforts based in part on the importance of each property; and (c) be considered to have no adverse effects on these properties if they conform with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The City will encourage applicants for City-assisted projects to submit proposals consistent with this policy.
Policy 3.7	Property Relocation Rather than Demolition as Part of Discretionary Projects As a condition of approval for all discretionary projects involving demolition of existing or Potential Designated Historic Properties, the City will normally require that reasonable efforts be made to relocate the properties to an acceptable site.

Table 5. Related Policies in the Safety Element

Policy	Description
Policy PS-1	Maintain and enhance the city's capacity to prepare for, mitigate, respond to and recover from disasters and emergencies.
Policy FI-3	Prioritize the reduction of the wildfire hazard, with an emphasis on prevention.
Policy HM-2	Reduce the public's exposure to toxic air contaminants through appropriate land use and transportation strategies.

Policy FL-1	Enforce and update local ordinances, and comply with regional orders, that would reduce the risk of storm-induced flooding.
Policy FL-2	Continue or strengthen city programs that seek to minimize the storm-induced flooding hazard.
Policy FL-3	Seek the cooperation and assistance of other government agencies in managing the risk of storm-induced flooding.
Action FL-4.3	Inform shoreline-property owners of the possible long-term economic threat posed by rising sea levels.
Action FL-4.4	Stay informed of emerging scientific information on the subject of rising sea levels, especially on actions that local jurisdictions can take to prevent or mitigate this hazard.

Table 6. Related Policies in the Bicycle Master Plan

Policy	Description
Policy 1A	Bikeway Network Develop and improve Oakland's bikeways network.
Policy 1B	Routine Accommodations Address bicycle safety and access in the design and maintenance of all streets.
Policy 1C	Safe Routes to Transit Improve bicycle access to transit, bicycle parking at transit facilities, and bicycle access on transit vehicles.
Policy 1D	Parking and Support Facilities Promote secure and conveniently located bicycle parking at destinations throughout Oakland.
Policy 2A	Education Work with public agencies and the private sector to improve bicycle education, enforcement, and promotional programs.
Policy 2B	Enforcement Prioritize the enforcement of traffic laws that protect bicyclists.
Policy 3A	Resources Seek the necessary staff and funding to implement the Bicycle Master Plan.
Policy 3B	Project Development Prioritize and design bicycle projects in cooperation with key stakeholders.
Policy 3C	Public Review Prior to the implementation of bikeway projects, affected residents, merchants, and property owners shall be notified of the project's costs and benefits.

Table 7. Related Policies in the Pedestrian Master Plan

Policy	Description
Policy 1.1	Crossing Safety Improve pedestrian crossings in areas of high pedestrian activity where safety is an issue.
Policy 1.2	Traffic Signals Use traffic signals and their associated features to improve pedestrian safety at dangerous intersections.

Policy 1.3	Sidewalk Safety Strive to maintain a complete sidewalk network free of broken or missing sidewalks or curb ramps.
Policy 2.1	Route Network Create and maintain a pedestrian route network that provides direct connections between activity centers.
Policy 2.2	Safe Routes to School Develop projects and programs to improve pedestrian safety around schools.
Policy 2.3	Safe Routes to Transit Implement pedestrian improvements along major AC Transit lines and at BART stations to strengthen connections to transit.
Policy 3.2.	Land Use Promote land uses and site designs that make walking convenient and enjoyable.
Policy 4.1	Education Promote safe and courteous walking and driving and the benefits of walking through targeted outreach programs.
Policy 4.2	Enforcement Prioritize the enforcement of traffic laws that protect the lives of pedestrians.

Table 8. Related Policies in the Estuary Policy Plan

Policy	Description
Objective C-2	Establish a continuous waterfront parkway; a safe promenade for pedestrians, bicycles, and slow-moving automobiles.
Objective C-5	Promote transit service to and along the waterfront.
Objective C-6	Improve pedestrian and bicycle circulation.
Policy JL-6	Encourage the preservation and adaptive reuse of existing buildings in a new Waterfront Warehouse District. Use of buildings and new infill development should include joint living and working quarters, residential, light industrial, warehousing & distribution, wholesaling, offices and other uses which preserve and respect the District's unique character.
Policy JL-14	Provide for increased transit service to the Jack London District.
Policy JL-15	Enhance bicycle circulation through the Jack London District.
Policy OAK-6	Explore the future potential for a new BART station and major parking facility on BART property at Fifth Avenue and East Eighth Street.
Policy OAK-9	Improve the Embarcadero east of Oak Street as a multimodal landscaped parkway with bicycle, pedestrian and vehicular facilities.
Policy OAK-10	Create a network of pedestrian-friendly streets that opens up views and access to the water.
Policy SAF-9	Provide a continuous Embarcadero parkway from Ninth Avenue to Damon Slough.

B. Summary of Adopted City Energy and Climate Policies Covered in Other Existing City Policies Supporting GHG Reductions

In addition to policies considered under the Previous CEQA documents, actions included in the ECAP are also consistent with many additional adopted City policies that were considered exempt from CEQA, including:

- Recycled Content Procurement and Source Reduction Policy – adopted in 1994 via Resolution No. 70814 C.M.S.
- Sustainable Development Initiative – adopted in 1998 via Resolution No. 74678 C.M.S.
- Climate Protection Resolution – adopted in 1998 via Resolution No. 72809 C.M.S.
- Waste Reduction Resolution – adopted in 2002 via Resolution No. 77500 C.M.S.
- Construction and Demolition Recycling Ordinance – adopted in 2002 via Ordinance No. 12253 C.M.S.
- Green Fleet Resolution – adopted in 2003 via Resolution No. 77842 C.M.S.
- Recycling Market Development Zone Program – adopted in 2003 via Resolution No. 77759 C.M.S.
- Civic Green Building Ordinance – adopted in 2005 via Resolution No. 12658 C.M.S.
- Chicago Climate Exchange Resolution – adopted in 2005 via Resolution No. 79135 C.M.S.
- Zero Waste Resolution – adopted in 2006 via Resolution No. 79774 C.M.S.
- Zero Waste Strategic Plan Resolution – adopted in 2006 via Resolution No. 80286 C.M.S.
- Green Building Guidelines Resolutions – adopted in 2006 via Resolution No. 79871 C.M.S.
- Urban Environmental Accords Resolution – adopted in 2006 via Resolution No. 79808 C.M.S.
- Green Food Service Ware – adopted in 2006 via Ordinance No. 12747 C.M.S.
- Williams Resolution – adopted in 2007 via Resolution No. 80659 C.M.S.
- Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Policy – adopted in 2007 via Resolution No. 80747 C.M.S.
- Mills Act Pilot Program – adopted in 2007 via Ordinance No. 12784 C.M.S.
- Extended Producer Responsibility Resolution – adopted in 2007 via Resolution No. 80390 C.M.S.
- Bicycle Parking Ordinance – adopted in 2008 via Ordinance No. 12884 C.M.S.
- Bay Friendly Landscaping Ordinance – adopted in 2009 via Ordinance No. 12950 C.M.S.
- Green Building Ordinance for Private Development Projects – adopted in 2010 via Ordinance No. 13040 C.M.S.