

INITIAL STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

1. Project Title: Pedestrian Master Plan
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Oakland
Community and Economic Development Agency
Planning Division
250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 3330
Oakland, CA 94612
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Zachary Wald, Pedestrian Planner
Telephone: (510) 238-5226
E-mail: zwald@oaklandnet.com
4. Project Location: City of Oakland
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: City of Oakland
Office of the City Manager
Oakland Pedestrian Safety Project
1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza
Oakland, CA 94612

Zachary Wald, Pedestrian Planner
Telephone: (510) 238-5226
E-mail: zwald@oaklandnet.com
6. General Plan Designation: Not Applicable
7. Zoning: Not Applicable
8. Description of Project: The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to adopt a Pedestrian Master Plan (PMP) as part of the Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE) of the City of Oakland General Plan. The Pedestrian Master Plan further develops pedestrian policies adopted in March 1998 as part of the Land Use and Transportation Element of the City of Oakland General Plan. Specifically, Policy T4.5 of the LUTE recommends the preparation, adoption, and implementation of a Pedestrian Master Plan. Prior to adopting the Land Use and Transportation Element, the City of Oakland certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Final EIR evaluated potential impacts that could result from implementation of policies included in the Land Use and Transportation Element.

B₁B-1

PUBLIC SAFETY CMTE
OCT 29 2002

The Pedestrian Master Plan identifies policies to promote pedestrian safety and access throughout Oakland. It designates a pedestrian route network that connects parks, schools, neighborhoods, and commercial districts throughout the City. The designation of the route network is a planning tool for understanding where physical improvements are most needed and where those improvements would have the most positive impact. The plan also recommends pedestrian design elements to encourage higher standards for pedestrian safety and access in future City projects.

This Initial Study addresses the potential environmental impacts of the Pedestrian Master Plan as a policy document. These policies address existing City rights-of-way. An "Implementation Plan" details possible future pedestrian projects to improve the route network. Composed of a list of potential projects, this list serves as a planning tool in formulating future physical improvements. For implementation, the proposed projects would require additional review by traffic engineering and under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Furthermore, engineering judgment is necessary to determine the specific locations and features of each project.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The City of Oakland is located on the eastern side of San Francisco Bay. It is a substantially built-out city of approximately 400,000 residents. The pedestrian policies identified by the Pedestrian Master Plan address streets and off-street routes that are existing rights-of-way in the City. These routes traverse residential, commercial, and industrial areas connecting parks, schools, neighborhoods, and commercial districts throughout the City.
10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval May Be Required: California Department of Transportation
11. Actions for Which This Initial Study May Be Applied Without Limitation: General Plan Amendment

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. However, proposed mitigation measures would reduce these to less than significant impacts.

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because mitigation measures have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Leslie V. Gould
Signature

August 23RD, 2002
Date

Leslie Gould
Planning Director

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

CEQA requires that an explanation of all answers except “No Impact” answers be provided along with this checklist, including a discussion of ways to mitigate any significant effects identified. As defined here, a significant effect is considered a substantial adverse effect.

<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
---	---	---	----------------------

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Comment: The proposed policies would result in pedestrian improvements to sidewalks, crossings, signage, lighting, and streetscapes along existing City rights-of-way. Signage, lighting, and streetscape improvements will not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas.

Source: Project description and plans
Existing Conditions

- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Comment to Questions Ib-Ic: The proposed policies would result in pedestrian improvements to sidewalks, crossings, signage, and lighting along existing City rights-of-way. These improvements would retain or improve the existing character and quality of Oakland City streets and will therefore not cause the degradation of scenic resources or visual character.

Source: Project description and plans
Existing Conditions

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Comment: The Pedestrian Master Plan proposes lighting improvements along designated pedestrian routes. The Plan calls for pedestrian-scale lighting with frequent light posts of lower height and illumination than typical streetlights in the City of Oakland. By focusing illumination on the areas of pedestrian travel and ensuring that lighting is directed downward and shielded to prevent spillover light, the improvements will not produce substantial new light or glare. Community feedback will be considered when determining locations for potential lighting improvements.

Source: Project description and plans
Existing Conditions

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓ |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓ |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓ |

Comments to Questions IIa-IIc: The Plan would not have any impacts on agricultural resources. The Plan addresses existing rights-of-way in an urban area that does not contain agricultural uses.

Source: Oakland General Plan, Land Use and Transportation Element, March 24, 1998
 Oakland General Plan, Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element, October 1995

III. AIR QUALITY -- Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | ✓ | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments to Questions IIIa-IIIe: The proposed pedestrian policies would not contribute to air quality problems in the San Francisco Bay Area. The Pedestrian Master Plan has the potential to improve air quality by encouraging walking and transit as transportation alternatives to private automobile use. Future pedestrian improvement projects may involve physical changes with air quality impacts. These projects would be subject to environmental review as separate projects. To ensure that the potential air quality impacts are less than significant, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

- Air quality analyses would be prepared during the environmental review process for future projects in order to determine whether the projects would have the potential to create significant air quality impacts due to construction-generated dust or changes in traffic circulation.

Source: Project description and plans
Existing Conditions

<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
---	---	---	----------------------

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - - Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

d) 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Comments to Questions IVa-IVf: The Pedestrian Master Plan will not result in significant impacts to biological resources because it addresses existing rights-of-way within the City of Oakland. The Plan will not impact wetlands, special status species, sensitive habitats, or conservation plans. Compliance with the City of Oakland Tree Preservation Ordinance would be required if future pedestrian improvement projects would entail removal of or construction within close proximity to a protected tree. This compliance would ensure that potential biological impacts on trees are less than significant.

Source: Oakland General Plan, Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element, October 1995
Existing Conditions

<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
---	---	---	----------------------

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

Comment: The Plan may result in pedestrian improvements along City rights-of-way that are adjacent to historical resources. However, the Plan will not cause a substantial adverse change because it is directed at existing City rights-of-way.

Source: Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey
Oakland General Plan, Historic Preservation Element, July 21, 1998
Project description and plans
Existing Conditions

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Comments to Questions Vb-Vd: The Plan does not call for substantial excavation or grading and will thereby not impact archaeological or paleontological resources or human remains.

Source: Project description and plans

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

- iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
---	---	---	----------------------

iv) Landslides?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Comments to Questions VIa(i)-VIa(iv): Although pedestrian improvements may be located within an earthquake zone, the Pedestrian Master Plan proposes at-grade improvements that would not expose people to additional impacts from a major seismic event or landslide. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Source: Oakland General Plan, Environmental Hazards Element, September 1974
 Oakland Environmental Factors Analysis, Technical Report #6, October 1995
 Oakland General Plan, Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation Element, October 1995

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

e) Have 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Comments to Questions VIb-VIe: The policies proposed by the Pedestrian Master Plan are directed at existing rights-of-way. Future pedestrian projects conducted by the City would be required to comply with all applicable regulations and standard measures to address potential geologic and soils impacts related to grading or excavation activities. The proposed policies thereby would not result in significant soils or geologic impacts or result in mudslides, landslides, or changes in geologic substructures.

With implementation of the following standard practices, potential impacts on soil would be reduced to less than significant levels. To minimize soil erosion, a construction period erosion control plan must be submitted to the Building Department for approval prior to the issuance of grading permits. Long-term erosion potential would be addressed through installation of project landscaping and storm drainage facilities, both of which shall be designed to meet applicable regulations. Construction operations shall be confined as much as possible to the dry season in order to avoid erosion of disturbed soils.

Source: Oakland General Plan, Environmental Hazards Element, September 1974
 Oakland Environmental Factors Analysis, Technical Report #6, October 1995
 Oakland General Plan, Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation Element, October 1995

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments to Questions VIIa-VII d: The Pedestrian Master Plan proposes policies to increase safety and access for pedestrians in Oakland. As a policy document, the Plan will not impact sites contaminated with hazardous materials or entail the use of hazardous substances outside of existing use for the maintenance of pedestrian facilities. For future pedestrian improvement projects located on such a site, all applicable requirements must be satisfied at the project site prior to issuance of grading or building permits. Requirements apply to the remediation, removal, and ongoing monitoring of any hazardous substances remaining on the site. These requirements must be met in accordance with the Alameda County Environmental Health Department, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Department of Toxic Substance Control, California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and the City of Oakland Building Services Division.

Source: Project description and plans

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Comments to Questions VIIe and VII f: While the Plan may improve sidewalks, crossings, signage, and lighting for pedestrians near an airport, it is not expected that these improvements will pose a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area.

Source: Oakland General Plan, Land Use and Transportation Element, March 1998

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comment to Question VIIg: The Pedestrian Master Plan was formulated to avoid conflicts with emergency response or evacuation plans. No impediments to emergency routes would be created. However, pedestrian routes would provide alternative forms of evacuation in the event of an emergency. The policies are also formulated to reduce the number of traffic collisions and thereby reduce the number of emergency responses.

Source: Draft Multi-Hazard Functional Plan, City of Oakland, 1993
Project description and plans

h) Expose 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Comment: The Pedestrian Master Plan would not result in the exposure of people or structures to wildland fires.

Source: Project description and plans

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially 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 (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions VIIIc-VIIIj: The Pedestrian Master Plan addresses areas that are presently developed with streets and paths. Projects envisioned in the Plan would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns or discharge into surface waters or groundwater. The policies proposed by the Pedestrian Master Plan address areas where the course of water movement is determined by existing control measures. The improvements would not alter these measures and thereby would not substantially alter the course of water. Thus, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts with respect to erosion, flooding, stormwater drainage system capacity, surface water quality or quantity.

Source: Oakland General Plan, Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation Element, October 1995
Project description and plans
Existing Conditions

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions IXa-IXc: The policies of the Pedestrian Master Plan will not entail the physical division of any established community. The Land Use and Transportation Element of the General Plan

recommends the completion of a Pedestrian Master Plan. The Pedestrian Master Plan also supports related policies or recommendations contained within the Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element (OSCAR) of the General Plan. The proposed policies in the Pedestrian Master Plan do not alter existing plans for the land use, density, or character of any area.

Source: Oakland General Plan, Land Use and Transportation Element, March 1998
 Zoning Regulations
 Project description and plans

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Comments to Questions Xa-Xb: The Pedestrian Master Plan does not include any proposal that entails on-site quarrying, mining, dredging, or extraction of non-renewable natural resources. Given that Oakland is largely a built-out city, pedestrian improvements are directed primarily at existing streets and paths. Therefore, this project would not significantly impact mineral resources.

Source: Oakland General Plan, Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation Element, October 1995
 Oakland Environmental Factors Analysis, Technical Report #6, October 1995
 Project description and plans

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments to Questions XIa-XId: The Pedestrian Master Plan proposes pedestrian improvements to sidewalks and crossings within a built-out urban area. The only operational noise-generating component of the Plan is audible pedestrian signal heads to aid persons with visual impairments in crossing streets.

Noise may also be generated by construction of pedestrian improvement projects. With implementation of the following mitigation measure, potential impacts on noise would be reduced to less than significant levels:

- The operational and construction period ambient noise levels arising from pedestrian improvements will be analyzed during the environmental review process for future projects.

Source: Project description and plans

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comment to Questions XIIa-XIIc: While the provision of improved pedestrian infrastructure may induce additional walking trips, the Pedestrian Master Plan is not expected to induce population growth.

Source: Oakland General Plan, Land Use and Transportation Element, March 1998
 Oakland General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element, Final Addendum to the Draft EIR, February 1998
 Project description and plans

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES - - Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions XIIIa-XIIIe: The Plan is not expected to generate a substantial need for additional public services. Improving pedestrian infrastructure will likely require some additional City maintenance but it is not expected to require new construction of government facilities to support that maintenance.

Source: Oakland General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element, Final Addendum to the Draft EIR, February 1998
Oakland Community Services Analysis, Technical Report #5, October 1995

XIV. RECREATION - - Would the project:

a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Questions XIVa-XIVb: The Pedestrian Master Plan may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks by providing improved pedestrian access to these destinations. However, the potential increase in use is not expected to cause substantial deterioration of park facilities or to require new construction.

Source: City of Oakland, Life Enrichment Agency, Parks and Recreation Division
Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation Element, October 1995
Project description and plans

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - - Would the project:

a) 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	---	--------------------------	--------------------------

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways ?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Comments to Questions XVa-XVb: The Pedestrian Master Plan is not expected to cause an increase in motor vehicle trips. However, the Plan does identify potential pedestrian improvements that, if implemented, may affect the volume to capacity ratio or level of service of city streets for motor vehicles. These potential improvements are bulb-outs, refuge islands, and street reconfigurations that may reduce the number of motor vehicle travel lanes. To ensure that the potential impacts are less than significant, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- Improvements needed for pedestrian safety and access shall be designed to the maximum extent feasible such that existing level of service of city streets for motor vehicles is not reduced. If such a reduction in level of service is unavoidable, traffic analyses will be conducted as part of the environmental review of that project to determine the impacts to motor vehicle circulation.
- Improvements needed for pedestrian safety and access shall be designed to the maximum extent feasible such that existing volume to capacity ratios of city streets for motor vehicles are not reduced. The Pedestrian Master Plan proposes traffic analyses of city streets with four or more motor vehicle lanes to identify those streets with excess motor vehicle capacity. These analyses will be part of the environmental review process for future pedestrian projects. The Plan suggests that the streets identified by these analyses are potential sites for lane reconfiguration projects such as a reduction of 6 to 4 motor vehicle lanes or 4 to 2 motor vehicle lanes plus the addition of center turn lanes and bicycle lanes. For those streets with excess motor vehicle capacity, potential projects will be evaluated based on the impact of the change to motor vehicle circulation and projections for future demand versus improved safety and access for pedestrians and bicyclists as well as improved livability for adjacent residents.
- As part of the environmental review of future pedestrian improvement projects, a construction-period traffic control plan shall be developed to address any potential impacts on traffic caused by lane closures or sidewalk closures necessitated by the construction activity.

Source: Project description and plans
Design Guidelines

c) 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Comments to Question XVd-XVe: The Plan should help eliminate design features that create pedestrian hazards and modal conflicts. The proposed policies on traffic signal timing, pedestrian crossings, and sidewalk standards will not significantly impact emergency access. However, potential safety impacts of

pedestrian improvement design features would be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measure:

- Impacts of future pedestrian improvement projects shall be subject to future environmental review of their potential impacts on hazards due to design features.

Source: Project description and plans

	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments to Question XVf: The Pedestrian Master Plan does not propose policies or design guidelines with the explicit purpose of changing parking capacity. However, potential pedestrian improvements for safety and access may affect the number of on-street motor vehicle parking spaces. The potential improvements that may decrease motor vehicle parking capacity include bulb-outs, bus bulb-outs, tree bulb-outs, mid-block pedestrian crossings, and lane reductions. Parking capacity for bicycles could be increased through the installation of bulb-outs. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the potential negative impacts on motor vehicle parking to less than significant levels:

- Improvements needed to ensure pedestrian safety and access shall be designed to the maximum extent feasible such that existing motor vehicle parking spaces are not removed. To the extent that such removal is unavoidable, a parking study shall be conducted as part of the future pedestrian project's environmental review to determine the project's negative impacts on parking and minimize those impacts.

Source: Project description and plans

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Comments to Question XVg: The Plan reinforces existing policies, plans, and programs supporting alternative transportation identified by the Land Use and Transportation Element of the General Plan. The Pedestrian Master Plan was prepared as a companion document to the Bicycle Master Plan.

Source: Project description and plans

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - - Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	✓

Comments to Questions XVIa-XVIg: The policies in the Pedestrian Master Plan are not expected to result in significant impacts to utilities or service systems. These policies relate to pedestrian safety and access on existing City streets and paths.

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

XVII.MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project 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?

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Comments to Questions XVIIb-XVIIc: The Pedestrian Master Plan may have potential impacts on air quality, noise, and transportation as a result of future pedestrian improvement projects. These future projects would be subject to additional environmental review that would include an analysis of both short-term and cumulative impacts.

Summary of Mitigation Measures Incorporated into the Pedestrian Master Plan

File No. ER020016

Ref. No. GP02323

Air Quality (IIIb, IIIc, and IIId)

Future pedestrian improvement projects may involve physical changes with air quality impacts. These projects would be subject to environmental review as separate projects. To ensure that the potential air quality impacts are less than significant, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

- Air quality analyses would be prepared during the environmental review process for future projects in order to determine whether the projects would have the potential to create significant air quality impacts due to construction-generated dust or changes in traffic circulation.

Monitoring Responsibility: Community and Economic Development Agency, Planning Division

Monitoring Timeframe: Implementation shall occur prior to grading and construction activities.

Noise (XIa, XIb, XIc, and XI d)

With implementation of the following mitigation measure, potential impacts on noise would be reduced to less than significant levels:

- The operational and construction period ambient noise levels arising from pedestrian improvements will be analyzed during the environmental review process for future projects.

Monitoring Responsibility: Community and Economic Development Agency, Planning Division

Monitoring Timeframe: Implementation shall occur prior to grading and construction activities.

Transportation/Traffic (XVa, XVb, XVd, and XVf)

The Pedestrian Master Plan identifies potential pedestrian improvements that, if implemented, may affect the volume to capacity ratio or level of service of city streets for motor vehicles. These potential improvements are bulb-outs, refuge islands, and street reconfigurations that reduce the number of motor vehicle travel lanes. To ensure that the potential impacts are less than significant, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- Improvements needed for pedestrian safety and access shall be designed to the maximum extent feasible such that existing level of service of city streets for motor vehicles is not reduced. If such a reduction in level of service is unavoidable, traffic analyses will be conducted as part of the environmental review of that project to determine the impacts to motor vehicle circulation.
- Improvements needed for pedestrian safety and access shall be designed to the maximum extent feasible such that existing volume to capacity ratios of city streets for motor vehicles are not reduced. The Pedestrian Master Plan proposes traffic analyses of city streets with four or more motor vehicle lanes to identify those streets with excess motor vehicle capacity. These analyses will be part of the environmental review process for future pedestrian projects. The Plan suggests that the streets identified by these analyses are potential sites for lane reconfiguration projects such as a reduction of 6 to 4 motor vehicle lanes or 4 to 2 motor vehicle lanes plus the addition of center turn lanes and bicycle lanes. For those streets with excess motor vehicle capacity, potential projects will be evaluated based on the impact of the change to motor vehicle circulation and projections for future

demand versus improved safety and access for pedestrians and bicyclists as well as improved livability for adjacent residents.

- As part of the environmental review of future pedestrian improvement projects, a construction-period traffic control plan shall be developed to address any potential impacts on traffic caused by lane closures or sidewalk closures necessitated by the construction activity.

Monitoring Responsibility: Community and Economic Development Agency, Planning Division

Monitoring Timeframe: Implementation shall occur prior to grading and construction activities.

Potential safety impacts of pedestrian improvement design features would be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of the following mitigation measure:

- Impacts of future pedestrian improvement projects shall be subject to future environmental review of their potential impacts on hazards due to design features.

Monitoring Responsibility: Community and Economic Development Agency, Planning Division

Monitoring Timeframe: Implementation shall occur prior to grading and construction activities.

Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the potential negative impacts on motor vehicle parking to less than significant levels:

- Improvements needed to ensure pedestrian safety and access shall be designed to the maximum extent feasible such that existing motor vehicle parking spaces are not removed. To the extent that such removal is unavoidable, a parking study shall be conducted as part of the future pedestrian project's environmental review to determine the project's negative impacts on parking and minimize those impacts.

Monitoring Responsibility: Community and Economic Development Agency, Planning Division

Monitoring Timeframe: Implementation shall occur prior to grading and construction activities.

B, B-1
PUBLIC SAFETY CMTE
OCT 29 2002