



180 Grand Avenue
Suite 1050
Oakland, CA 94612
510.839.5066 phone
510.839.5825 fax

www.esassoc.com

preliminary scope of work – phase 2

TRANSMITTED BY ELECTRONIC MAIL ONLY

December 13, 2018

Peterson Vollmann, Planner IV
City of Oakland, Bureau of Planning
pvollmann@oaklandca.gov

Bijal Patel, Special Counsel
Oakland City Attorney's Office
bpatel@oaklandcityattorney.org

Larry Gallegos
City Project Coordination
lgallegos@oaklandca.gov

Subject: Oakland Waterfront Ballpark District Project – Phase 2 Scope of Work (Preparation of the Draft EIR)

Dear Mr. Vollmann:

We are excited about continuing our work with the City of Oakland to complete the EIR for the Oakland Athletics (A's) proposed ballpark and mixed-use development at Howard Terminal. This scope of work and description of the EIR analysis methodology is designed to provide the City with an EIR that is consistent with the Notice of Preparation (NOP) that was published on November 30, 2018, that reflects the City's independent judgment, and that achieves the proposed schedule.

I. Introduction

The Phase 2 scope of work presented in this letter and attachments outlines the tasks necessary to prepare and publish a Draft EIR for the proposed Oakland Waterfront Ballpark District Project. In general, Phase 2 is expected to commence with the end of the public scoping period for the EIR (mid-January) and conclude at the end of the public comment period on the Draft EIR. The one major exception to this work relates to Fehr & Peer's scope of work, which has been included in Phase 1 even though a substantial piece of their work will occur during Phase 2.

The Phase 2 scope of work presented below first summarizes the Project components that will be the subject of ESA's analysis, and identifies studies that will be provided by the applicant, and subconsultants who will be part of ESA's team. The scope of work then describes the three-phased approach to our scope of work, and lists all of the tasks involved, going into detail for those tasks included in Phase 2. Attachment A provides a detailed summary of the technical subjects that will be

addressed in the Draft EIR, including assumptions, data needs, and the level of effort required for each. A preliminary cost estimate for the Phase 2 scope of work is provided in Attachment B and includes subconsultant cost estimates. All subconsultant scopes of work are included in Attachments C, D, and E, with the exception of the Fehr & Peers scope of work, which was included in Phase 1.

II. Project Components

For purposes of this Phase 2 scope of work and related budget estimate, we assume that the Project will be as described in the NOP (updated from that described in the Phase 1 scope of work). Specifically, the Project applicant proposes to develop the Howard Terminal property with the following key initial plan elements:

- Demolish existing buildings on the Project Site, except the existing power plant and the existing container cranes, which may be retained;
- Address any hazardous materials that may be present on the Project Site;
- Construct:
 - A new privately funded, open-air, approximately 35,000-person capacity Major League Baseball park;
 - Up to 4,000 residential units of varying affordability and types
 - Approximately 2.27 million square feet of adjacent mixed use development, including retail, commercial, office, cultural, entertainment, flex light industrial/manufacturing, and recreational uses;
 - A performance venue with a capacity of up to 3,500 individuals;
 - A 300- to 400-room hotel;
 - New and expanded utility infrastructure; and
 - New signage and lighting;
- Construct/provide improved access from the surrounding neighborhood and regional transportation networks, which could include, but may not be limited to:
 - an expanded shuttle and/or bus service (“rubber-tire trams”); and
 - a new network of public streets and sidewalks that provide connectivity to and through the Project Site, and pathways that lead directly to the waterfront and related amenities.
- Construct/provide new waterfront public access, enhanced water views, and on-site open space;
- Comply with Assembly Bill (AB) 734 regarding implementation of sustainability measures, development of a LEED Gold ballpark, and no net increase of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions; and

- Phase development of the proposed Project, with a target completion date of Spring 2023 for construction of Phase 1, including the ballpark, hotel, up to 500 residential units, 500,000 square feet of office, up to 50,000 square feet of retail, and associated infrastructure.

The proposed Project may also consider one or more variants or options, potentially including, but not limited to:

- New elevated pedestrian connections over the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) railroad tracks, and improvements to existing at-grade crossings;
- An aerial tram or gondola above Washington Street extending from downtown Oakland near the 12th Street BART station to Jack London Square;
- Development of a portion of an existing power plant and removal of adjacent tanks;
- Altered edge configuration of the existing wharf to enhance public views and provide additional boat access/active water uses; and/or
- Extension of Embarcadero West to Middle Harbor Road and a new ramp from the existing Adeline Street overpass for new direct access to the Project Site.
- Desired transportation management plan enhancements (operational and capital projects) that are outside the exclusive control of the City of Oakland.

The location of the Project would occupy approximately 55 acres on property identified in the NOP.

III. Applicant-Prepared Studies

This scope of work anticipates preparation of a number of technical studies by other firms under contract to the A's, as listed in detail in Task 4 in the scope of work. Where information is provided by the Project applicant team, the ESA Team's experts will peer review the information and incorporate relevant and appropriate information into the EIR.

IV. Subconsultants

We currently anticipate that ESA's in-house technical experts will prepare all of the original analyses to support the EIR, with the following exceptions. We have augmented our team with **Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants (Fehr & Peers)**, with whom we have partnered on several other sports facilities, to conduct the CEQA transportation/traffic analysis, which ESA and the City will peer review. In addition, we have included **Lighting Design Alliance (LDA)** on our team to provide technical analyses of spillover lighting and related effects based on a lighting and glare study prepared by the A's. **Environmental Vision** will peer review the aforementioned visual simulations and shadow study prepared by the A's. ESA has also included **ALH Urban and Regional Economics**, which will conduct an assessment of socioeconomic effects, such as indirect displacement, and a separate assessment of the economic effects on surrounding businesses resulting from the A's departure from the Coliseum.

V. City Guidance and Expedited Approach

We understand that the City views CEQA scopes of work to be in “draft” form, which may be modified in the future as more becomes known about the Project and/or other factors affecting the CEQA analysis. The assumptions articulated in this scope are based on our discussions with the City and the A’s to date, and are not intended to limit the City’s independent review and actions related to the Project. Also, while the City generally requires that all initial versions of CEQA scopes for private projects incorporate the protocols found in the City’s *Guidelines for Environmental Consultant Contracts Concerning Private Development Projects* (Consultant Guidelines), we have incorporated modifications to the protocols necessary to achieve the goal of certifying the Final EIR by the end of 2019; the specific proposed modifications are described within Tasks 10 and 11 of the scope of work. We have discussed these modifications with City staff and will continue to support the City’s efforts to achieve the schedule goal.

VI. Scope of Work

The EIR scope of work is structured in three (3) major phases:

- **Phase 1: Project Initiation, Definition, and Scoping** (per the City-approved Phase 1 Scope of Work, dated 10/4/18). This phase includes tasks to identify and assemble Project information to develop a preliminary Project description suitable for the NOP; develop and circulate an NOP; attend the Public Scoping Meeting(s); review public comments on the NOP; and refine the scope of work and data needs for Phase 2. Phase 1 also includes meetings to confirm the appropriate form and structure of the CEQA document with the City, discussions of activities underway to certify the proposed Project for streamlining pursuant to AB 734, and identification of resulting requirements regarding maintenance of the Administrative Record. Where feasible and necessary to maintain the Project schedule, some initial technical work and early consultations with certain permitting agencies are assumed to start in Phase 1.
- **Phase 2: Draft EIR.** This phase includes tasks to prepare a refined Project Description suitable for the EIR and analyses; continued peer review of technical studies prepared by the Project applicant; and preparation of an Administrative Draft EIR, Screencheck Draft EIR, and Draft EIR for public release. Consistent with the City’s practice, we have also included preparation of a preliminary Standard Conditions of Approval / Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (SCA/MMRP) in this phase. Phase 2 covers all required components to publish the Draft EIR, and activities during the public comment period, including public noticing and maintenance/publication of the Administrative Record (i.e. Record of Proceedings) consistent with AB 734, and conducting a Public Hearing on the Draft EIR.
- **Phase 3: Final EIR and Project Approvals.** This phase includes tasks to review and organize public comments received during the Draft EIR comment period and to prepare a summarizing memo aimed at securing the City’s agreement on an approach to responses. This phase then includes preparation of Responses to Comments in an Administrative Final EIR, a Screencheck

Final EIR, and Final EIR. This phase also includes making refinements to the draft SCA/MMRP as needed, assisting the City Attorney with preparing draft findings under Public Resources Code § 21081, along with draft findings that may be required under other AB 734 or other State law or local requirements; preparing public notices for release of the Final EIR, including those specific to AB 734; and attendance at the Planning Commission and City Council hearings on the Final EIR. The Phase 3 scope will be refined at the end of the Draft EIR public comment period.

The scope of work below covers Phase 2: Draft EIR.

Phase 2: Draft EIR

Task 1: Phase 2 Project Management

ESA's Project Management team, Hillary Gitelman (Project Director), Crescentia Brown (Project Manager), and Jill Feyk-Miney and Paul Mitchell (Deputy Project Managers) will oversee all consultant team activities, coordinate with City staff, and engage with the Project applicant team to the extent necessary in order to implement the overall scope of work and meet the City's goals, which include certification of an environmental document in late 2019. ESA's Principal-in-Charge (Brian Boxer) will provide strategic CEQA guidance, and Christina Erwin will assist with quality assurance and control (QA/QC).

Crescentia Brown, as the day-to-day Project lead, will coordinate interaction between the City team, Project applicant team, and ESA staff. Deputy Project Managers, Jill Feyk-Miney and Paul Mitchell, will support Crescentia and oversee preparation of each component of the environmental analysis, coordinating a team of in-house technical experts and contributions from subconsultants/others. Hillary Gitelman will ensure timely review and delivery of work products to the City.

This scope and budget assumes a high level of involvement by this team to address Project management issues, including regular coordination with the City team, internal coordination of the technical members of the ESA Team, guidance of the technical team, preparation of public presentations, review and revision based on City comments, QA/QC, and other related tasks.

This task will also involve the development of the Phase 3: Final EIR and Project Approvals scope of work when work efforts near completion on Phase 2: Draft EIR.

Task 1 Deliverables:

- ✓ Monthly progress reports, invoices, quality assurance, budget management, and Project communications
- ✓ Refined and expanded scopes of work for Phase 3: Final EIR and Project Approvals

Task 2: Meetings with Project Applicant and City Teams

This task includes regular Project coordination meetings/conference calls with the City team. It is anticipated that these meetings will be attended by ESA's Project Manager, and, as needed, by the

Project Director and/or Deputy Project Managers, as well as other technical team members as needed and as supported by the budget, to address issues as they arise.

Based on our understanding of the current expectations of the Project team, we assume that team meetings or conference calls will be held, on average, weekly through the environmental review process, depending on need. For each meeting or conference call, a pre-meeting or conference call between the City's Project Manager and ESA's Project Manager will also occur as needed. In the event that individual meetings/conference calls are determined to be unnecessary, they can be readily cancelled or reduced to biweekly; in our experience it is much easier to cancel a standing meeting than to call an ad-hoc meeting on short notice.

During Phase 2, key issues to be discussed and worked out will include:

- Project Description, including a description of all mixed use development and/or off-site improvements and Project variants. Because of the unique characteristics of sports and entertainment venues, detailed assumptions need to be made about numerous operational characteristics such as start/end times for events, arrival/drop off locations for a wide variety of transportation modes, interaction of events with transit availability, truck loading and storage/parking during events, media truck staging, and pedestrian access points;
- CEQA process, including identification of any steps necessary to comply with requirements of PRC § 21168.6.7 (AB 734);
- Scope of work, including any necessary adjustments to the methodology and significance criteria for all EIR technical issues, including the transportation and circulation analysis;
- Cumulative context for all EIR technical issues, especially related to the Downtown Specific Plan, the Port of Oakland, the Coliseum site, and other development in the City and surrounding area; and
- Alternatives definition, including alternatives for full consideration in the EIR, as well as those that were considered but eliminated from further consideration.

Task 2 Deliverables:

- ✓ Project coordination meeting agendas
- ✓ Running list of follow-up items
- ✓ Detailed schedule including Project description and related information requirements

Task 3: Administrative Record Maintenance Under AB 734

As described in the memo (protocol), schedule, and index developed in Phase 1, ESA will maintain the Administrative Record for the proposed Project throughout the EIR process until the City renders a final decision on the Project. While the Administrative Record will first be made public concurrent with release of the Draft EIR, for purposes of budgeting, we assume that the Administrative Record

will be maintained continuously until the end of November 2019 (the targeted date for completion of the environmental review and entitlements process for the Project).

ESA has established and will maintain the playball@esassoc.com email address for the receipt of documents prepared by or on behalf of the City; documents submitted by the Project applicant; and provided by other agencies, interested organizations, and members of the public. ESA will organize documents received at this address according to an index and will batch them at a minimum monthly for review by the City Attorney and the City's outside legal counsel. A complete Administrative Record, reviewed and approved by the City Attorney, will need to be ready for public posting prior to publication of the Draft EIR because AB 734 requires the Administrative Record to be publically available within 3 days of publication of the Draft EIR.

This scope assumes that the City will host a link on a City website that would direct users to an off-site server so it would appear to members of the public viewing materials on-line that they have remained on the City's website. ESA will design and build the user interface page (form and content to be approved by the City) to allow the public access to the Administrative Record after publication. (Note that this web page is different and distinct from the Comment Tracker page/portal established to accept public comments.)

Because AB 734 effectively requires the Administrative Record to be continuously updated after Draft EIR publication to provide public access to new information (e.g., public comments, final documents prepared by the City, or new materials submitted by the applicant) as they are received, ESA staff will continuously organize (index), provide non-public comment letter materials for review by City Attorney and City's outside legal counsel and post new materials following publication of the Draft EIR as described in the agreed-upon protocol. (This work will continue in ESA's Phase 3 scope of work.)

Task 3 Deliverables:

- ✓ Project Website to Host the Administrative Record
- ✓ Administrative Record at the date of publication of the Draft EIR
- ✓ Continuous updates to the Administrative Record following publication of the Draft EIR

Task 4: Peer Review Applicant-Prepared Technical Studies

The Project applicant has retained qualified consultants who have prepared or are preparing a number of environmental and other technical documents prior to ESA's preparation of the EIR. This scope of work assumes the Project applicant will provide studies addressing the following environmental issues:

- Water supply, wastewater, storm drainage;
- Geology and soils;
- Hazardous materials;
- Air quality/health risk assessment;

- GHG emissions;
- Energy resources;
- Visual simulations;
- Light and glare;
- Wind testing; and
- Shadow.

These documents will be made available to the City and ESA to inform the preparation of the EIR. It is common practice to use such third-party studies to assist in describing the Project setting, particular Project effects, and/or mitigation measures. Such studies can ultimately be useful in supporting the City's analysis and conclusions in the EIR. However, to establish objective credibility and independent judgment of the EIR document, it is important that such third-party prepared studies are independently peer reviewed by technical experts under the employ of the City and/or ESA prior to inclusion in the EIR.

ESA will use its in-house senior experts to conduct a thorough technical peer review of any third-party prepared studies provided to the City and/or ESA. ESA will also peer review Ramboll's scope of work for the air quality, health risk, GHG emissions and energy analyses to be prepared as technical studies upon which ESA will base the EIR sections.

Given the desired EIR schedule, it may be necessary that certain third-party studies (e.g., public utilities and infrastructure) be concurrently reviewed by relevant City departments (e.g., Public Works, Transportation) for purposes of their plan review, and by ESA for its peer review for the EIR. These concurrent reviews will be closely coordinated through the weekly EIR coordination meetings (Task 2, above).

The City itself is contracting with another consultant for a peer review of Fehr & Peers' transportation scope and analyses (included in our Phase 1 scope of work) and ESA will utilize subconsultants to peer review applicant-provided visual simulations (Environmental Vision) and study of light and glare (LDA). The scopes for these two peer reviews are included in Attachment D and E, respectively.

ESA's peer reviews (including any prepared by subconsultants) will document and establish the technical accuracy of the information, and identify any apparent deficiencies, errors and/or omissions affecting the completeness, methodologies, findings and adequacies of the technical reports. The peer reviews will not repeat the third-party analysis. The peer reviews will provide independent validation of the accuracy and objectivity of the analyses, and will advise the City of any revisions or additions to the technical studies that may be necessary to provide an adequate analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Project.

If a peer review does not identify any substantive issues, ESA will document completion of its review as part of ESA's internal QA/QC documentation protocol. If the peer review raises substantive issues relevant to the third-party study's ability to support the CEQA analysis, the product of the peer review

will be in the form of summary memoranda with attached document mark-ups that will be submitted to the City for its review. It is expected that issues raised in the draft memoranda will be discussed with the City, and that the City will require the issues to be addressed in revised versions of the technical studies prepared by the third-party experts. The final memoranda will reflect ESA's conclusions as to the validity of third-party provided information for use in the EIR. The final versions of these peer review memoranda will become part of the Administrative Record for the EIR.

Task 4 Deliverables:

- ✓ Draft and final peer review memoranda (electronic) for any studies where ESA identifies substantive issues

Task 5: Scoping and NOP [Included in Phase 1]

Task 6: (Fehr & Peers) Transportation Management Plan [Included in Phase 1]

Task 7: (Fehr & Peers) Multi-Modal Traffic Operations Model [Included in Phase 1]

Task 8: (Fehr & Peers) Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Screening, Trip Generation, Trip Distribution, and Study Intersection Selection [Included in Phase 1]

Task 9: Pre-Administrative Draft Project Description

In Phase 2, ESA will expand on the Project Description framework developed in Phase 1 and submit a stand-alone Pre-Administrative Draft ("work-in-progress" draft) of the Project Description chapter of the Administrative Draft EIR to the City and Project applicant for review and approval. It is expected that ESA may initiate certain technical work prior to approval of the Pre-Administrative Draft Project description. We expect that the Project design will evolve incrementally during preparation of the EIR, partly in response to information that emerges from ESA's work. However, this scope assumes that the applicant will confirm the maximum development envelope and all land uses of the Project prior to preparation of substantive environmental analysis by ESA.

The Project Description chapter will include information set forth in State CEQA Guidelines §15124, and will encompass the whole of the Project proposed, including off-site improvements or any infrastructure proposed to support the Project, and any options/variants under consideration. The Project will be described in terms of its physical design, operational characteristics (number and timing of events, employment characteristics, etc.), and construction information developed and provided to ESA by the Project applicant team in graphic, tabular, and/or narrative format. The chapter will also address existing conditions, Project objectives, sustainability performance objectives or characteristics, changes proposed to the General Plan and zoning designations, entitlements and approvals required for the Project, and agencies involved in any aspect of the Project's approvals.

ESA will identify any remaining gaps in Project information needed for the Draft EIR and not yet provided in response to the detailed Project information request submitted in Phase 1 (Task 2). If key

information is not available when necessary to maintain the Project schedule, ESA will make reasonable assumptions about the Project based on our experience with the characteristics of other similar facilities. ESA will request confirmation from the Project applicant's technical team that ESA's interim assumptions are reasonable. ESA anticipates that the design of the proposed ballpark will be more advanced than some or all of the proposed mixed use development, which may be proposed for construction on a more extended schedule than that of the ballpark. We also understand that The A's will provide an illustrative phasing plan, but desire to maintain flexibility regarding the order of development. If detailed design information is not available for any component of development, the Project description will indicate that those elements of the Project will be analyzed at a programmatic level in the EIR (rather than at a Project-specific level).

Task 9 Deliverables:

- ✓ Pre-Administrative Draft Project Description
- ✓ Request for Outstanding Project Information

Task 10: Prepare Administrative Draft Environmental Impact Report

ESA will prepare one (1) Administrative Draft EIR encompassing the analysis of all resource topics pursuant to the requirements of the CEQA, California Public Resources Code §§21000 et seq., the State CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, California Code of Regulations §§15000 et seq., and City requirements and guidelines.

Two-Part ADEIR Submittal

In light of the Project schedule, the Administrative Draft will be submitted in two parts, with transportation, air quality, GHG emissions, noise and vibration, the summary, and alternatives in part two, and the rest of the sections in part one. In addition, ESA will submit a draft of one technical section in advance of Administrative Draft part one to allow the City's review of format, structure and approach. In total, the contents of the Administrative Draft EIR document will include the following:

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms

Chapter 1, Introduction and Background

This chapter will describe the CEQA context for preparation of the Draft EIR, the type and use of the EIR, the environmental review process, the focus of the EIR analysis, and opportunities for public comment. As noted earlier, we assume that sufficient information will be available to evaluate the ballpark and Phase 1 development uses at a project-specific level, while the balance of proposed uses ("Build-Out") will be analyzed programmatically. For some topics, the EIR will programmatically analyze interim phases in addition to Phase 1 and Build-Out. Chapter 1 will also include an explanation of, and all notices required by, AB 734.

Chapter 2, Summary

This chapter will summarize the proposed Project from its detailed descriptions in other parts of the Draft EIR. This chapter will also summarize the environmental impact findings disclosed in the Draft EIR, specifying significant unavoidable impacts and using a table that states each impact, before and after applicable mitigation measures. The Summary chapter will also summarize areas of controversy, the alternatives analyzed, and significant and unavoidable impacts, if any. The Summary will be presented and formatted with the intent that it may be separately printed and distributed for use by interested parties or used by the City in the development of staff reports. The Summary will include the information required by State CEQA Guidelines §15123.

Chapter 3, Project Description

See Task 9, above.

Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Standard Conditions of Approval

This chapter includes the existing settings, regulatory framework, significance criteria, methodology, and technical analyses for each environmental topic, each presented in a discrete subsection within this chapter. The analyses will be prepared in accordance with current professional standards and practices, and be consistent with the City of Oakland's CEQA Thresholds of Significance Guidelines (May 22, 2013), updated as needed to align with subsequent updates to CEQA guidance by OPR or BAAQMD. The analysis will be based on an environmental baseline and where relevant, will factor in cumulative scenarios that ESA and Fehr & Peers have confirmed with the City. Specifically, the baseline will consist of existing conditions at the time of the NOP, and the assessment of regional impacts (VMT, GHG and air pollutant emissions) will assume no MLB games at the Coliseum. **[NOTE TO REVIEWERS: Discuss what should be assumed for CEQA purposes.]**

Work presented in this chapter will also incorporate analyses conducted by ESA's subconsultants, as well as analyses contained in peer-reviewed third-party technical studies prepared under contract to the Project applicant, as described above. The Draft EIR will present the necessary substantial evidence to support that the proposed Project either would or would not result in a significant effect (as defined by CEQA) on each of the environmental topics potentially affected. Potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts will be identified.

We anticipate that the analysis of the ballpark and possibly parts of the mixed-use development program will be conducted at a project level, and that other non-ballpark parts of the Project will be analyzed at a program-level. The analysis will apply significance criteria, Oakland's Standard Conditions of Approval (SCAs), and mitigation measures for significant effects not fully addressed by the SCAs, as appropriate to the level of analysis applied.

Based on our initial understanding of the Project, we anticipate that the proposed Project has the potential to affect the environmental topics listed below. The overall scope of the analysis for each environmental topic is briefly summarized here and detailed work tasks for each environmental topic are presented in **Attachment A**, Work Tasks by Environmental Topic, to this Phase 2 scope of work. Please note that there are several technical analyses that are scoped to identify impacts of the environment on the project consistent with the City's significance thresholds. As required by the City, ESA will insert the following language into the CEQA document: "CEQA requires the analysis of potential adverse effects of the project on the environment. Potential effects of the environment on the project are legally **not** required to be analyzed or mitigated under CEQA. However, this document nevertheless analyzes potential effects of the environment on the project in order to provide information to the public and decision-makers. Where a potential significant effect of the environment on the project is identified, the document, as appropriate, identifies City Standard Conditions of Approval and/or project-specific non-CEQA recommendations to address these issues."

- ***Aesthetics, Shadow, and Wind:*** The EIR will explain the applicability of Public Resources Code Section 21099(d), if applicable, and address the potential for the Project to substantially and adversely affect publicly available scenic views, damage scenic resources, and degrade the visual quality of the Project site and its surroundings for informational purposes. The analysis will also consider whether Project lighting or Project-generated glare would substantially and adversely affect daytime or nighttime views. With respect to shadow, the EIR will consider whether the Project would substantially impair the use of publicly accessible parks and other open spaces; substantially impair the function of existing solar energy, heat, or hot water systems; adversely affect historical resources; or conflict with policies or ordinances concerning the adequacy of light available to nearby uses. The EIR's wind analysis will consider whether the Project would exceed the City's 36 mph wind speed threshold for one or more daylight hours per year. ESA will prepare the analyses with assistance from Environmental Vision (aesthetics), Lighting Design Alliance (lighting), and based on a wind tunnel analysis prepared by RWDI (working under contract to the applicant).
- ***Air Quality:*** (peer review Ramboll; Criteria Pollutants, Health Risks) The EIR will incorporate appropriate information from the peer-reviewed Ramboll technical reports to identify demolition, excavation and construction emissions from development within the Project area. Additionally, the EIR will incorporate Ramboll's operational emission estimates from development of the Project that will be based on trip generation data provided in the transportation analysis and the assumed square feet of mixed use development and number of housing units. The transportation analysis will account for the redistribution of traffic due to relocation of baseball activities from the Coliseum to the Project site. The EIR will contain an assessment of impacts associated with toxic air

contaminants that would result during construction and operation of the Project based on peer-reviewed estimates to be provided by Ramboll.

- **Biological Resources:** The EIR will determine the likelihood of the presence of populations or individuals of listed or other special-status species. It will identify suitable habitat for species of concern, and assess and determine the potential for impacts to existing populations due to the construction or operation of the proposed Project. Potential upland (terrestrial), aquatic, and bird impacts will be assessed. (Also see later section on Federal Permitting).
- **Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources:** (Archaeology, Historic Structures) The EIR will address the potential for the proposed Project to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources, archaeological resources, or tribal cultural resources during construction and operation. The analysis will consider potential direct impacts from ground disturbing activities, including vibration, as well as indirect impacts of new construction on adjacent historic buildings and/or historic districts. The Project will include Oakland's Standard Conditions of Approval regarding cultural resources to reduce impacts, as feasible.
- **Energy:** (peer review Ramboll) The EIR will incorporate information from the peer-reviewed Energy Resources analysis to quantify energy (i.e., electricity, natural gas and transportation fuel) consumption rates associated with construction and operational of the Project in compliance with the requirements of Appendix F and CEQA case law, including analysis of all relevant energy sectors, construction, operation, transportation uses of electricity, natural gas, and fuel.
- **Geology, Mineral Resources, Soils and Paleontological Resources:** The EIR will address the potential for the proposed Project to result in significant effects regarding geology, seismicity, soils, and paleontological and mineral resources during construction and operation of the Project. The analysis will consider potential short-term construction effects (e.g., erosion), and long-term operations effects (e.g., settlement and unstable geologic units). Portions of the site are known to be on fill or Bay Mud, both of which present settlement and stability issues. In addition, the EIR will evaluate the Project site for potential paleontological and mineral resources.
- **GHG Emissions / Climate Change:** (peer review Ramboll) The EIR will incorporate appropriate information from the peer-reviewed Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Technical Report to identify construction and operational GHG emissions associated with the proposed Project, including GHG reduction measures proposed in compliance with AB 734. The EIR will address the potential for the proposed Project to result in

significant effects regarding greenhouse gas emissions during construction and operation of the proposed Project.

- ***Hazards and Hazardous Materials:*** The EIR will address the potential for the proposed Project to result in significant effects regarding hazards and hazardous materials during construction and operation of the Project. The primary hazards and hazardous materials issues would be residual contamination from the previous uses of the property, particularly beneath the existing Oakland Power Plant “cap.” Although hazardous materials would be used during the construction of structures and excavation activities, and the operation of the Project, the transportation, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials is heavily regulated and compliance with the law is anticipated to reduce risks of exposure. ESA will address the potential hazards and hazardous materials related impacts of the proposed Project in accordance with CEQA requirements. The evaluation will address whether implementation of the proposed Project would result in significant impacts to the public or the environment.
- ***Hydrology and Water Quality:*** The hydrology and water quality section of the EIR will assess the proposed Project’s potential to affect surface water quality, and groundwater resources. In addition, the Project’s potential coastal flood exposure to Bay flooding, both existing and with sea-level rise, will be assessed.
- ***Land Use, Plans and Policies:*** The EIR will address the potential for the proposed Project to result in significant environmental effects related to land use by examining existing and proposed land uses in the site and vicinity, and by considering the Project’s relationship to adopted land use plans and policies. The analysis will describe the potential for land use conflicts between adjacent or nearby uses such as Schnitzer Steel and the railroad, and the potential that the Project could divide an established community either directly or indirectly. The analysis will also assess potential conflicts with plans and policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental impacts, and describe proposed amendments of the City of Oakland General Plan and zoning ordinance, as well as proposed amendments to plans governing Bayfront uses (Bay Plan, Seaport Plan) and the proposed tidelands public trust exchange. The cumulative analysis will consider land use changes anticipated as a result of the Project in combination with potential future projects, including development within the Downtown Specific Plan area, at BART stations in the vicinity, and at the Coliseum.
- ***Noise and Vibration:*** The EIR will address the potential for the proposed Project to result in significant effects regarding noise and vibration during construction and operation of the Project. The analysis will evaluate potential effects from the proposed Project related short-term construction and long-term operational noise sources (e.g.,

vehicular traffic, crowd noise within the ballpark, on nearby sidewalks and at transit queuing locations, and amplified sound from concert events). The exposure of nearby sensitive receptors and buildings/structures (including historic structures) to vibration generated during the construction of the proposed Project will also be evaluated in the EIR. The EIR will include state and local noise regulations, including the noise/land use compatibility guidelines contained in the Noise Element of the City of Oakland General Plan, the City's Standard Conditions of Approval and any other relevant City ordinances or regulations including the City's Noise Control Ordinance to determine the level of significance for potential noise and vibration impacts.

- ***Population and Housing:*** The EIR analysis will consider the population, housing, and employment changes generated by the proposed Project in the context of existing and planned population, employment, and housing in Oakland. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15131, which addresses economic and social effects of projects, the EIR will consider whether anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the Project will result in direct or indirect displacement or other physical environmental changes.
- ***Public Services:*** (Police Protection, Fire Protection, Parks and Recreation, Schools) The EIR will address the potential for the proposed Project to result in significant physical impacts related to demand for and provision of public services. The analysis will consider the potential for substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection, police protection, schools, and other public facilities.
- ***Recreation:*** The EIR will address the potential for substantial deterioration of existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, or other recreational facilities due to an increase in use of these facilities as a result of the proposed Project. The EIR will also consider whether or not the construction and operation of Project recreational facilities or other new or expanded recreational facilities necessary would have a substantial adverse physical effect on the environment.
- ***Transportation and Circulation:*** (Fehr & Peers) The EIR will analyze potential transportation impacts associated with Project construction and operation consistent with the City's practice and direction. The analysis will assess potential impacts for all modes, utilizing vehicle miles travelled (VMT) as the primary method to assess automobile impacts. Automobile access and safety will also be considered, as will impacts on regional roadways included in the Congestion Management Program (CMP). Potential impacts will be considered for Phase 1 (including the ballpark as well as additional parts of the mixed use development) and build-out of the site, as well as a

number of scenarios involving day, evening, and weekend ballgames, special events at the ballpark, and operations with and without transportation improvements that are outside of the A's and the City's control. Effectiveness of the ballpark Transportation Management Plan (TMP) will be analyzed, and a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program will be proposed to reduce automobile trips from non-ballpark development. Construction impacts and truck access to the Port will be considered.

- ***Utilities and Service Systems:*** (Water Supply, Wastewater Generation and Treatment; Storm Drainage; Solid Waste Demand) The EIR will analyze the proposed Project's demand for utilities and service systems from construction and operation on water supply, wastewater conveyance and treatment, storm drainage conveyance, and solid waste generation. The analysis will rely on a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) to consider the potential for the Project to affect available water supplies at buildout, and will also consider the capacities of existing wastewater and storm drainage conveyance and treatment facilities. ESA anticipates that EBMUD will conduct the WSA based on a City-issued request letter prepared by ESA, based on existing and with-Project demands calculated by the Project applicant's engineering consultant, BKF.

Based on our current understanding, one topic will likely not be affected by the proposed Project and will be addressed in a section regarding Effects Found Not to be Significant with a brief explanation:

- ***Agriculture and Forestry Resources:*** No agricultural activities or farmland, or forestry resources exist on the Project site. Thus, the proposed Project would have no effect on these resources.

ESA will also conduct an assessment of the following two topics, which will inform the EIR's analysis:

- ***Socioeconomics / Urban Decay*** (*ALH Urban and Regional Economics*): As a subconsultant to ESA, ALH will conduct an analysis of potential gentrification and displacement, as well as potential "urban decay" to inform the analysis of Land Use and Population & Housing in the ADEIR. **[NOTE TO REVIEWERS: Consider if this should state the the EIR will specifically address whether the Project will result in urban decay under CEQA significance standards.]** The ALH analysis will be coordinated with the City's investigation of equity issues, and will examine effects under the project of the A's no longer having major league games at the Coliseum site, as well as their proposed development at Howard Terminal. (The ALH scope of work is in Attachment C.)
- ***Federal Permitting:*** Until the proposed Project design elements involving in-water work are identified and the alternatives considered, the actual federal permits, approvals, and federal interagency consultations required for the Project cannot be specified in great

detail. However, assuming the Project will include some in-water work and/or structures within the waters of the Bay, and based on ESA's permitting experience with waterfront and in-water projects of a similar nature (such as the 34th America's Cup, the Golden State Warriors mixed-use project when it was originally proposed at San Francisco's Piers 30-32, the Old San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge Demolition Project, and the current Mission Bay Ferry Landing Project), a general framework and strategy for the federal permitting of these types of activities can be outlined, in early coordination with the Project team. The potential environmental impacts of the anticipated in-water activities of the Project will be analyzed in the EIR.

The EIR only needs to identify potential permitting requirements from other agencies. However, to benefit the City, other agencies, and information to the public, ESA will develop a Permitting Strategy Memo to include a comprehensive table itemizing each regulatory agency likely to be involved in the federal permitting or approval process for the proposed Project (likely to include the USACE, USCG, EPA, USFWS, NMFS, and SHPO); indicating the specific activity(ies) that would trigger the need for the federal permit or approval; the expected duration or lead time necessary for preparing and processing; and specific studies, information, or actions necessary to apply for each federal permit. We will also develop a comprehensive schedule for the regulatory approval process, indicating the relationship with the CEQA and NEPA decision-making processes, as well as the related local and State permits required for federal permitting. If an Individual Permit will be required from the USACE (which is a possibility for a project of this nature, scale, and level of visibility), the USACE will be required to prepare a NEPA document, relying upon information submitted by the Project Team; if the Project has other requirements to satisfy NEPA, coordination of these efforts with the USACE's requirements will also be required. Regardless, the potential Project's NEPA requirements as triggered by the USACE permit will be addressed in the Memo. The federal permitting table and schedule will be integrated into a Permitting Strategy Memo, which will also address key potential Project constraints and recommendations for how best to proceed with the federal permitting process.

Chapter 5, Project Variants

It is our understanding that the Project applicant has requested consideration in the EIR of multiple Project variants, including the following:

- New elevated pedestrian connections over the railroad tracks and improvements to existing at-grade crossings;
- An aerial tram or gondola above Washington Street extending from downtown Oakland near 12th Street BART to Jack London Square;

- Development of a portion of an adjacent existing power plant and removal of adjacent tanks;
- Altered edge configuration of the existing wharf to enhance public views and provide additional boat access/active water uses;
- Extension of Embarcadero West to Middle Harbor Road and a new ramp from the existing Adeline Street overpass for new direct access to the Project Site; and/or
- Desired Transportation Management Plan enhancements (operational and capital projects) that are outside the control of the City of Oakland.

Project variants will be evaluated in a focused discussion and described at a level of detail sufficient to evaluate those issues where the variants may result in new or substantially more severe impacts, or where mitigation requirements would be different than with the base Project. For other issues, variants will be evaluated similar to the way alternatives are addressed, by identifying impacts that would be the same or less than with the base Project. The description of each variant will identify agency approvals required for their implementation.

Chapter 6, Alternatives

An alternatives chapter will identify and evaluate alternatives that reduce or avoid significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project. Pursuant to CEQA, alternatives must avoid or reduce the magnitude of one or more significant impacts of the Project, while still achieving most of the basic objectives of the Project (see State CEQA Guidelines §15126.6). We anticipate that this chapter will include a robust discussion of alternatives/options that have been previously considered and rejected for in-depth analysis, along with reasons that those alternatives/options are not appropriate for further study. The EIR will be required to consider a No Project alternative, which would likely reflect continued use of the existing Coliseum. In addition to the No Project alternative, one or more project alternatives will be required to be analyzed, including potential changes to the size and configuration of the ballpark and/or mixed use development.

We assume that analysis of an off-site alternative will be required. The section will document the history of alternative sites that the A's have considered, and it is anticipated that an alternative involving construction of a new ballpark and associated development on the Coliseum site will be addressed. We will utilize data and analysis already available regarding the Coliseum site, and have not assumed any new detailed technical analyses in order to compare impacts of development on the Coliseum site to impacts of the proposed Project.

Chapter 7, CEQA-Required Statutory Sections

The Draft EIR is required to address mandatory impact categories pursuant to CEQA. The chapter will list all Significant Unavoidable Impacts (if any) and discuss Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes, Growth-Inducing Impacts, and Effects Found Not to be Significant.

Other Sections

The Draft EIR will also include a section listing EIR Preparers, as well as technical appendices and references. Because the desired schedule will make stand-alone technical studies impractical, we anticipate that City reviewers will carefully review the technical appendices as well as the text of the Administrative Draft EIR. Pursuant to PRC §21168.6.7(f)(2), the appropriate noticing and full text of AB 734 will be included as an appendix to the Draft EIR.

Technical Topic Preview Sessions

ESA analysts will be available to meet with the City to describe preliminary findings, recommended mitigation measures, or any unique issues that emerge during preparation of the technical analysis – prior to submittal of each of the ADEIRs.

Work Plan by Environmental Topic

A detailed work plan for the EIR's technical analysis is attached to this Phase 2 scope of work as Attachment A and provides a methodological summary and task list for each of the environmental topics listed above and has been prepared for the purposes of budgeting. It is anticipated that the preliminary work plan will be refined based on additional input from the City, the A's (regarding the proposed Project), consultation with outside agencies and parties, and comments received in response to the NOP.

Task 10 Deliverables:

- ✓ Administrative Draft EIR Part 1 and Part 2 (12 hard copies of each with an emailed pdf)
- ✓ Alternatives Approach Memo
- ✓ Technical Reports (i.e., Socioeconomics /Urban Decay, Archaeological Resources Memorandum, Historic Resources Evaluation)
- ✓ Federal Permit Strategy Memo

Task 11: Prepare Draft Environmental Impact Report

11.1: Screencheck Draft Environmental Impact Report

Based on comments on the Administrative Draft EIR provided by the City, ESA will prepare one (1) Screencheck Draft EIR in underline / strike-out format for City review at a "roundtable" style review session.

For budgeting purposes, we have assumed that no new technical studies will be prepared and that the supporting technical appendices will not need to be substantially revised based on changes to the Project or pre-approved assumptions. The budget also assumes that all City reviewer comments on the Administrative Draft EIR will be directed through the City's Bureau of Planning.

We have allocated a level of effort to this task based on our understanding of the schedule and our past experience. Once the comments are received and review meetings have been conducted, ESA will consider the adequacy of the level of effort and confirm this with the City.

11.2: Public Draft Environmental Impact Report

ESA will incorporate City staff comments on the Screencheck Draft EIR and submit a final Public Draft EIR to the City for distribution for a 45-day public comment period. We do not anticipate and have not budgeted for additional comments/revisions other than minor editorial changes following agreed-upon changes to the Screencheck Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR will include a Notice of Streamlined Judicial Review under AB 734. Concurrent with publication of the Draft EIR, ESA will upload Administrative Record materials approved by the City Attorney to a webpage that can be accessed from the City's website. Please see Task 3 for a full description of the Administrative Record. ESA will also provide a web address that can be used for submittal of public comments. Please see Task 15.2 for a description of the Comment Tracker tool.

11.3: Comment Tracker

ESA's custom web-based application called Comment Tracker will be used for collecting and managing public comments received on the Draft EIR. ESA staff will design a web page format for review by City staff and will work with the vendor and City staff to make that page accessible via the City's website upon publication of the Draft EIR. Comments received via the Comment Tracker during the public comment period will be reviewed and posted in the Administrative Record as described in Task 3.

The application also includes a comment management interface for authorized team members to review, bracket, assign, and draft responses to comments using one coordinated platform, ensuring consistency and efficiency throughout the process. This use of the Comment Tracker will be discussed in ESA's Phase 3 scope of work.

Task 11 Deliverables:

- ✓ Screencheck Draft EIR (6 hard copies; emailed/uploaded pdf of full document and individual sections/chapters; emailed/uploaded MS Word files of individual sections/chapters)

- ✓ Draft EIR and NOC (50 hard copies with CDs of full document and appendices; 25 stand-alone CDs; emailed/uploaded pdf indexed for the website)
- ✓ Comment Tracker Web Page
- ✓ Administrative Record for Draft EIR

Task 12: SCA/MMRP

Consistent with the City's practice, ESA will submit a draft Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) prior to publication of the Draft EIR. The MMRP will be in compliance with Public Resources Code §21081.6, State CEQA Guidelines §15097, and City requirements. Because Standard Conditions of Approval (SCAs) will be incorporated into the EIR, the document will be referenced as "SCA/MMRP." For all SCAs and mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR, the SCA/MMRP will include the following:

- Full impact statements for impacts that required SCAs or mitigation measures (for internal reference throughout the SCA/MMRP document);
- Full text of the mitigation measure and SCA applicable to each impact (stated in full in its first instance only, to avoid repetition);
- Schedule or timing for implementing all SCA or mitigation measure actions; and
- Parties responsible for monitoring or verifying that the actions are implemented.

Task 12 Deliverables:

- ✓ Draft SCA/MMRP

Task 13: Draft EIR Noticing and Informational Workshop Pursuant to AB 734**13.1 Notice of Availability and Notice of Completion**

ESA will coordinate with City staff to prepare a Notice of Availability (NOA) to accompany the Draft EIR. We assume the City will distribute the NOA to interested stakeholders, contiguous property owners, and/or publish the NOA in a newspaper of general circulation in the area affected by the proposed Project.

ESA will also draft and file a Notice of Completion (NOC) at the State Clearinghouse (SCH) with required materials, and will file the NOA at the County Clerk. The applicant will be responsible for providing the fee in advance of filing.

This task assumes that the City will prepare the NOA for the final EIR and distribute it to public agencies that commented on the NOP (except for State agencies that will receive the document through the State Clearinghouse), and all other interested parties.

Consistent with the City's practice, ESA will incorporate a copy of the NOA and the NOC within the Draft EIR document.

13.2 AB 734 Informational Workshop

Pursuant to AB 734 streamlining legislation, within ten (10) days of publication of the Draft EIR, ESA will support the City's hosting of an informational workshop summarizing the analysis and conclusions of the Draft EIR. ESA will assist the City in preparing the format and exhibits for this workshop, and will provide a PowerPoint presentation that summarizes the Project Description and conclusions of the Draft EIR. The City will post the required noticing for the hearing; schedule the date, time, and location for the hearing (which may be concurrent with the NOA of the Draft EIR); and secure the meeting room. It is assumed that the Project applicant will provide a court reporter to prepare a transcript of the hearing. ESA will review the transcript for accuracy and completeness, and will submit any corrections to the court reporter to prepare a final transcript. ESA's Project Director, Project Manager, Principal-in-Charge, and certain technical experts will attend the workshop.

Task 13 Deliverables:

- ✓ Notice of Availability of Draft EIR
- ✓ Notice of Completion and attachments for SCH filing
- ✓ Informational Workshop Presentation
- ✓ Attendance at the Informational Workshop

Task 14: Draft EIR Public Comment Period and Draft EIR Hearing

14.1 Public Comment Period

ESA will receive and collate public comments, and, to ensure consistency with AB 734, will work with the City to implement a system of posting of public comments within 72 hours of receipt by the City. Please see Phase 1 Task 3 for a full description of the Administrative Record and development of a protocol for this process.

14.2: Public Hearing on Draft EIR

Pursuant to AB 734, a public hearing to receive oral testimony on the Draft EIR must be conducted within the last 10 days of the 45-day Draft EIR public review period. The purpose of the meeting will be to provide responsible agencies and the public the opportunity to provide input on the adequacy of the Draft EIR. ESA will assist the City in preparing the CEQA exhibits for this hearing (if needed in addition to those previously prepared for the Informational Workshop, subtask 13.2, and will provide a PowerPoint presentation that summarizes the conclusions of the Draft EIR. The City will post the required noticing for the hearing (which may be concurrent with the NOA of the Draft EIR); schedule the date, time, and location for the hearing; and secure the meeting room. It is assumed that the Project applicant will provide a court reporter to prepare a transcript of the hearing. ESA will review the

transcript for accuracy and completeness, and will submit any corrections to the court reporter to prepare a final transcript. ESA

Task 14 Deliverables:

- ✓ Attendance at the Draft EIR public hearing
- ✓ As-needed public hearing exhibits
- ✓ Draft and Final Draft EIR public hearing transcript by a Court Reporter
- ✓ Posting of public comments and other documents to the Administrative Record webpage as they are received, per AB 734

Phase 3: Final EIR

The scope of work for Phase 3 will be refined and budgeted as part of the conclusion of the Phase 2 tasks.

Task 15: Response to Comments / Final EIR

15.1 Comments Summary and Assessment

Following the conclusion of the 45-day public review period for the Draft EIR, ESA will organize and sort all written comments and code the transcript(s) of Public Hearing comments received on the Draft EIR. ESA will prepare a summary of comment topics and identify comments that require discussion with City staff to determine the appropriate response approach. We assume there will be a number of topics that lend themselves to consolidated “master” responses, but that there will also be a significant number of individual responses required.

15.2 Comment Tracker

ESA and the City will be able to use the Comment Tracker to efficiently manage and coordinate the preparation and internal review of comment and responses if desired. The application’s comment management interface allows authorized team members to review, bracket, assign, and draft responses to comments. ESA has successfully used the tool to organize and respond to as many as 8,000 individual communications received during a public comment process.

15.3 Final EIR Contents

ESA will prepare an Administrative Draft Response to Comments / Final EIR. The document will consist of the following:

- Notices required pursuant to AB 734 (PRC § 21168.6.7(f)(1)) list of the persons and organizations commenting on the Draft EIR;
- all comments received on the Draft EIR (written and oral);
- corresponding individual responses to comments response, including Master Responses where appropriate;

- any staff-initiated changes to the Draft EIR;
- disclosure of any changes to the Project made since publication of the Draft EIR; and
- an assessment of the environmental effects of those changes.

The Final EIR also will include any technical appendices that are updated or altered after publication of the Draft EIR. Pursuant to PRC §21168.6.7(f)(2), the full text of AB 734 will be included as an appendix to the Final EIR. The Final EIR will not include reproduction of a complete revised Draft EIR.

15.4 Support Mediation Requests

As needed, ESA will also be available to support the City to address a request from anyone who commented on the Draft EIR and who requests mediation within five (5) days of the end of the Draft EIR public comment period, pursuant to AB 734.

Task 15 Deliverables:

- ✓ Comment summary for discussion with City staff
- ✓ Draft Administrative Draft Response to Comments / Final EIR
- ✓ Assistance, as needed, to support any mediation request, per AB 734
- ✓ (Optional) Comment management using ESA Comment Tracker

Task 16: Screencheck and Final EIR for Publication

Following the City's review of the Administrative Draft Response to Comments / Final EIR, ESA will incorporate the City's revisions in underline and strike-out format into the Screencheck Final EIR for a "roundtable" style review.

Following receipt of City comments, ESA will prepare a Final EIR for publication, including the notice required by AB 734. ESA will also assist the City with distribution of responses to all commenters and will file a Notice of Completion with the County and the State Clearinghouse.

Task 16 Deliverables:

- ✓ Administrative Draft Response to Comments / Final EIR
- ✓ Final EIR for publication
- ✓ Notice of Completion, filed with the County and the State Clearinghouse

Task 17: Public Hearings and Notice of Determination (NOD)

17.1 EIR Certification and Public Hearings

The ESA Project Director, Project Manager, and Principal-in-Charge will participate in up to four (4) public hearings before the City Planning Commission and the City Council related to consideration of certification of the EIR and approval of the Project. ESA will also attend the approval meeting held by the Port of Oakland. We assume that City and Port staff will prepare any necessary presentations, and

that the ESA team will support that process by assisting with a PowerPoint presentation, for example, or answering questions during the hearing(s) related to EIR certification and the Project's merits.

17.2 Notice of Determination

ESA will coordinate preparation of a Notice of Determination (NOD) with City staff and will assist the applicant with filing the notice with the County Clerk within five (5) days following the first Project approval. This scope assumes that the State and County fees will be paid directly to the County Clerk by the Project applicant. Alternatively, ESA will file the NOD at the County Clerk if provided with a check or other suitable form of payment made to the payment of the County Clerk.

Task 17 Deliverables:

- ✓ Attend up to four (4) City Planning Commission and/or City Council hearings, and the Port of Oakland, including preparing relevant materials
- ✓ Prepare NOD and assist applicant with filing after each approval action by the City and the Port of Oakland

Task 18: Finalize Administrative Record

ESA will post the Index and Administrative Record concurrent with release of the Draft EIR and add to it thereafter as required by AB 734. ESA will provide the final Index and Administrative Record materials for the City's certification within two (2) days of the City's decision on the Project so that the City may meet the statutory obligation to certify the final Administrative Record within five (5) days of Project approval.

Task 18 Deliverables:

- ✓ Final Administrative Record Following EIR Certification

Schedule

Based on ESA's experience and understanding of the CEQA process, as well as timeframes and review periods for various components of this EIR, we anticipate completion of the EIR in a period of approximately 12 months from issuance of the NOP. Assumptions to maintain this timeframe are reduced from guidelines provided in the City's *Guidelines for Environmental Consultant Contracts Concerning Private Development Projects* (Consultant Guidelines). Factors that could lengthen or shorten the schedule include dates of receipt of Project information, adequacy and completeness of Project description information provided by the Project applicant team, adequacy of technical reports provided by the Project applicant team, length of administrative document review by the City, and unanticipated issues arising from internal or public review of the environmental document.

ESA will continue to work with the City to maintain a detailed schedule. Preliminarily, we have assumed the following:

- Comments on the Administrative Draft EIR and the Administrative Draft Responses to Comments/Final EIR will be provided to ESA within three (3) weeks of City review (and Project applicant review at City discretion).
- City team and any other necessary personnel will be available for full day review meetings on the Administrative Draft and Final EIR document (or portions thereof, as submitted), and will provide their comments on Screencheck documents via a “roundtable” meeting format.
- No new issues requiring new or unanticipated technical analyses will be raised in late comments on NOP, Administrative Draft EIR, Screencheck Draft EIR, Draft EIR, or other documents, including as limited by AB 734 streamlining legislation.

Cost Estimate

Phase 1

The Phase 1 scope was budgeted at approximately \$490,000, of which approximately \$150,000 was for ESA and subconsultants LDA and ALH, and \$340,000 was for Fehr & Peers. The approved executed contract amount for Phase 1 totaled \$506,000.

An Amendment #1 for approximately \$364,000 (underway December 2018) is under consideration for additional costs to address the City’s comments on the transportation scope of work, the use of ESA’s Comment Tracker for the scoping period, initial work by Environmental Vision, attend additional scoping meetings, and other additions to the ESA scope of work. With pending Amendment #1, the total Phase 1 and total Draft EIR transportation budget is approximately \$854,000, of which nearly \$590,000 is for Fehr & Peers.

Phase 2

A variety of factors will affect the overall cost to prepare the Draft EIR, and we have based the preliminary Phase 2 budget on information known to date. **Table 1 below summarizes the Phase 2 scope of work by major task. Attachment B** to this Phase 2 scope of work shows a detailed preliminary cost spreadsheet.

The Phase 2 cost estimate of approximately **\$1,145,000** includes up to approximately \$1,075,000 for ESA, as well as \$69,400 for subconsultant ALH, Environmental Vision, LDA and Critigen¹. (Fehr & Peers’ scope and budget through the Draft EIR have been included in Phase 1 given the early advancement of that work.) All subconsultant costs assume an 8 percent ESA administration fee.

TABLE 1 – PHASE 2 COST SUMMARY

(See Detailed Cost Spreadsheet in Attachment B)

	Task	Hours	Cost
1.0	Project Management	670	\$ 170,880

¹ Phase 2 cost estimates by subconsultants Environmental Vision, LDA and Critigen are in progress as of this initial draft of the Phase 2 Cost Estimate.

	Task	Hours	Cost
2.0	Meetings with Project Applicant and City Teams	588	\$ 137,580
3.0	Administrative Record Maintenance Under AB 734	700	\$ 114,500
4.0	Peer Review Proponent Prepared Technical Studies	150	\$ 29,490
9.0	Pre-Administrative Draft Project Description	48	\$ 11,220
10.0	Prepare Administrative Draft Environmental Impact Report	2,463	\$ 487,175
11.0	Prepare Draft Environmental Impact Report	250	\$ 54,010
12.0	SCA/MMRP	48	\$ 7,830
13.0	Draft EIR Noticing and Informational Workshop Pursuant to AB 734	48	\$ 10,590
14.0	Draft EIR Public Comment Period and Draft EIR Hearing	44	\$ 10,000
ESA Labor Subtotal		5,009	\$1,033,275
Communication Fee on ESA Labor (3%)			\$ 30,998
Direct Expenses (printing, CDs, deliveries, supplies)			\$ 10,970
ESA Labor and Expenses Total			\$1,075,243
Subconsultants Total (8%)			\$ 69,390
<i>ALH (socioeconomics / urban decay)</i>			<i>\$ 33,210</i>
<i>Environmental Vision (simulations peer review)</i>			<i>\$ 21,600</i>
<i>LDA (lighting peer review)</i>			<i>\$ 10,800</i>
<i>Critigen (Tracker)</i>			<i>\$ 3,780</i>
TOTAL PHASE 2 COST ESTIMATE		5009	\$1,144,633

Note: Tasks 5.0 through 8.0 are in Phase 1

Assumptions

These cost estimates, subject to revision, are based on the following assumptions:

- 1) The number and type of deliverables will not exceed those specified;
- 2) Alterations to the proposed Project description that occur after establishment of the CEQA Project description, as agreed upon by the City, ESA, and the applicant would be considered beyond the existing scope and may require contract modification if additional level of effort is required;
- 3) Adherence with the proposed EIR schedule by all parties, including City reviewers;
- 4) Technical adequacy of all third-party technical studies;
- 5) A level of controversy from interest groups that is consistent with estimated levels of effort for responding to public comments; and
- 6) No new substantive issues raised in late comments on NOP or comments on the Administrative Draft EIR or Draft EIR.

Other factors that could affect the overall level of effort and cost of the EIR process could include, but are not limited to:

- Consideration of off-site infrastructure or other associated development or infrastructure improvements not identified by the time of the NOP; or

- Need for additional technical studies not anticipated here.

Phase 3

Based on our experience with EIRs on other similar sports and entertainment facilities, ESA anticipates that the total cost for completion of the Final EIR (Phase 3) will be approximately \$500,000 to \$760,000. The scope of work for Phase 3 will be refined and budgeted as part of the conclusion of the Phase 2 tasks.

ESA Contact

We are excited about the opportunity to work with the City of Oakland on this important, high-profile, and potentially transformative project. We look forward to discussing this initial scope of work with you and answering any of your questions. Please contact ESA Project Manager Crescentia for any questions and next steps.

Sincerely,



Crescentia Brown
Project Manager
Direct: 415-962-8455
cbrown@esassoc.com



Hillary Gitelman
Project Director
Direct: 415-262-2309
hgitelman@esassoc.com

Brian D. Boxer, AICP
Senior Vice President
Principal-in-Charge
Direct: 916-231-1270
bboxer@esassoc.com

Attachment A: Phase 2 Detailed Work Plan by Environmental Topic
Attachment B: Phase 2 Cost Proposal -
Attachment C: ALH Scope and Cost
Attachment D: Environmental Vision Scope and Cost
Attachment E: LDA Scope and Cost

ATTACHMENT A – WORK TASKS BY ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC

Overview

This detailed work plan provides a methodological summary and task list for each environmental topic to be addressed in the Draft EIR, as specified in Task 10. It is prepared for the purposes of budgeting and expected to be refined based on additional input from the City, the A's (regarding the proposed Project), consultation with outside agencies and parties, and comments received in response to the NOP.

Work Tasks that Apply to All Environmental Topics

To avoid redundancy in this work plan, the overall work tasks that are required for every CEQA topic, as listed in Tasks 4 through Task 10 are not repeated below for each topic. The specific technical tasks described below would largely occur during development of the Administrative Draft EIR in Task 10 and therefore are numbered as sub-task of Task 10 (e.g., Tasks 10.1, 10.2, etc.).

For each environmental topic, ESA will:

- 1) Prepare an environmental setting that describe physical conditions and regulatory requirements relevant to the analysis. The setting will have described relevant policies from all applicable approved City of Oakland plans; describe all applicable CEQA significance criteria and thresholds adopted by the City; describe all applicable City Standards Conditions of Approval (SCAs). For purposes of this EIR, we assume that the environmental setting at the time of the NOP will constitute the environmental baseline for CEQA purposes. For all topics, this will include the current use(s) of the Howard Terminal site. For regional topics (e.g. VMT, air quality, GHG, energy), the baseline will also include existing ballpark operations at the Coliseum.
- 2) Describe the *Approach to the Analysis*, which specifies the approach and assumptions employed to the analysis. In general, the ballpark and other Phase 1 uses will be analyzed at a project-specific level, while site build-out will be analyzed at a programmatic level. For some topics, interim phases will also require programmatic analysis (and potentially mitigation) to account for potential impacts and exposure of Project residents during construction or operation of later phases of development.
- 3) Specify topics considered to be less than significant and therefore not addressed in detail in the Draft EIR. The section will briefly describe why the topic is designated less than significant or to have no impact.
- 4) Analyze the potential effects of the Project during construction and operations, specifying the analysis scenarios (e.g. Existing + Phase 1, Existing + Build-Out, Interim Phases etc.) in cases where the impacts may vary under the different scenarios.
- 5) Analyze the potential effects of the Projects with each specified Project Variant.

- 6) Analyze the potential cumulative effect of the Project combined with reasonably foreseeable past, present, and future cumulative projects, and if one exists, discuss whether the Project has a significantly considerable contribution to the cumulative effect. The analysis will describe the cumulative context specific to the environmental topics. As allowed under CEQA, the cumulative analysis will utilize regional projections and a list of planned projects, including development under the draft Downtown Specific Plan and the Coliseum Specific Plan, being careful not to “double count” development on the list that may already be included in the regional projections.
- 7) Identify applicable SCAs that would ensure potential effects of the Project are less-than-significant.
- 8) Where applicable, identify potentially feasible mitigation measures to reduce the potential effects to less than significant, including where necessary in addition to SCAs.
- 9) Identify potential secondary effects of recommended mitigation measures.
- 10) Conduct a comparative analysis of project alternatives considered to reduce or avoid any significant unavoidable impacts identified for the Project, including a no project scenario.
- 11) Assemble and detail all persons or agencies conducted for preparation of the setting or analysis, and maintain dated, electronic documentation and bibliography of all source information for all references cited for inclusion in the Administrative Record prepared pursuant to AB 734.
- 12) Participate in pre-ADEIR technical topic impact preview sessions, as needed and requested, to present and discuss working impacts and mitigation measures with City staff prior to submittal of the ADEIR.

Detailed Work Tasks by Environmental Topic

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
10.1 Aesthetics, Shadow, and Wind		
Context: The Project site, which is located on the Oakland Estuary at the foot of Market Street, is not generally publicly accessible. Therefore, views of the site are generally limited to those through an existing cyclone fence that separates the site from Embarcadero West to the north. Views into the eastern portion of the site are also available from Clay, Jefferson, and, Water Streets and, in particular, from Martin Luther King Jr. Way. The site is also partially visible from the Jack London Square ferry terminal and the adjacent waterfront grassy open	ESA will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the applicability of SB 743 with regard to aesthetics, and the City's desire to include an analysis for informational purposes. • Describe views of and across the Project site, and describe scenic views of or across the site that could be affected by Project development. Describe the existing visual character of the site, using photographs of existing conditions to illustrate the textual description. Graphically demonstrate changes in views of and across the site from selected viewpoints, agreed upon by the City, for which the Project architect will prepare visual simulations for Phase 1 (To be confirmed) and full buildout scenarios. ESA subconsultant Environmental Vision will assist in the selection of viewpoints for the visual simulations and will provide quality assurance review of the 	Key Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall design and massing of the ballpark and the conceptual massing of the Project's mixed-use component (towers and other buildings) will not change meaningfully during the EIR analysis. Substantive changes would require re-analysis, including new wind-tunnel testing, new visual simulations, and new shadow graphics.

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
<p>space, and can be seen from locations across the Estuary in Alameda. However, from many Alameda locations, existing industrial activities along the shoreline at least partially obscure the site such that the cranes are often the only visible element. The site (again, primarily the cranes) is also visible from the elevated I-880 freeway to the north. Excellent views of the site are available from the Oakland Estuary (for example, from Bay ferry service).</p> <p>The Project site is industrial in nature, currently used largely for container storage; it contains little in the way of traditional scenic resources. However, the site's four large container cranes, which can rise to a height of more than 200 feet when operational, are visual landmarks along the Estuary. The site is surrounded by a metal recycling facility and Port operations to the west, rail tracks and industrial uses to the north beyond Embarcadero West, and a mix of office and retail uses in Jack London Square to the east.</p> <p>With respect to the gondola variant, the EIR will describe the locations of the two terminals (at 10th and Washington Streets and at Embarcadero and Washington).</p> <p>Like other Port of Oakland freight-handling locations, the Project site is brightly lit at night, with light fixtures mounted a height of about 80 feet.</p> <p>With few structures, and none more than a single story tall other than the cranes and light fixtures, the Project site casts little shade at present.</p> <p>The lack of structures generally means that prevailing westerly and northwesterly winds from the Bay pass over the site largely unimpeded.</p>	<p>finished simulations. Qualitatively describe changes in views illustrated in the visual simulations and from other locations, as applicable and readily perceivable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With respect to the gondola variant, qualitatively describe changes in views and impacts to visual character and quality resulting from construction of the two terminal structures as well as the overhead cables and operation of the gondola. It is anticipated that the Project architect will provide visual simulations of each terminal structure. • Quantitatively describe the existing level of lighting in terms of illuminance based on measurements taken at various locations on the site. Quantitatively describe proposed ballpark lighting based on lighting plans to be supplied by the Project applicant. It is assumed that the applicant's lighting consultant will, at a minimum, provide figures depicting calculated spill light (light outside the ballpark) at an appropriate distance from the ballpark in both horizontal and vertical illuminance (foot-candles). ESA subconsultant Lighting Design Alliance will make specific requests for appropriate data from which to evaluate spill light and will prepare a technical memorandum evaluating Project lighting, including spill light, to assist in this evaluation. • Graphically depict existing shadows and shadows with the proposed Project for Phase 1 (To be confirmed) and full buildout scenarios, based on shadow analysis to be provided by the Project architect. Identify shade-sensitive facilities and locations in the Project vicinity and qualitatively describe effects on these shadow receptors. • Quantitatively present wind-tunnel test results for existing conditions, Phase 1 conditions, full buildout conditions, and, if warranted based on City direction, a cumulative scenario. Wind-tunnel testing will be undertaken by RWDI based on a 3D architectural model to be supplied to RWDI by the Project applicant/architect. If cumulative wind-tunnel analysis is warranted, the City will provide model(s) of cumulative development. • It is assumed that no wind-tunnel testing will be undertaken for the gondola variant, as it is presumed that the terminal structures will be sufficiently minimal as to not result in substantial changes in ground-level winds. RWDI will be asked to prepare a brief qualitative assessment of these structures. • Other Project variants (pedestrian overcrossings of the railroad tracks, sawtooth wharf edge) will be assessed qualitatively, with no visual simulations, shadow graphics, or wind-tunnel testing specific to these variants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project architect will prepare up to eight (8) visual simulations (two of which will encompass the two gondola terminals) for Phase 1 (TBD) and full buildout scenarios from viewpoints approved by the City. • The shadow analysis prepared by the Project architect will illustrate Project shadows for Phase 1 (TBD) and full buildout scenarios on, at a minimum, the summer and winter solstices and the spring/fall equinox, at 9 a.m., 12 noon, 3 p.m., and 5 p.m. Additional shadow graphics (other months and/or times) may be required if necessary to evaluate Project shadow on particular receptors. <p>Data Needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the wind-tunnel analysis, the Project applicant/architect will provide RWDI with a 3D model of the proposed Project at a sufficient level of detail to allow for construction of a physical wind-tunnel model. • As described above, the Project architect will prepare visual simulations and shadow graphics for peer review by ESA and Environmental Vision. <p>Optional Tasks:</p> <p>Wind-tunnel testing of the gondola terminal structures can be undertaken if desired; however, this scope assumes a qualitative analysis.</p>

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
10.2 Air Quality		
<p>Context: The City of Oakland is located in an air basin that is designated as nonattainment for the state and federal ambient air quality standards for ozone and particulate matter. The air basin is also designated as a maintenance area for carbon monoxide.</p>	<p>ESA will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the climate and topography of the study area within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin as well as the regulatory context for air pollution in the Bay Area. Federal, state, and regional agencies such as the BAAQMD, with jurisdiction over sources of air pollution in and around the Bay Area, will be identified and the regulations related to stationary and mobile sources of criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants (TAC) described. Discuss current air quality in the Oakland area based on air quality data from nearby air quality monitoring stations (i.e., Oakland West) and identify the locations of existing stationary sources of criteria air pollutants and TAC in or around the Project area for which development is proposed. Identify the locations of any major sources of odor in and adjacent to the Project site based on consultations with City staff and survey of surrounding land uses. Identify the locations of sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the Project area, including existing sensitive receptors and proposed sensitive receptors that are part of the Project. Describe the BAAQMD's methodology for assessing impacts as set forth in its 2017 CEQA Guidelines, including methodologies for assessing health risks from TAC exposure as identified in BAAQMD and California Environmental Protection Agency Office of Environmental Health Risk Assessment (OEEHA) health risk guidance documents. Also identify the City of Oakland's significance criteria for assessing air quality impacts updated in 2013. Also identify City of Oakland air quality-specific SCA's that will be assumed to be incorporated as part of the Project. Incorporate appropriate information from the peer-reviewed Ramboll technical reports to identify construction and demolition emissions from development within the Project area based on the anticipated square feet of development, the number of residential units, and a reasonable rate of development for Project facilities. Incorporate appropriate information from the peer-reviewed Ramboll technical reports to identify operational emissions from development of the Project based on trip generation data provided in the transportation analysis, the anticipated square feet of development, the number of housing units, and the traffic redistribution (from the Coliseum) for ball park events. Identify Project-related sources of TAC, including from construction and operation of the proposed Project. To the extent that the proposed Project traffic would exacerbate TAC emissions from vehicular traffic on major traffic corridors, the EIR will evaluate potential exposures to increased TAC emissions for existing and future sensitive receptors in and around the Project as presented in the health risk assessment (HRA) conducted by Ramboll. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key Assumptions: Ramboll will conduct all air quality emissions modeling for the Project and variants necessary, including modeling of mitigation measures. Ramboll's community risk/health assessment will be based on screening techniques and/or the AERMOD dispersion model, and will include cumulative sources of air toxics for new sensitive receptors based on the City's adopted air quality thresholds. Ramboll's analysis will include an assessment of cumulative health risks that include Project construction, Project operations, existing sources and cumulative projects within the 1,000-foot zone of influence. <p>Data Needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ramboll AQ and GHG technical reports, including all modeling files and appendices. Detailed land use information for all Project and variant components Estimated buildout schedule and construction phasing of the Project and variants. Detailed construction operations description and proposed construction equipment to be used, including durations. Operational vehicle trip generation from the Traffic Study, including freight loading demand.

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on Ramboll's peer-reviewed technical analysis, assess impacts associated with TAC that would result during construction and operation of the Project on both existing off-site and new on-site sensitive receptors. It is presumed that the discussion will focus on the location of sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the Project site, the estimated TAC emissions and exposure, and the associate project-level health risks. Identify new sources of odors that may occur within the campus as a result of proposed development and qualitatively discuss the potential for these sources to impact proposed receptors if the City deems this necessary give the Supreme Court's recent decision. Pursuant to the direction of the Supreme Court in CBIA v. BAAQMD, effects on future Project users or residents due to existing odor sources that would be not exacerbated by the proposed Project will not be considered in the EIR. Based on Ramboll's peer-reviewed technical analysis, identify existing and planned cumulative sources of TACs adjacent to the proposed Project. Based on Ramboll's peer-reviewed technical analysis, assess impacts associated with cumulative TACs from nearby stationary sources, on-road emissions, and Project-related TACs, on both existing off-site and new on-site sensitive receptors. Review the latest mitigation measures recommended by the BAAQMD, as well as those recommended in the Attorney General's office and CAPCOA, and consider the extent to which these measures are already being implemented through the TMP strategies and other Project design features. Based on this review, relevant policies and design features will be suggested which could serve to minimize criteria pollutant and TAC emissions that would be associated with the Project. Discuss AB 734 compliance regarding implementation of sustainability measures, development of a LEED Gold ballpark, and no net increase of GHG emissions, as it relates to reducing emissions of criteria pollutants and TACs. Describe Project commitments, design features, and mitigation measures that would reduce the Project's criteria pollutants and TAC emissions and determine the potential for air quality impacts. Identify mitigation measures beyond the City's SCA's, if needed, to reduce any potential significant air quality impacts Work with Ramboll to quantify, to the extent feasible based on available information, the potential differences in air quality impacts associated with up to five Project variants. Impact assessment of variants will focus on the differences in criteria air pollutants from construction and operation as well as health risk impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed operational information including energy use, emergency generator use, and any other operational sources of GHG emissions.
10.3 Biological Resources		
Context:	ESA will:	Key Assumptions:

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
<p>While terrestrial portions of the site are largely developed, both upland and marine biological species will be affected by construction and operation of Oakland's waterfront ball park. Construction activities could affect nesting birds located on the site, while construction of new structures including gondola infrastructure will increase the potential for bird strikes and may require design considerations to minimize impacts on birds. It is anticipated that Project conformity to the City's <i>Bird Collision Reduction Measures</i> and tree removal requirements will avoid potentially significant bird-strike impacts.</p> <p>Sensitive marine biological resources that could be affected by project construction or operation include fish and marine mammals. In-water construction activities, including wharf modifications and additional boat access could result in temporary disturbance to aquatic habitat and sensitive species, and could result in potentially significant noise impacts on special-status fish and marine mammals. Additional impacts on marine resources could be associated with maintenance dredging</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review any existing biological studies relating to the Project site and regional surrounding area. Consult the state California Department of Fish and Wildlife Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) resources, and California Native Plant Society database to identify any local biological constraints and obtain additional information on special-status species and sensitive communities. Perform a reconnaissance-level biological survey to corroborate earlier survey findings and assess local wildlife and aquatic resources in the area based on direct and indirect observation (e.g., scat, tracks, burrows, indicator plant species, etc.). Summarize and evaluate federal, state, and local policies and regulations as they pertain to biological resources in the area. Determine the likelihood of the presence of populations or individuals of listed or other special-status species. Identify suitable habitat for species of concern, and assess and determine the potential for impacts to existing populations due to the proposed Project. Based upon the above actions, prepare relevant portions of a draft and final EIR biological resources analysis that fully describe the Project's natural and regulatory setting, identifies potential project impacts, and provides mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than significant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The field review will not include aquatic sampling or surveys. The field assessment will not include a wetland delineation, which will be needed to support permitting with resource agencies. <p>Data Needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A description of proposed pier modifications and in-water construction work. A description of the proposed gondola/aerial tram to support the review of the Project's potential impacts to birds. The footprint of the proposed dredging area and estimated dredging volumes. Information on chemical contaminants in the dredge area and the type and volume of contaminated material. <p>Optional Tasks: None.</p>

10.4 Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources

Context:	ESA will:	Key Assumptions:
<p>Construction of the proposed Project could potentially impact archaeological resources, tribal cultural resources, and human remains should they exist in the Project area footprint.</p> <p>The Project area and vicinity includes potential historic buildings and/or historic districts that could be directly impacted by construction or indirectly impacted by introduction of new features to the setting. The gondola variant could impact the Old Oakland Historic District.</p>	<p>ESA will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete an Archaeological Resources Memorandum that analyzes the potential for archaeological resources, tribal cultural resources, and human remains. The analysis will include background research at the Northwest Information Center, and a review of historic and geologic maps to assess sensitivity for archaeological resources, tribal cultural resources, and human remains. Prepare a Historic Resources Evaluation Report that includes the identification of significant historic architectural resources within the Project area footprint (including variants) that could be subject to direct Project impacts, and within the Project vicinity that could be subject to indirect Project impacts. California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms will be completed for up to eight architectural resources evaluating these resources for eligibility to the California Register of Historical Resources and for local listing. Should any additional historic architectural resources require documentation and evaluation, the analysis would be conducted under a separate scope and budget. 	<p>Key Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be no changes to the Project area footprint following preliminary analysis for direct or indirect impacts to cultural resources, including Project variants. The City will undertake tribal consultation pursuant to AB 52 with ESA's assistance (included in the Phase 1 scope). <p>Data Needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design details for all on- and off-site improvements, including

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate the findings of the studies into the Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources section of the Administrative Draft EIR. The section will include a summary of Oakland's Standard Conditions of Approval regarding cultural resources. Any additional mitigation measures to avoid or reduce any potentially significant impacts to cultural resources will be provided, as feasible. • Illustrate the location of historic architectural resources surveyed. 	<p>those proposed as Project variants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior environmental studies that included the Project site and the surrounding neighborhood; prior historic resource evaluations for buildings located on or adjacent to the Project site. <p>Optional Tasks: The proposed Project may need to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for federal permits. ESA can assist with Section 106 documentation and compliance under a separate scope and budget.</p>

10.5 Energy

Context:

Construction and operation of the proposed Project would consume energy, such as vehicle fuel, electricity, and natural gas.

The plan area includes existing energy consuming uses, including the power plant on parcels owned by PG&E along with truck parking and container loading.

The City does not have energy thresholds. The EIR analysis will use Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines and reflect recent case law.

ESA will:

- Prepare the setting and regulatory framework sections of the EIR, including a description of existing energy supplies and energy use patterns in the region and locality, and the existing regulatory framework governing energy use.
- Based on Ramboll's report, identify City of Oakland SCAs to reduce energy use that will be assumed to be incorporated as part of the proposed Project.
- Based on the outputs contained in the Ramboll report, compare the proposed Project's energy use to the City of Oakland, Alameda County, or Statewide use as appropriate. The proposed Project will also be compared to the energy policies found in the City of Oakland general plan and climate action plan.
- Based on information provided in the Ramboll report and the outputs contained in Ramboll's air quality and GHG analyses, apply Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines to determine energy impacts.
- Discuss AB 734 compliance as related to energy use, such as implementation of sustainability measures, development of a LEED Gold ballpark, and no net increase of GHG emissions.
- Describe the proposed Project commitments, design features, and mitigation measures that would minimize and reduce the Project's consumption of fuel and energy and determine the potential for energy impacts.
- Review the latest mitigation measures recommended by the BAAQMD, as well as those recommended in the Attorney General's office and the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) and consider the extent to

Key Assumptions:

Ramboll will outreach to PG&E and conduct all energy modeling for the Project and variants necessary for the EIR section, including modeling of energy conservation and mitigation measures.

Data Needs:

The energy analysis will rely on data provided for the Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions / Climate Change, and Utilities sections.

Optional Tasks:

For comparison purposes, ESA can work with Ramboll to estimate electricity and natural gas usage for a business-as-usual (BAU) scenario, which excludes energy and water efficiency measures beyond regulatory requirements. This may further demonstrate the Project's "wise and efficient use of energy" and that the Project avoids "wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
	<p>which these measures are already being implemented through the TMP strategies and other proposed Project design features. Based on this review, relevant policies and design features will be suggested which could serve to minimize energy use that would be associated with the proposed Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If potentially significant impacts are found, recommend additional feasible energy efficiency design features or mitigation measures to reduce impacts. 	consumption of energy” in accordance with Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines.

10.6 Geology, Mineral Resources, Soils, and Seismicity

<p>Context:</p> <p>Construction of the Project could temporarily cause short-term erosion during grading and excavation activities that could result in the migration of sediment and other pollutants into San Francisco Bay. Operation of the Project could result in Project structures and associated infrastructure being subjected to damage from settlement or unstable geologic units. Portions of the site are known to be on fill or Bay Mud, both of which present settlement and stability issues.</p>	<p>ESA will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review reports, maps, and GIS data provided in technical studies provided by the Project applicant, and published by the US Geological Survey, California Geological Survey, Alameda County, Natural Resources Conservation Service, UC Berkeley Museum of Paleontology, and other sources to identify and summarize geologic, seismic, soil, paleontological, and mineral resources conditions in the Project area and develop comprehensive understanding of potential issues of concern. This would include researching data available from the Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities to assess the potential seismic risk and the strength an earthquake would pose to structures on the site. Independently review, verify and incorporate, as appropriate, information and findings provided in Project-specific plans, geotechnical investigations, and grading plans provided by the Project applicant. If present, data gaps will be identified. The review will include the nexus of construction activities on the existing Oakland Power Plant cap. Identify the relevant regulations, building codes and standards, and local ordinance codes that would apply to construction and operation of the Project, and determine the manner and extent to which compliance would address potential impacts. This will include discussing how the state Construction General Permit and the California Building Code would address erosion, settlement, unstable geologic units, and seismic issues. The degree to which such requirements will reduce potential effects and any additional actions that might be required will receive careful consideration. Describe Project grading and construction, including amount of disturbance, cut and fill, and final topographic configuration; the methods to manage storm water; and determine if, where, and to what extent geologic hazards to structures would remain after compliance with building codes and geotechnical recommendations. Identify which, if any, impacts are significant, and present mitigation, where applicable and feasible, to reduce the impacts to below applicable significance thresholds. Prepare tables & figures showing regional faults, the modified Mercalli intensity scale, active faults, and summarizing 	<p>Key Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Oakland Power Plant, located in the eastern portion of the site has an existing cap to prevent exposure of people and the environment to the underlying contaminated materials. It is assumed that the Project will either (1) not disturb or penetrate the cap or (2) if disturbing or penetrating the cap is necessary, restore and reseal the cap to the satisfaction of the regulatory agency, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). The construction activities will obtain coverage under the state Construction General Permit, which requires the implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to manage stormwater and non-stormwater runoff and runoff to and from the site. <p>Data Needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary Master Plan / Site Plan Preliminary Geotechnical Report Grading Plan Depths of excavations Landscape Plan
---	--	---

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
	impacts related to geology, paleontology, and mineral resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Remediation Plan <p>Optional Tasks: None</p>

10.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions / Climate Change

<p>Context:</p> <p>Construction and operation of the proposed Project would produce GHG emissions.</p> <p>The plan area includes existing GHG generating uses, including the power plant and fuel tanks on parcels owned by PG&E along with truck parking and container loading.</p>	<p>ESA will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the City of Oakland's significance criteria for assessing GHG impacts the CEQA guidelines impact criteria regarding the "extent to which the Project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions." Identify City of Oakland GHG-specific SCAs that will be assumed to be incorporated as part of the Project. Prepare the setting and regulatory framework sections of the EIR, including a description of GHGs and global climate change, a summary of statewide and regional GHG emissions inventories, a summary of state, regional, and local plans to reduce GHG emissions (including the CARB 2017 Scoping Plan and the ECAP), and the existing regulatory framework governing GHG emissions. Based on the outputs contained in the Ramboll report, describe the Project's contribution to cumulative GHG emissions in the context of state and global estimates, and apply the City of Oakland's significance criteria for assessing GHG impacts. Analyze the proposed Project for consistency with the applicable plans, policies, and regulations that have been adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, including state plans (such as SB 32 and CARB's 2017 Scoping Plan), regional plans (such as Metropolitan Transportation Commission Plan Bay Area), and local plans (such as the ECAP). Discuss AB 734 compliance regarding implementation of sustainability measures, development of a LEED Gold ballpark, and no net increase of GHG emissions. Describe Project commitments, design features, and mitigation measures that would reduce the Project's GHG emissions and determine the potential for GHG impacts. Review the latest mitigation measures recommended by the BAAQMD, as well as those recommended in the Attorney General's office and CAPCOA, and consider the extent to which these measures are already being implemented through the TMP strategies and other Project design features. Based on this review, relevant policies and design features will be suggested which could serve to minimize GHG emissions that would be associated with the Project. 	<p>Key Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ramboll will conduct all GHG emissions modeling for the proposed Project and variants necessary for the EIR section, including modeling of mitigation measures. The EIR will use the City of Oakland's significance criteria for assessing GHG impacts updated in 2013. <p>Data Needs:</p> <p>Same as for Air Quality, above.</p> <p>Optional Tasks:</p> <p>ESA can work with the City to develop a Project-specific GHG threshold to be used in the EIR, consistent with CARB's 2017 Scoping Plan and the City's ECAP targets (as applicable) in response to recent GHG case law.</p>
---	---	--

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If potentially significant impacts are found, recommend additional feasible design features or mitigation measures to reduce impacts. 	
10.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
<p>Context: The primary hazards and hazardous materials issues would be residual contamination from the previous uses of the property, particularly beneath the existing Oakland Power Plant cap. Although hazardous materials would be used during the construction of structures and excavation activities and the operation of the Project, the transportation, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials is heavily regulated and compliance with the law is anticipated to reduce risks of exposure. The Oakland Power Plant, located on the eastern portion of the site, has a cap that was installed to prevent contact with underlying contaminated soil. The seal provided by this cap must be maintained. Emergency response and the proximity of the rail corridor and industrial uses will also be considered.</p>	<p>ESA will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a site-specific setting of the environmental conditions using the published site-specific reports and maps, along with other relevant reports from the Project applicant, and the state GeoTracker and EnviroStor database websites. The information will be reviewed to identify data gaps, if any. ESA will use the setting and the proposed construction plans to identify the hazards and hazardous material issues that could result from the implementation of the plan. Identify the relevant regulations and local ordinance codes that would apply to construction and operation of the Project, and determine the manner and extent to which compliance would address potential impacts. Review the rail operator's emergency response plan and any regulations requiring an evacuation plan for the ballpark. Identify which, if any, impacts are significant, and present mitigation, where applicable and feasible, to reduce the impacts to below applicable significance thresholds. Prepare tables and figures illustrating the Oakland Power Plant cap, nearby active hazardous materials sites and schools, and a summary of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. 	<p>Key Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The construction activities will obtain coverage under the state Construction General Permit, which requires the implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to manage stormwater and non-stormwater runoff and runoff to and from the site. The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the overseeing regulatory agency for the existing cap under the Oakland Power Plant, will approve of any activities that disturb or penetrate the cap, and the measures to restore the seal of the cap if broken. The Project applicant will maintain the cap to the satisfaction of the DTSC. Any contaminated materials excavated from anywhere on the site, including from beneath the cap, will be transported to a licensed facility permitted to accept the materials. <p>Data Needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary Site Plan Preliminary Geotechnical Report Grading Plan Depths of excavations Landscape Plan Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Remediation Plan

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health Risk CEQA Analysis <p>Optional Tasks: None</p>

10.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

Context:

The Project site is currently developed and covered with impervious surfaces. As a result, it is not anticipated that development of the proposed uses would result in a substantial change in the rate and amount of run off over that which currently exists. Never the less, there could be a change in the amount and quality of stormwater runoff that could impact the existing drainage system. In addition, construction of the Project would involve grading that could affect receiving water quality. The Project's Bay shoreline location potentially exposes the site to Bay flooding, an exposure that could worsen with sea-level rise.

ESA will:

- Peer review the technical studies provided by the Project applicant for adequacy of information to be used in support of the description of existing conditions and evaluation of Project impacts.
- Evaluate potential runoff water quality impacts attributed to grading and other construction activities
- Evaluate potential impacts to the level and quality of groundwater resources
- Evaluate site's relationship to the 100-year floodplain, both for current conditions and with future sea-level rise.
- Include exhibits of the 100-year floodplain and other flood hazards zones, existing site topography and drainage patterns, and depth and direction of underlying groundwater. Include current and future Bay water levels, existing site elevations, proposed site elevations with current and future 100-year flood extents, and a representative shoreline cross section.

Key Assumptions:

- The description of existing conditions and assessment of the existing drainage system, and proposed new facilities will be provided by the Project applicant's consultant.
- No new in-water fill, structures, and/or dredging

Data Needs:

- Description of any dewatering activities necessary to accommodate Project construction and/or operation
- Site Drainage Plan
- Site Existing Grade, Grading plan, and vertical datum relative to NAVD88
- Elevations of lowest floor within all structures that will remain on site (e.g. wharf) or be constructed as part of the Project
- Construction Erosion and Sediment Control Measures
- Design Measures to reduce stormwater runoff and source control measures to limit impacts to receiving water quality
- Design Measures to adapt the site to coastal flood hazards and to integrate with regional shoreline adaption measures

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
		<p>Optional Tasks</p> <p>If coastal flood hazard assessment provided by Project's applicant is incomplete, ESA shall recommend additional coastal flood analysis that leverages existing data to clarify current and w/sea-level rise coastal flood hazard.</p>
10.10 Land Use, Plans and Policies		
<p>Context:</p> <p>The Project site is located on the Oakland waterfront adjacent to the Oakland Estuary, an active railroad corridor, and active industrial uses. The Project would change land uses on the Project site from maritime uses to a mix of new uses including open space/public access, a Major League ballpark, housing, and commercial (retail and office).</p> <p>Agencies with land use jurisdiction and plans or regulations that apply to the site include the City of Oakland (including the Port of Oakland), the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) and the State Lands Commission.</p>	<p>ESA will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct field reconnaissance to determine the type and distribution of land uses near the Project site and in areas that could be affected by Project variants or alternatives. • Assess potential land use conflicts or land use changes that could divide an established community. • Assess the potential for conflicts with plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigation environmental impacts and describe proposed amendments to the City's General Plan and zoning, as well as proposals to amend the Bay Plan and Seaport Plan, and to seek a tidelands trust exchange. • Describe regional growth projections and provide a list of planned projects for a cumulative analysis, including development anticipated in the Downtown Specific Plan area, in the West Oakland Specific Plan area, at nearby BART stations, and at the Coliseum. • Prepare tables and figures to illustrate (a) existing land uses in the vicinity & Port owned property; (b) existing & proposed General Plan land use designations; (c) existing & proposed zoning; (d) West Oakland & Downtown Specific Plan boundaries; (e) cumulative project list and projections; (f) site plan showing BCDC and State Lands jurisdiction; (g) existing land uses and historic district boundaries along the gondola route; and (f) maritime cargo facilities in San Francisco Bay with total existing and future demand (provided by A's). 	<p>Key Assumptions:</p> <p>The A's will separately contract with a maritime consultant to provide data regarding cargo facilities throughout the Bay and quantify existing and future demand relative to regional capacity.</p> <p>Data Needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development program (land uses by sq. ft. & the number of dwelling units and bedrooms) by phase and the physical arrangement of proposed uses on the site. • Text of the General Plan amendment and parameters of the development standards/zoning amendment, requested entitlements, and State legislation. • List of pending developments at the City and the Port, as well as planned future development, including build-out assumptions developed for the Downtown Specific Plan. • Forecast of projected growth in cargo and an analysis of regional capacity. <p>Optional Tasks: None</p>

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
10.11 Noise and Vibration		
<p>Context:</p> <p>Construction of the proposed Project would temporarily affect short-term ambient noise levels in the vicinity of construction sites, as well as long-term noise levels.</p> <p>The plan area includes existing noise generating uses, including nearby highways, an outdoor metal recycling operation, and active freight and commuter rail lines.</p> <p>Construction of the proposed Project would temporarily generate localized vibration from pile driving and other vibration inducing activities</p> <p>The plan area includes existing vibration sources, including active freight and commuter rail lines</p> <p>Operation of the proposed Project would result in new noise sources</p> <p>The proposed Project would result in new noise-sensitive land uses (residences) that would be exposed to existing noise from rail activity and event and transit noise from the proposed ballpark</p>	<p>ESA will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarize the existing noise environment within the plan area by collecting up to three long-term (24-hour) and ten short-term (15-minute) noise measurements sufficient to characterize ambient noise environment of the Project site and transportation corridors that would be used for site access. Ambient noise measurements will be taken around the Project site and/or in adjacent neighborhoods to assess average, day-night, and peak noise exposure at sensitive land uses that may be impacted by noise-producing operations of the proposed Project and establish the noise environment of the proposed residential uses. Characterize the local vibration environment based on the number of commuter and freight rail pass-by events and propagation equations of the Federal Transit Administration. Identify state and local noise regulations, including the noise/land use compatibility guidelines contained in the Noise Element of the City of Oakland General Plan and any other relevant City ordinances or regulations including the City's Noise Control Ordinance. Identify all noise-related Standard Conditions of Approval that would apply to the proposed Project. Assess potential noise impacts from proposed Project construction based on anticipated schedules, project phasing, and available information from the applicant or reasonable assumptions about construction equipment to be used during the construction phases. Assess the potential for construction-related vibration to result in building damage or human annoyance. ESA will use Caltrans' methodology to evaluate the potential for building damage during the use of impact pile driving. In addition, the human annoyance impact of pile driving will also be assessed using Caltrans' perception thresholds. Discuss to what degree existing City of Oakland SCA's would address potential construction noise and vibration impacts and identify Project-specific mitigation measures as warranted. Although not a consideration pursuant to CEQA, ESA will assess the potential for noise and vibration from existing industrial and rail operations to disturb proposed residential land uses. Assess the potential for noise impacts associated with baseball games using CadnaA noise propagation software. Noise sources due to baseball games are assumed to be crowd and PA systems. Sample noise data will be collected from other baseball games in California, possibly at the existing A's stadium or AT&T Park. CadnaA model will be calibrated using the collected data at the other stadium. Noise contours will be developed to demonstrate resultant noise levels within the surrounding communities of Oakland and Alameda. 	<p>Key Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing adjacent outdoor metal recycling operation will continue operations. The existing metal recycling structure is not considered historic for the purposes of assessing vibration impacts (more stringent thresholds apply to historic structures). The existing ferry boat launch structure located immediately adjacent to the proposed Project's western boundary is historic for the purposes of vibration impact assessment. The nearest sensitive receptors to the proposed Project area consist of condominiums at 1010 Embarcadero, 311 2nd Street and 222 Broadway. There are no sensitive receptors located within 1,000 of the proposed Project boundary. <p>Data Needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimated buildout schedule and phasing of the proposed Project. Hours of construction per day (e.g., Monday through Friday, 7am to 4pm) Detailed construction operations description and proposed construction equipment to be used, including durations. Locations of where onsite impact pile driving will occur. AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes at

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for noise impacts associated with concert events using CadnaA noise propagation software. Noise sources due to concert events would be crowd and speakers. Sample noise data will be collected from other concert events at similar venue. CadnaA model will be calibrated using the collected data at the other venue. Noise contours will be developed to demonstrate resultant noise levels within the surrounding communities of Oakland and Alameda. Discuss the potential for pre-event and post-event crowd noise at major transit hubs including gondola queuing locations and the Oakland Ferry Terminal. Calculate the change in noise levels due to existing, existing plus Project, cumulative and cumulative plus Project traffic volumes along key regional and arterial roadway segments most affected by traffic within and adjacent to the proposed Project site. Use the noise prediction model of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to determine whether there would be significant project-level or cumulative effects on noise levels along streets within the City's sphere of influence where existing noise-sensitive land uses exist. Assess potential cumulative noise impacts with consideration of other foreseeable projects in the Jack London Square or adjacent Alameda Island areas. Identify practical, feasible mitigation measures including the use of performance standards to allow for future development to be included within the context of the EIR. Evaluate whether mitigation measures would reduce the impacts below a level of significance. While not a consideration pursuant to CEQA, ESA will discuss the potential for noise from MLB game and concert events to impact proposed residential uses, based on noise contours developed for existing receptors Prepare up to four noise contour figures for inclusion in the Draft EIR as well as a figure depicting noise monitoring locations Prepare tables to summarize estimated construction noise levels, noise increases along roadways used to access the Project site, and existing noise levels monitored around the Project site. 	<p>intersection effected by the proposed Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The location and specifications of outdoor amplified sound systems as well as the route attendees of the MLB park will take. Locations of potential loading/unloading areas for delivery trucks at the MLB park 3D AutoCAD file of the entire Project site. 3D AutoCAD file of venues where sample noise data was collected for calibration purpose. <p>Optional Tasks: None.</p>

10.12 Population and Housing

Context:

Construction of the proposed Project would displace existing short term tenants related to maritime support uses and temporarily increase construction employment.

The Project site does not currently provide housing, therefore construction and operation of the Project would not directly displace existing housing or an

ESA will:

- Describe existing conditions and trends for population, employed population, households, housing units, and jobs in Oakland and region-wide.
- Assess residential and employment population impacts that may be associated with the construction of the Project, including direct and indirect growth effects not captured in other topics of the EIR. Incorporate results of a separate study of potential displacement due to indirect displacement. (See ALH scope of work.)

Key Assumptions:

- There will be no direct displacement of existing housing or people on the Project site
- ESA will use existing demographic data from Downtown Specific Plan documents or City-approved CEQA documents and existing

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
<p>existing population necessitating the construction of replacement housing.</p> <p>Operation of the Project would introduce daytime and nighttime populations on the Project site through the introduction of new residential, commercial, office, open space, and entertainment uses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the estimated residential and employment populations generated by the new uses under Project operation, (residential, commercial, office, open space, entertainment, MLB park, and hotel) and analyze whether this represents a substantial change as it relates to planned population growth by the City of Oakland General Plan and Plan Bay Area Assess the Project's generation of jobs and housing and compare it with the existing ratio of jobs to housing within the City of Oakland as an additional consideration but not in relation to any CEQA threshold. Prepare tables and figures to illustrate population and housing data and trends. 	<p>data sources (e.g., ABAG, MTC, US Census) to establish existing and projected data for Oakland and the region.</p> <p>Data Needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimated number of construction workers by phase, to establish a peak number of construction employees Existing number of employees at the Project site Agreement on population generation rates for all use categories of the Project (this should align with population assumptions used in Transportation analysis) Agreement on cumulative growth scenario Existing and projected employment by analysis scenario and category (e.g., corporate and office staff vs. event day staff) Whether all or a percentage of existing event jobs would be relocated Assessment of potential indirect displacement of housing units or residents (see ALH scope). <p>Optional Tasks: None.</p>
10.13 Public Services		
<p>Context:</p> <p>The additional temporary construction and operation population (both permanent and day/nighttime event related) generated by the Project could increase demand for police protection, fire protection, schools, and other public services.</p>	<p>ESA will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With assistance from City project staff, obtain input from the Oakland Fire Department (OFD), Oakland Police Department (OPD), and Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) about existing facilities and services and the agencies' abilities to adequately accommodate service demands from the Project. Evaluate the potential for the Project to increase the demand for public services to the extent that existing service capacities or thresholds would be exceeded, necessitating new facilities that could have physical impacts. 	<p>Key Assumptions:</p> <p>The fire station within the Project site boundary is currently operational, but not up to code, and would be relocated or enhanced as part of the Project.</p> <p>Data Needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Input on staffing levels, service ratios, response times, or other

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the impacts associated with the potential relocation and/or enhancement of the fire station within the Project site boundary at 47 Clay Street. Describe the impacts of Project demand on public services (such as the OPD Special Events Unit and OFD) during ballpark and other events and identify physical effects, if any. Determine Project impacts on OUSD facilities serving the Project site using data from OUSD's Strategic Regional Analysis 2017-2018 dataset including enrollment and building conditions. Analyze cumulative impacts on public services (OFD, OPD, and OUSD), with an agreed upon cumulative build out date and cumulative project environment Prepare tables and figures regarding crime statistics, school enrollment (current, historic, projected), estimated student generation rates, fire station location(s) and emergency response routes/response times. 	<p>performance objectives from OFD, OPD, and OUSD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location and footprint of the potential fire station relocation. Confirmation on access routes to the site given rail road crossings and associated impacts to response times. Information regarding emergency support facilities that would be included with the ballpark, such as an on-site command center for on-site security personnel, OPD, and OFD. <p>Optional Tasks: None.</p>
10.14 Recreation		
<p>Context:</p> <p>New population from the Project could increase the current use of nearby parks and recreational facilities in the Project vicinity.</p> <p>The Project would include new waterfront access, open space, and recreational uses, and could include altered edge configuration of the existing wharf to enhance public views and provide additional boat access/active water uses.</p>	<p>ESA will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and describe existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, and other recreational facilities in the Project vicinity. Qualitatively assess the level of demand the Project would have from new visitors, residents, and employees on existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, and other recreational facilities in the Project vicinity. Evaluate the impact of new residents on the parkland standard of 4 acres per 1,000 residents (for parks that meet the active recreational needs of the community as opposed to passive recreational open space) and the overall parkland standard of 10 total acres per 1,000 residents established in the City's General Plan, and other applicable General Plan policies. Prepare tables and figures to summarize the acreage of existing parks and open spaces, city acreage goals, Oakland park types, summary of park acreage and parks ratio, and illustrate parks and recreational facilities in the Project area, with connections to the site. 	<p>Key Assumptions:</p> <p>The Project would create new open space and recreational facilities. Additional in-water recreation uses would be part of the Project variant.</p> <p>Data Needs:</p> <p>Estimated locations and square footages of public and private open space and recreational facilities that will be included as part of the Project and variant.</p> <p>Optional Tasks: None.</p>
10.15 Transportation		
	<p>ESA will:</p> <p>Incorporate the transportation setting and impacts analysis completed by Fehr & Peers. (See Phase 1 Scope of Work.)</p>	<p>Key Assumptions:</p> <p>Fehr & Peers will draft EIR sections related to transportation and provide data needed for Air Quality, GHG, Noise, and Energy evaluations. Their work was</p>

Context	Proposed Tasks	Data Needs & Key Assumptions
		included in the Phase 1 scope of work.
10.16 Utilities and Service Systems		
<p>Context:</p> <p>The proposed Project site includes uses that have some demand for water, wastewater, and storm drainage utilities and service systems. However, the proposed Project would result in a significant increase in demand for these utilities that could impact water supply, and demand for the conveyance and treatment of wastewater and storm drainage from the site.</p>	<p>ESA will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer review the technical studies provided by the Project applicant for adequacy of information to be used in support of the description of existing conditions and evaluation of Project impacts. • Evaluate the potential impacts from increased demand on water supplies. • Evaluate the potential impacts from increased demand on wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities on- and off-site. Assess the need for modifications to existing wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities and/or construction of new facilities. • Evaluate the potential impacts from increased demand on storm drainage conveyance and treatment facilities on- and off-site. Assess the need for modifications to existing storm drainage conveyance and treatment facilities and/or construction of new facilities. • Evaluate the potential solid waste generation of Project construction activities and uses effect on collection and disposal facilities • Exhibits will show existing utilities and proposed new facilities. 	<p>Key Assumptions:</p> <p>The description of existing conditions and assessment of existing utilities and proposed new facilities will be provided by the Project applicant's consultant.</p> <p>Data Needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Supply Assessment prepared in compliance with SB 610. • Site Drainage Plan • Wastewater and water supply infrastructure technical report documenting existing and post-Project conditions. • Solid waste generation rates by use <p>Optional Tasks: None.</p>
10.17 Federal Permitting		
<p>Context:</p> <p>The site abuts the Oakland Estuary and any in-water work will require federal permits and NEPA review. Anticipating what may be required will help to inform the EIR's analysis.</p>	<p>Proposed Tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a permit strategy memo itemizing each regulatory agency likely to be involved in the federal permitting or approval process (likely to include the USACE, USCG, EPA, USFWS, NMFS, and SHPO). Identify specific studies, information, or actions necessary to apply for each federal permit and a schedule for the regulatory approval process, indicating the relationship with the CEQA and NEPA processes. This memo will not appear in the EIR, but will be available to inform ESA's technical authors, the City, and the applicant. 	<p>Key Assumptions:</p> <p>The applicant will identify those features of the Project that may require federal permits.</p> <p>Optional Tasks:</p> <p>ESA will provide strategic advice, but is not currently scoped to conduct NEPA review or to actively engage with federal permitting agencies. We can provide these services at an additional cost.</p>

APPENDIX B – PHASE 2 COST PROPOSAL

[back](#)

1 11X17

2 11X17

APPENDIX C – ALH SCOPE OF WORK AND COST

[back](#)

APPENDIX D – ENVIRONMENTAL VISION SCOPE OF WORK AND COST

[back](#)

12/12/18 WORKING DRAFT BY ESA – TO BE
REFINED AND FINALIZE BY EV AFTER FOCUSED
AESTHETICS SCOPING SESSIONS – WEEK OF
12/17

Task 1: Peer Review and Consultation of Visual Simulations Prepared by the Project Applicant.

In Phase 2, Environmental Vision (EV) will conduct quality assurance review of the finished simulations and shadow studies prepared by the A's design team. (In Phase 1, EV is scoped to conduct field work and take high quality digital photographs of the project site and assist in the selection of viewpoints for the visual simulations.)

For this task, EV will peer review up to six (6) visual simulations total for inclusion in the Draft EIR. Quality assurance peer review will address accuracy of the visual simulations, including building placement and scale as well as whether the images provide a reasonable illustration of proposed site development including grading, paving, and landscaping.

This task also includes (1) coordination with ESA, (2) consultation regarding varying view angles and panoramic photos and the presentation of the (before) existing views and (after) simulation images, (3) attendance via telephone at up to five (5), 1.5-hour meetings with the City, ESA and A's design team, and (4) preparation and delivery of a memo detailing the results of the peer review.

Data. Data required for accurate peer review of the visual simulations include the following:

- 1) High resolution image files and hard copy versions of both the preliminary massing simulation images and the final rendered simulation images in addition to information on camera lens assumptions used for the renderings.
- 2) Project design data: site plans, existing and proposed grading, building plan and elevation drawings and landscape plans in PDF and CAD format.
- 3) 3D Sketch Up Model file.

Cost Estimate. **TBD**

back

APPENDIX E – LDA SCOPE OF WORK

[back](#)

12/12/18 WORKING DRAFT BY ESA – TO BE REFINED AND FINALIZE BY LDA AFTER
FOCUSED AESTHETICS SCOPING SESSIONS –
WEEK OF 12/17

Task 1: Peer Review and Consultation of Lighting and Glare Study Prepared by the Project Applicant.

Lighting Design Alliance (LDA) will conduct quality assurance review of the proposed lighting plan for the Project. This task is anticipated to involve an analysis that would

- 1) Quantify the existing level of lighting (illuminance?) at the Project site;
- 2) Characterize existing conditions based on field measurements;
- 3) Quantify the proposed ballpark lighting based on lighting plans to be supplied by the Project sponsor design team. We assume that the team's stadium lighting consultant will, at a minimum, provide figures depicting calculated spill light (light outside the ballpark) at an appropriate distance from the ballpark in both horizontal and vertical illuminance (foot-candles); and
- 4) Evaluate glare.
- 5) Establish a threshold of significance. Under the City of Oakland's CEQA standards, a significant impact would occur if the project would "create a new source of substantial light or glare which would substantially and adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area." ESA and LDA will work with City staff to determine how to translate that threshold into numerical values, if appropriate.
- 6) Prepare a technical memorandum evaluating project lighting, including spill light, to assist us in the overall evaluation of the project's aesthetic impacts.

Data. LDA will make specific requests for appropriate data from which to evaluate spill light.

Cost Estimate. TBD

back
3096975.2