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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Assembly Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB</td>
<td>Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACDEH</td>
<td>Alameda County Department of Environmental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Bay Conservation and Development Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMPs</td>
<td>Best Management Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNSF</td>
<td>Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Board of Port Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal OSHA</td>
<td>California Division of Occupational Safety and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Clean Air Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARB</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>California Code of Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDF</td>
<td>California Department of Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dB</td>
<td>Decibels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dBA</td>
<td>A-weighted decibels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPM</td>
<td>Diesel Particulate Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTSC</td>
<td>Department of Toxic Substances Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBMUD</td>
<td>East Bay Municipal Utility District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH&amp;SP</td>
<td>Environmental Health and Safety Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM</td>
<td>Flood Insurance Rate Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Charles P. Howard Terminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hz</td>
<td>Hertz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS</td>
<td>Intrusion Detection System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Initial Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS/Addendum</td>
<td>Initial Study/Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS/ND</td>
<td>Initial Study/Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leq</td>
<td>Equivalent Sound Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lmax</td>
<td>Maximum A-Weighted Sound Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lp</td>
<td>Sound Pressure Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lw</td>
<td>Sound Power Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUUP</td>
<td>Maritime Utilities Upgrade Project (synonymous with Utility Upgrade Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI</td>
<td>Notice of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>Oxides of Nitrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OICT</td>
<td>Oakland International Container Terminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHA</td>
<td>Occupational Safety and Health Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPR</td>
<td>Office of Planning and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCAR</td>
<td>Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAH</td>
<td>Polynuclear Aromatic Compounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>Pacific Gas and Electric Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Particulate Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV</td>
<td>Peak Particle Velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port</td>
<td>Port of Oakland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>Public Resources Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>Risk Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB</td>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Senate Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaport</td>
<td>Port of Oakland Maritime Facilities and Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOX</td>
<td>Sulfur Oxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRCB</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWIC</td>
<td>Transportation Worker Identification Credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>Uniform Building Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UST</td>
<td>Underground Storage Tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VdB</td>
<td>Vibration Velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Watts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

This Initial Study/Addendum (IS/Addendum) has been prepared in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes (PRC Section 21000 et. seq.) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 to address the environmental effects of fiber optic infrastructure improvements proposed in the Port of Oakland (Port) by SSA Marine, a Port tenant. The proposed additions, designed to enhance Port security, involve the installation of subsurface fiber optic cable and other equipment at the Port, located in the City of Oakland, California (see Figures 1 through 4). The Port considers this SSA fiber optic infrastructure proposal a technical change to their Maritime Utilities Upgrade Project (“MUUP” or “2010 project”), constituting a minor addition to the Intrusion Detection System within the MUUP. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 (b), the Port is proceeding with the preparation and processing of an Addendum to the MUUP Adopted Negative Declaration. Additional discussion to support the use of an Addendum to obtain CEQA clearance for the current SSA proposal is provided in Section 1.2 below.

The May 2010 Adopted Negative Declaration (ND) for the MUUP (State Clearinghouse #2010032100) evaluated the potential construction and operational-level impacts associated with the 2010 project. The ND described the Port’s efforts to insure that all resource impacts were reduced to a “less than significant” level that allowed qualification for an ND.

The MUUP consisted of the alteration of existing Port facilities in a manner that would not involve the expansion of the use of the Port facilities, with various portions of the project to be constructed by either the Port or its tenants. The MUUP had two elements (also detailed in Figures 5 and 6):

1. Phased construction and operation of shore power improvements at the marine terminals to improve air quality at the Port and in the adjacent West Oakland community by reducing emissions from ships at berth, in compliance with California Air Resources Board (CARB) regulations. Construction of this element is currently underway. Phase 1 is expected to be completed by the end of 2012, and Phase 2 will be completed by the end of 2013.

2. An upgrade to the Port’s existing perimeter security system by incorporating an Intrusion Detection System (IDS) to improve security and allow operation of the security system through video cameras linked by system-wide fiber optic communications infrastructure. The IDS upgrade was to provide the Port and the terminals with security equipment to insure: a) less false alarm triggering and false detection; b) easier and more user-friendly operation; and c) the potential for future integration with existing security and operational systems. Construction of this element is almost complete, with completion expected in Spring 2012.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15300 allows for projects that have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment to be exempt from the provisions of CEQA, with certain exceptions. Although the MUUP was determined not to have a significant effect on the environment, the project was not categorically exempt from CEQA. CEQA Guidelines, Section 15300.2(e), state, “A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project located on a site
which is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.”
Section 65962.5 references hazardous waste sites, leaking underground storage tanks, and
similar sites with known contamination. Some locations within the 2010 project site boundary
were recorded on lists prepared pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code; hence,
the improvements were not categorically exempt from CEQA and an IS/ND was prepared.

The IS/ND was circulated for public review for 30 days beginning March 29, 2010 and ending
April 28, 2010. On May 18, 2010, the Port of Oakland approved Resolution No. 10-56 adopting
the ND for the MUUP, thereby providing environmental clearance under CEQA for construction
of the 2010 project.

This IS/Addendum, prepared for the current SSA fiber optic infrastructure proposal, compares
any potential impacts resulting from the SSA proposed action with impacts of the MUUP
addressed in the 2010 Adopted Negative Declaration. This IS/Addendum relies on the use of
an Environmental Checklist Form, as suggested in Section 15063 (d)(3) of the State CEQA
Guidelines. This IS/Addendum reviews any significant changes in the condition of the site and
environmental conditions that have occurred since the ND was prepared and adopted. It also
reviews any new information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have
been known with exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the ND was adopted.

The Port’s Board of Port Commissioners will use this IS/Addendum to evaluate the potential
environmental impacts of the current proposed project prior to making a decision to grant or
deny approval of the proposed action. The document will also be used as a source of
information by Responsible Agencies with permitting or approval authority over the proposed
project in their respective review process.

1.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164 (b) state, “An addendum to an adopted negative declaration
may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the
conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR
[Environmental Impact Report] or negative declaration have occurred.” CEQA Guidelines,
Section 15162 state:

“(a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no
subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the
basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the
previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant
environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified
significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is
undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative
Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a
substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have
been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was
certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the
following:
(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

(b) If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under subdivision (a). Otherwise the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, an addendum, or no further documentation.”

Based upon the environmental checklist prepared for the current project and the supporting checklist responses (Section 3), implementation of the proposed SSA fiber optic infrastructure improvements will not result in any environmental impacts, and there will be no substantial change from the previous analysis as contained in the Adopted Negative Declaration. Only minor additions and clarifications are required to the Adopted ND, and none of the conditions triggering a subsequent Negative Declaration are present. The Port of Oakland therefore finds that preparation of an Addendum to the Adopted Negative Declaration for the Port Maritime Utilities Upgrade Project (SCH #2010032100) is appropriate and consistent with Sections 15162 and 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines.

1.3 LEAD AGENCY, APPLICANT AND CONSULTANT

The Port of Oakland is the Lead Agency in the preparation of this IS/Addendum. The location of Port Offices and contact information is as follows:

Port of Oakland
530 Water Street
Oakland, CA 94607
Contact: Tim Leong
510-627-1537

SSA Marine is the project applicant. Tetra Tech is the environmental consultant.

1.4 DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

As permitted by CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, this IS/Addendum incorporates by reference the previously adopted Negative Declaration – the Port of Oakland Maritime Utilities Upgrade Project Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse #2010032100). Information from the document has been briefly summarized in the appropriate section(s). The ND is available for review at the Port Offices at 530 Water Street, Oakland, CA 94607.
The ND and other sources that have been used in the preparation of this IS/Addendum are listed in Section 4, References.

1.5 DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS AND ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS

SSA Marine as the project applicant is seeking to obtain a building permit from the Port of Oakland to install utilities for SSA Port facilities. Issuance of a Port Development Permit will allow SSA to install utilities within the right-of-way. This Addendum and the previous Adopted Negative Declaration are intended to serve as the environmental documentation for the proposed action. The Port of Oakland, as the lead agency, has approval authority over the following entitlements/applications that are included as part of the proposed action and addressed in the Addendum:

- Approval of the IS/Addendum to the Adopted Negative Declaration for the Port of Oakland Maritime Utilities Upgrade Project; and
- Issuance of a Port Development Permit to allow utility installation within the right-of-way.

Some locations within the project site addressed in the Adopted ND for the MUUP are under regulatory oversight. The adopted ND included a list of Responsible Agencies with permitting or approval authority over the 2010 project in their respective review processes (pages 2,3). Responsible Agencies discussed in the 2010 ND as they relate to the current proposed project are as follows:

- **California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).** The Port is required to provide the DTSC and the RWQCB with notice of proposed construction activities at portions of the marine terminals where such construction would disturb an existing pavement cap as defined in deed restrictions (Article II, Section 2.04). Pursuant to any applicable Covenants to Restrict Use of Property: Environmental Restriction for terminal sites, the Port will provide the DTSC and RWQCB with notice of proposed improvements prior to initiating current project activities in affected areas. The DTSC and RWQCB, additionally, have existing and past jurisdictions over legacy contamination sites. Although construction for the proposed SSA fiber optic improvements will not breach the cap over the Charles P. Howard (Howard) Terminal nor disturb the potentially hazardous material underneath, these agencies will be notified regarding any residual contamination encountered.

- **Alameda County Department of Environmental Health (ACDEH).** The ACDEH will be notified about changed conditions if the Port, its tenants, or project contractors anticipate disturbing pavement in and through locations of former underground storage tanks (UST).

- **San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC).** BCDC has jurisdiction over development in San Francisco Bay and within 100 feet of the shoreline. Current proposed improvements will be limited to land area within the Port and will be well outside the BCDC 100-foot shoreline band jurisdiction. A permit from BCDC for the current action will not be required.

- **State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).** The SWRCB has authority over all projects that are located in or adjacent to the San Francisco Bay according to the Clean Water Act, Section 401, including storm water runoff from construction sites. Filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) to comply with the storm water General Construction Permit will be required under the applicable permit (General Permit For Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity for construction prior to July 1, 2010 and General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities for all construction activities occurring on July 1, 2010 or later). On behalf of SSA, the project proponent, the construction contractor shall file the NOI prior to initiating construction activities as required by the General Construction Permit. The contractor shall also develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The USACE has the legal authority to issue Rivers and Harbor Act Section 10 permits when a project results in the construction of structures in or adjacent to the San Francisco Bay. Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 U.S.C. 403) prohibits the unauthorized obstruction or alteration of any navigable water of the United States. This section provides that the construction of any structure in or over any navigable water of the United States, or the accomplishment of any other work affecting the course, location, condition, or physical capacity of such waters is unlawful unless the work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of the Army. (The Secretary's approval authority has since been delegated to the Chief of Engineers.) The Port holds a Port Maritime Facilities 10-year Maintenance Permit (Permit No. 27531S). The current proposed project does not have the potential to obstruct or alter any navigable water of the United States. The current SSA proposal is confined to land area set back considerably from the shoreline. It is not expected that conditions associated with Permit No. 27531S governing obstruction or alteration of navigable waters would be applied to the current proposed action because of the distance between the current project area and the shoreline of the San Francisco Bay, and the limited nature of the current proposed action.
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The Port of Oakland, located within the City of Oakland along the eastern shoreline of San Francisco Bay, contains marine terminals, berths, and ancillary maritime support facilities (see Figures 1 and 2). A tenant within the Port, SSA Marine is the applicant, and proposes to upgrade their Security Communications Infrastructure to support the federally-mandated Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) program. The current proposed project (“2012 SSA proposal” or “2012 SSA proposed action”) involves the installation of fiber optic infrastructure from the OICT to the Howard Terminal. Construction of up to 5,700 feet (1.08 miles) of underground fiber optic cable is planned to occur. The cable will be installed through existing conduit or routed aboveground, or be installed through directional boring or micro-trenching. The alignment of the proposed fiber optic line, extending from OICT to Howard Terminal, will generally follow Middle Harbor Road and Embarcadero West along the eastbound shoulder (see Figures 3 and 4). Related manholes, computer servers, and racks will also be installed. A proposed Laydown Yard (approximately .23 acres in size) is planned to the west of the fiber optic line alignment. The proposed fiber optic infrastructure improvements will not increase terminal operating area and will, therefore, not increase throughput capacity.

Port facilities immediately adjacent to SSA’s project site are OICT, Global Gateway Central Terminal, and Howard Terminal to the west, south, and east, respectively; and Middle Harbor Road and the Union Pacific Railroad Intermodal Yard on the north. Surrounding uses include residences near 3rd and Henry Streets to the north; retail and residential uses at Jack London Square to the east; and terminals and ancillary maritime facilities to the north/northwest, including the former Oakland Army Base (see Figures 1 and 2). Freight and passenger rail lines and the I-80 and I-880 freeways border the Port to the north and east.

Figures 3 and 4 provide overall and detailed views of the proposed project. Table 1 provides a tabular summary of the proposed SSA project analyzed in this IS/Addendum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiber optic infrastructure to be installed at the Port of Oakland in</td>
<td>• Up to 5,700 feet (1.08 miles) of underground fiber optic cable, installed through existing conduit or routed aboveground, or installed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the City of Oakland, California, from OICT to Howard Terminal to</td>
<td>using directional boring or micro-trenching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serve SSA. The route extends from the OICT 1717 Computer Room to the</td>
<td>• The fiber optic infrastructure will maintain a minimum of 36-inch cover in micro-trenches. Micro-trenches will be 5 inches wide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OICT Data Trailer; follows along the eastbound shoulder of Middle</td>
<td>• Related equipment will be installed, such as manholes along the fiber optic alignment, and patch panels on existing racks for fiber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Road; cuts across at the Middle Harbor Road grade separation to</td>
<td>connection to the existing SSA network in the computer rooms of the OICT and Howard Terminal, existing SSA buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Street/Embarcadero Way; and enters existing conduit at the Howard</td>
<td>• The disturbance area depicted in Figure 4 will comprise approximately 2.09 acres. The disturbance area will extend 12 feet on the north side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal to the Computer Room.</td>
<td>of the proposed fiber optic alignment and 3 feet on the south side. Up to 250 cubic yards of soil may be excavated within the disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>area during construction; clean material will be used for backfill to the greatest extent possible. Up to 40 cubic yards of asphalt and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concrete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.2 PROJECT CONSTRUCTION

The construction phase to install the fiber optic infrastructure to upgrade the SSA Security Communications Infrastructure is anticipated to last approximately 18 weeks or 4 to 4.5 months once all approvals and permits to go forward have been obtained. An estimated maximum 10 construction workers are expected to be onsite between 7:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. during the construction phase.

The construction phase is expected to generate limited truck trips over the 18-week period. Truck trips transporting project materials and supplies or construction equipment to and from the project site are expected to be less than 100 miles long. Onsite there will be three trucks – two one-ton trucks, and one dump truck. Internal construction trips will not exceed approximately .5 miles, with trucks traveling along Middle Harbor Road and Embarcadero West primarily during daytime hours.

#### 2.2.1 Project-Incorporated Best Management Practices and Hazardous Materials Management

The project description for the 2010 MUUP included Construction Best Management Practices to ensure that control measures would be required of the contractor during construction to avoid or minimize potential adverse environmental impacts. These same measures are incorporated here to apply to the current proposed SSA project, and are listed in Table 2. The Port and SSA, as a tenant of the Port, will require the selected Contractor(s) to use Best Management Practices (BMPs) as defined in project plans and specifications. These BMPs would be implemented as components of the current project to protect the environment.

The area occupied by Howard Terminal is regulated for significant soil and groundwater contamination. The current project will adopt the Health and Safety Plan previously prepared and approved by the Port of Oakland for work at the Howard Terminal (Model Health and Safety Plans A and B, Baseline Environmental Consulting, September 2005). These 2005 plans include specific measures to reduce potential health and safety hazards and to protect employees and nearby individuals. At the Howard Terminal, as noted, the conduit will either be placed inside existing conduit or be routed above ground; hence, the conduit will not breach the cap over the Howard Terminal nor disturb the potentially hazardous material underneath. Specific guidelines for working in other parts of the Maritime area are detailed in the Maritime Environmental Health and Safety Plan for Shallow Excavations for Port Facilities Staff and Port Contractors, February 2009. These 2009 Guidelines contain protocols to ensure health and safety of workers and nearby individuals in areas under construction. The Contractor would be required to follow protocols as specified in these 2009 Guidelines for areas outside Howard Terminal and not covered in the 2005 Model Health and Safety Plans.

It is possible that hazardous materials from past industrial activities and fueling practices could potentially be encountered during construction in and around the Howard Terminal (e.g., contaminated soil in the trenches). The current proposed project will follow the established plans and protocols to address potentially contaminated soils and water that may be
encountered during construction. In addition, the construction contractor shall prepare and implement an approved Soil and Groundwater Management Plan that describes how potentially contaminated material encountered during construction will be handled.

The proposed project is not expected to generate considerable amounts of construction waste material, such as excess aggregate base or asphalt. However, should material need to be disposed of, it would be hauled to the Port’s Materials Management Program maritime site located at the former Oakland Army Base or to another facility or location as appropriate and consistent with applicable regulations. Any waste matter containing hazardous materials would be properly disposed of through the Port’s hazardous waste hauling contractor at an approved facility in accordance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations. (See Section 3.8 of this Addendum for additional discussion of hazardous materials and potential environmental impacts.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Project Construction Best Management Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong>^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dust Control Measures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A publicly visible sign shall be posted at the project site with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The BAAQMD’s [Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s] phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Exhaust Control Measures**                         |
| • Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. |
| • All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. |
### Water Quality
- Contractor shall prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that complies with all requirements of the General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit, or subsequent permits, to avoid contamination from runoff from all construction activities at the terminals.

- Contractor shall conform to the Linear Underground/Overhead Requirements, as provided in Attachment A of the General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit, or subsequent permits.

- Contractor shall keep a clean and safe workplace. Good housekeeping procedures would include: locate fueling and equipment maintenance activities away from the San Francisco Bay, avoid spills through employee training, and clean accidental spills of construction-related materials (such as concrete, equipment fuel, hydraulic fluid, etc.) immediately.

- Dispose of construction debris in accordance with all relevant laws and regulations.

### Noise
- Construction contractor shall meet City of Oakland construction noise standards set in the Oakland Planning Code, including limits on the hours of noise-generating activities, limits on the number of consecutive days of noisy construction activities, and limits on maximum noise at receiving properties.

### Soil Management and Hazards
- Construction contractor shall comply with the Health and Safety Plan previously prepared and approved by the Port of Oakland for work at the Howard Terminal (Model Health and Safety Plans A and B, Baseline Environmental Consulting, September 2005). For working in other parts of the Maritime area, construction contractor shall also comply with the Maritime Environmental Health and Safety Plan for Shallow Excavations for Port Facilities Staff and Port Contractors, February 2009.

- Construction contractor shall use the Port of Oakland Best Management Practices for Small Construction Sites as guidance for preventing leaks and spills, handling construction debris, roadwork and pavement construction activities, excavation, contaminated and non-contaminated soil management, groundwater management, and dust management.

- Construction contractor shall notify the Port’s qualified HazMat Specialist if contamination is encountered in the field.

- Construction contractor shall prepare and implement an approved Soil and Groundwater Management Plan that describes how potentially contaminated material encountered during construction will be handled. Construction contractor shall also prepare and implement a Debris Management Plan and a Dust and Air Pollution Prevention Plan.

- Excavated soils when known to be, or found to be, contaminated should be stored immediately adjacent to the excavation, placed on plastic sheeting and covered with plastic sheeting. They shall be placed back into the original excavation whenever possible and as soon as possible. Stockpiled soil should be covered with plastic and secured from human contact.

- Construction contractor shall notify Port’s qualified HazMat Specialist if the displaced soil cannot be placed back into the excavation, in order to sample, examine, analyze, or otherwise assess the material to determine if it is a hazardous waste, designated waste, or non-hazardous waste or is inert as defined by Chapter 15, Division 3, of Title 23, CCR.

- Construction contractor shall implement measures to prevent soil contamination as a result of project construction activities. Pollutants shall not come in contact with onsite soil. Best management practices shall be employed to prevent soil contamination. Well-maintained equipment will be used to perform the work. Handling and storing of chemicals will be in accordance with guidance provided by the Port’s HazMat Specialist.
Cultural Resources

- Construction contractor shall follow the Port’s Emergency Plan of Action for Discoveries of Unknown Historic or Archaeological Resources should workers encounter any unidentified resources during digging/trenching activities. Project construction workers shall stop activities within fifty (50) feet of the find if they encounter material that may have cultural, historic, archeological, and or paleontological value. The contractor shall notify the Port and a qualified cultural resources specialist to evaluate the item(s) before continuing with digging activities.

- During all excavations, construction workers/crews should be especially alert for cultural resources anytime they observe the following conditions: 1) Soil and deposit changes, such as color or type; 2) presence of charcoal particles in soil; 3) Any buried objects or structures; 4) A cluster, cache, or deposit (i.e., lens) of materials should be considered historically or archaeologically important by the crew until it has been assessed otherwise; and 5) isolates (a bottle or two, a tool, fragments of a plate, etc.), should be put aside until the Port’s qualified cultural resources specialist can properly examine them.

- Contractor shall, for isolate finds (a bottle or two, a tool, fragments of a plate, etc.), set find(s) safely aside and continue working, then notify Port Project Inspector at the most convenient time (e.g., coffee break, lunch break) and turn over the find for examination.

- Contractor shall, for cache of bottles, plates, metalwork, structural remains, shipwreck, and human remains, stop all work within 50 yards and follow the procedures outlined in Emergency Plan of Action for Discoveries of Unknown Historic or Archaeological Resources. Do not resume work until the finds have been properly assessed, and Port has given go-ahead to resume.

---

1 In May 2011, the BAAQMD updated their CEQA Guidelines and incorporated significance thresholds for greenhouse gas emissions and toxic air contaminants. These updated CEQA Guidelines are undergoing additional review pursuant to a recent Alameda County Superior Court decision requiring that the Guidelines themselves undergo review under CEQA. Nevertheless, the “Basic Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for ALL Proposed Projects” from the updated BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines are included as air quality BMPs in this IS/Addendum. While the Port has not fully integrated the construction mitigation measures from the updated BAAQMD CEQA guidelines into Port construction specifications, Port Contractors are expected to adhere to these new BMPs.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION, THRESHOLDS AND DISCUSSION

Environmental Determination

Based upon the evidence in light of the whole record documented in the attached environmental checklist explanation, cited incorporations and attachments:

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

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

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

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

☒ I find that the proposed project constitutes a minor technical change or addition to a project previously analyzed by an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION which was adopted/certified pursuant to State and lead agency CEQA Guidelines where all potentially significant effects were avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION. Only minor additions and/or clarifications are needed to make the previous documentation adequate to cover the project which is documented in this addendum to the earlier CEQA document (CEQA §15164).

Anne M. Whittington
Printed Name
Port of Oakland
Agency

March 23, 2012
Date
Environmental Assessment Supervisor
Title
3.1 ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLDS AND DISCUSSION

The following Environmental Analysis Checklist, divided by issue area, is for projects with previously certified/approved environmental documents. This checklist takes into consideration the preparation of a previously prepared environmental document. This checklist evaluates the adequacy of the previously prepared document, the May 2010 Adopted Negative Declaration (ND) for the Maritime Utilities Upgrade Project (MUUP, State Clearinghouse #2010032100), pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164. The site of the proposed fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal lies within the MUUP site and project area studied in the Adopted ND. Environmental setting and impact discussions from the 2010 Adopted ND are summarized in the following sections, as appropriate.

3.1.1 Aesthetics

Environmental Setting
The May 2010 Adopted ND (pages 30-32) addresses aesthetics and describes the visual setting for the project area within and around the Port as predominantly industrial and related to the maritime industry. The project area is also described as being “…located within a flat, upland area of urbanized, industrial, and transportation-related development. Views include fences, utility poles, street lighting, stacked containers, vehicular traffic (e.g., trucks and cars), cargo-handling equipment, cranes, railroad tracks and buildings associated with maritime terminals or other transportation businesses along Middle Harbor Road, 7th Street, and Maritime Street. No unique scenic vistas or state scenic highways occur near the [MUUP] site. Viewers in the project area include maritime, rail and other transportation industry employees; travelers along nearby roadways and waterways; and Middle Harbor Shoreline Park visitors.”

Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP

a) Scenic Vistas

No scenic vistas or view corridors are identified in the area. Because of the proximity to the Oakland Inner Harbor and the San Francisco Bay, however, the ND anticipated that travelers on Embarcadero, Maritime Street, Middle Harbor Road, and other Seaport area roads and permanent viewers would consider changes within the Port to be important to the overall visual character.

The ND found that the shore power and security system improvements associated with the MUUP would not contribute to the obstruction of existing views of the Oakland Inner Harbor and San Francisco Bay. Similarly, it was found that views of the Port from surrounding businesses, maritime, and rail operations would not be obstructed.

The ND found that the MUUP would be visually consistent with existing Port facilities, and that views of the Port, San Francisco Bay, and Oakland Inner Harbor would be unchanged. The ND determined that the MUUP would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, and that no impact would be experienced.

b) Scenic Resources, including, but not limited to, Trees, Rock Outcroppings, and Historic Buildings within a State Scenic Highway

The City of Oakland General Plan Scenic Highway Element does not identify any scenic highways in the project vicinity. The project area is a highly industrialized area used primarily for maritime and transportation activities. Accordingly, scenic resources within a state scenic
highway would not be substantially affected by the MUUP; therefore, no impact would occur. No scenic highways, trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings, or other scenic resources are located within the project area; hence, the ND concluded that no damage to scenic resources would occur.

c) Existing Visual Character or Quality of the Site and its Surroundings
The existing visual character of the project area consists of largely developed and industrial areas that are dominated by fences, utility poles, street lighting, stacked containers, vehicular traffic (e.g., trucks and cars), cargo-handling equipment, cranes, railroad tracks and buildings associated with maritime terminals. It was found that MUUP construction activities would temporarily alter the appearance of the MUUP site; however, the ND indicate that it would remain consistent with the industrial character of the area upon completion.

The ND indicated that the new shore power infrastructure for the marine terminals/berths would not appear significantly different from the existing infrastructure that is used for operating the terminals. The MUUP entailed installing conduits, cabling, manholes, outlets, switchgear/transformers, and substations. The ND found that the MUUP site’s visual character would continue to be industrial with industrial transportation uses (maritime and trucking).

The MUUP intrusion detection and reporting system (security system upgrade) involved mounting video cameras around the perimeter of the marine terminals on new or existing poles at various locations along the fence lines. The ND found that proposed improvements were consistent with existing conditions and would not substantially alter or degrade the visual character of the site.

It was concluded that the MUUP would have no long-term impact to the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

d) Light or Glare
The MUUP included installation of security cameras; however, the proposed security system did not include installation of any additional light sources. The ND found that the installation of all other MUUP components would not add substantial light or glare to the Port or the surrounding area that could potentially affect day or nighttime views in the area and that no impact would occur.

2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under this 2012 SSA proposal will similarly result in no aesthetics impacts and raise no new substantial issues for aesthetics. The 2012 SSA proposed action would be visually consistent with existing Port facilities, and views of the Port, San Francisco Bay, and Oakland Inner Harbor would be unchanged. The 2012 SSA proposal would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Scenic resources within a state scenic highway would not be substantially affected under the 2012 SSA proposed action, and no damage to scenic resources would occur. SSA construction activities would temporarily alter the appearance of the SSA project site; however, it would remain consistent with the industrial character of the area upon completion. The current proposal would not result in a long-term impact to the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Installation of the currently proposed fiber optic infrastructure improvements would not add substantial light or glare to the Port or the surrounding area that could potentially affect day or nighttime views in the area. Aesthetic impacts from the 2012 SSA proposed action represents no substantial change from the previous analysis.

**3.1.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources**

**Environmental Setting**
The Adopted ND (pages 33-35) addresses agriculture and forestry resources, and describes the setting within and around the Port as an existing seaport/maritime area located in a highly urbanized industrial setting. The area accommodates primarily industrial, marine terminal, and transportation uses.

**Summary of Adopted ND analysis for MUUP**

a) **Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency; Existing Zoning for Agricultural Use; Williamson Act Contract**

The ND indicates that there are no agricultural areas or farms located within the MUUP area or on the MUUP site. The MUUP site is mapped as Urban and Built-up Land according to maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The MUUP site also does not contain any land designated as Prime Farmland or Unique Farmland.

No Williamson Act land use contract exists for the Port Facilities or the MUUP site. The City of Oakland General Plan designates the MUUP site as “Heavy Industry The MUUP site was found to be consistent with existing land use designations and is not expected to encourage the non-renewal or cancellation of other contracted lands. Given there are no agricultural areas or farms located within the MUUP area or within the MUUP vicinity, the proposed utility upgrades for shore power and security improvements included in the MUUP would not result in the
conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. No impacts related to agriculture resources were expected to occur.

b) Forest Land

The ND indicates that Forest land in the Public Resources Code (PRC) is defined as “land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits;” additionally, timberland is defined as land “…which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products….” The MUUP site is fully developed with Port terminals and only consists of developed and disturbed lands; therefore, no forest land or timberland activity could be supported on the MUUP site or in the vicinity of the MUUP site, which precludes the possibility of changes to forest land or timberland zoning. For these reasons, no impact to forestry resources was expected to occur.

2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
   - ☐
   - ☐
   - ☑️
   - ☑️

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
   - ☐
   - ☐
   - ☑️
   - ☑️

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?
   - ☐
   - ☐
   - ☑️
   - ☑️

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
   - ☐
   - ☐
   - ☑️
   - ☑️

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to nonforest use?
   - ☐
   - ☐
   - ☑️
   - ☑️

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will similarly result in no impact on agriculture and
forestry resources, and raises no new substantial issues for agriculture and forestry resources. The area within and around the Port is an existing seaport/maritime area located in a highly urbanized industrial setting accommodating primarily industrial, marine terminal, and transportation uses. Implementation of the 2012 SSA proposed action will result in no impacts to agriculture and forestry resources. Agriculture and forestry resource impacts from the 2012 SSA proposal represents no substantial change from the previous analysis.

3.1.3 Air Quality Environmental Setting
The May 2010 Adopted ND (pages 36-42) addresses air quality and describes the air quality setting for the project region. A brief discussion of air quality setting is provided below. Environmental setting for greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) is addressed separately in this IS/Addendum in Section 3.1.7.

Physical
The San Francisco Bay Area is subject to a combination of topographical and climatic factors. Marine air traveling through the Golden Gate, as well as across San Francisco and through the San Bruno Gap, is a dominant weather factor. The MUUP site is located in West Alameda County and is part of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for preparing plans for attaining and maintaining ambient air quality standards in the region, for adopting and enforcing rules and regulations concerning stationary air pollutant sources, and for enforcing mobile source regulations according to agreements with the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Air quality plans adopted and implemented by the BAAQMD include the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy and the Bay Area Clean Air Plan.

The BAAQMD air quality monitoring station closest to the Port is located at Filbert Street in West Oakland, where PM2.5 is monitored. The West Oakland neighborhood is the closest residential area to the MUUP site, situated between the seaport and Downtown Oakland.

Legislative/Regulatory
CARB approved its Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Auxiliary Diesel Engines Operated on Ocean-Going Vessels At-Berth in a California Port (Titles 13 and 17, California Code of Regulations) (Shore Power Regulation) in December 2007. The CARB regulation calls for reducing emissions from diesel auxiliary engines on container ships, passenger ships, and refrigerated-cargo ships while berthing at a California Port. The key elements and intent is to maximize diesel particulate matter and NOX reductions, with a reduction of CO2 as a co-benefit. The Port and its tenants pursued implementation of shore power through the MUUP.

Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP
a) Applicable Air Quality Plan and Air Quality Standards, and Criteria Pollutants
CARB and the local air districts (BAAQMD for the nine-county Bay Area) develop and approve air quality plans to demonstrate how and when California will attain air quality standards established under both the federal and California Clean Air Acts. BAAQMD has jurisdiction over the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, although it shares regional air quality planning responsibilities with two other regional planning agencies, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments.

Data collected from the network of air monitoring stations show that ambient standards for ozone and particulate matter are exceeded at some locations in the region. As a result, ARB
has designated the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin as “Nonattainment” for ozone and particulate matter (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$) and the EPA has designated the Air Basin as “Nonattainment” for ozone and PM$_{2.5}$. The San Francisco Bay Area is designated “Attainment” for other pollutants.

The Adopted ND found that the MUUP, proposed to implement shore power and security system upgrades, did not conflict with or obstruct the Bay Area Clean Air Plan (CAP). Shore power would: 1) provide a clean option for providing power to marine vessels berthed at the Port; and 2) allow the vessels to shut-off their on-board auxiliary engines, thereby substantially reducing the impact of diesel particulate matter and nitrogen oxides in the Oakland area. The MUUP would result in air quality benefits.

The ND concluded that the MUUP would comply with and implement CARB’s Executive Order R-08-013, "Relating to Adoption of Proposed Regulations to Reduce Emission from Diesel Auxiliary Engines on Ocean-Going Vessels While at Berth at a California Port."

The ND indicated that construction equipment could emit exhaust with DPM, NO$_x$, carbon monoxide, ozone precursors and other criteria pollutants, as well as generate particulates such as fugitive dust or diesel emissions (PM$_{10}$ and or PM$_{2.5}$) during project construction. Only minor fugitive dust emissions (particulate matter) were expected from the MUUP as no major clearing, grading and/or earthmoving activities would be involved. The ND also indicated that construction vehicle travel on paved areas, vehicle equipment exhaust, and general disturbance of the soil might also generate some emissions. Depending on the weather, soil conditions, and the amount of activity taking place, dust emissions could potentially affect construction workers and other workers in the area. This potential impact would occur throughout the entire construction period. This impact would not significantly conflict with or obstruct implementation of any air quality plans, and would be mitigated by the implementation of the air quality control measures incorporated into the MUUP Construction Best Management Practices. These air quality control measures were included as a requirement of the MUUP construction specifications, and were to be implemented by the project contractor, monitored by the Port or tenant Construction Manager, and would satisfy any BAAQMD requirements for the control of air pollutants during demolition and construction activities.

The ND found that no significant air quality impacts would result from construction or operation of the MUUP. The MUUP would reduce maritime-related air quality emissions to benefit the environment and reduce the risk to human health. It was determined that the MUUP would not violate any air quality standard nor contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The MUUP would also not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Air quality impacts were anticipated to be less than significant.

b) Sensitive Receptors

The West Oakland neighborhood was identified as the closest residential area to the MUUP site, situated between the seaport and Downtown Oakland.

The ND indicated that construction workers or other workers could be exposed to air pollutants from the proposed construction activities. This, however, was recognized as a temporary impact, because of air quality control measures that were part of the proposed project (also
incorporated into the 2012 SSA proposed action and provided in IS/Addendum Table 2). Generation of fugitive dust was expected during project construction. Large amounts of construction-generated fugitive dust could result in a localized impact. The BAAQMD’s approach to CEQA analyses of construction dust impacts is to emphasize implementation of effective and comprehensive control measures rather than detailed quantification of emissions. The BAAQMD urges that all feasible control measures be implemented for emissions from construction activities although they are short-term or temporary.

The 2010 utility upgrade project included feasible control measures for construction emissions of particulate matter. These measures were commensurate with the BAAQMD’s measures provided in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines. The ND found that the MUUP would not result in significant impact from fugitive dust emissions from construction activities.

The proposed shore power improvements were intended to reduce reliance on fossil fuels (i.e., diesel fuel). The MUUP would enable ships to use electric power while at berth, instead of diesel fuel, or to implement a technology with comparable emissions reductions, thereby reducing the health risks to the local community from DPM. The ND therefore concluded that the utility upgrade project would not result in exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

c) Objectionable Odors

Construction equipment for the MUUP could generate short-term transient fuel odors during construction, which could temporarily affect the workers. This impact was found to be less than significant because construction activities would be temporary. The proposed utility upgrade project would not create odors when it is in operation; therefore, it would not result in significant odor impacts affecting a substantial number of people.

2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The improvements to the Port Security System proposed as part of the 2010 project involved trenching for 8 miles of underground cable. The air quality impacts of the MUUP, adequately and fully evaluated in the Adopted ND, were determined to be less than significant. The current SSA proposed action involves trenching for only 1.08 miles of underground cable. Effective and comprehensive air quality control measures incorporated into the 2010 project have also been integrated into the current SSA proposal (see Table 2). Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will similarly result in less than significant impacts on air quality by: 1) not conflicting with applicable Air Quality Plans and standards; 2) not exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; and 3) not creating objectionable odors from equipment or from trenching activities during construction, or during operation. The 2012 SSA proposal also raises no new substantial issues for air quality. Air quality impacts from the 2012 SSA proposal represent no substantial change from the previous analysis.

3.1.4 Biological Resources
Environmental Setting
The May 2010 Adopted ND (pages 43-46) addresses biological resources and describes the biological setting for the MUUP site. The ND indicates that the MUUP site is located in proximity to the Oakland Estuary-Inner Harbor Channel, Outer Harbor Channel, and Middle Harbor in San Francisco Bay. Several listed species (federal and/or state protected animal or plant species) may occur in the Oakland harbor area. The federal- and state-listed California least tern has been observed and known to forage occasionally in Oakland Harbor.

Special-status species are known to occur in the project vicinity: Double-crested cormorant, California brown pelican, California least tern, American peregrine falcon. The MUUP site is located in a previously disturbed, paved urban and industrial setting which does not provide the ability for wetlands or other sensitive natural communities to exist in this location.

Local Plans, Policies, and Ordinances
The City of Oakland’s General Plan, Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Element (OSCAR), adopted in June 1996, contains policies related to protection of biological resources. The City also has Tree Protection and Creek Protection ordinances.

Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP
a) Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species
The construction and operation of the MUUP would occur within a highly developed industrial area that is previously disturbed and almost entirely paved. The utility upgrade project did not propose disturbance of any lands or construction of any project components within any areas that have the potential for habitat identified for candidate, sensitive, or special status species. The ND, therefore, found that the MUUP would not result in a substantially adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive or special status species. The utility upgrade project would result in no impact to these species.

b) Riparian Habitat or Other Sensitive Natural Community
Construction activities for the MUUP were planned to occur on a developed, industrial, upland area. There are no wetlands, riparian habitat, or other sensitive natural communities in existence at or in the vicinity of the MUUP site. The utility upgrade project would not result in a
substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. No impact would occur.

c) Federally Protected Wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (Including, but not limited to, Marsh, Vernal Pool, Coastal, etc.)

The ND found that construction of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly affect the drainage patterns of the MUUP site. The site is located in an highly urbanized/industrialized setting and is completely developed; no wetlands or other sensitive natural communities exist onsite. The utility upgrade project would not result in a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means. Furthermore, the Port has standard operating procedures related to construction activities that prevent potential stormwater pollution, both during and after construction, from impacting the Oakland Inner Harbor and the San Francisco Bay. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Native Resident or Migratory Fish or Wildlife Species, Established Native Resident or Migratory Wildlife Corridors, or Wildlife Nursery Sites

The construction activities for, and operation of, the utility upgrade project were to occur on a developed upland area adjacent to the Oakland Inner Harbor. The MUUP also did not require any actions to require use of the San Francisco Bay. There are no natural corridors (e.g., riparian corridors, wind rows) within the MUUP site, and no existing development pattern that would cause wildlife to be channeled into the site. The utility upgrade project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, the ND found that construction of the utility upgrade project would not interfere with the movement of any fish or wildlife species.

e) Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources, such as a Tree Preservation Policy or Ordinance

The ND indicated that no creeks would be effected by the utility upgrade project. It was not anticipated that any trees would need to be removed. If tree removal were to be required, then removal would be conducted in compliance with the Port’s tree removal policy. The ND stated that the MUUP would not conflict with any local (City of Oakland or Port of Oakland) policies or ordinances that protect biological resources. A less than significant impact was expected to occur.

f) Adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other Approved Local, Regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan

There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans adopted for the MUUP site or area.
No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The biological resource impacts of the MUUP were adequately and fully evaluated in the Adopted ND. Of the six thresholds for assessing biological resource impacts of the MUUP, five were determined to have no impact. Only threshold 4(e) addressing potential conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources was determined as having a less than significant impact for the MUUP because of the potential for tree removal. Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will result in similar impacts on biological resources, and raises no new substantial issues for biological resources. Biological resource impacts from the 2012 SSA proposal represent no substantial change from the previous analysis.

3.1.5 Cultural Resources

Environmental Setting
The May 2010 Adopted ND (pages 47-51) addresses cultural resources and describes the cultural setting for the MUUP site. The ND indicates that numerous historic structures and related facilities dating from the mid-1870s through the 1940s have been observed within and immediately adjacent to the Port’s marine terminal areas. However, given the developed nature of the project site, the ND indicated that there is a very low potential for encountering significant
archaeological resources during construction because the Port maritime area is, in large part, the result of filling over the past 80 to 100 years.

Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP
a) Historical, Archaeological, and Paleontological Resources; Unique Geologic Features; and Human Remains, including those Interred Outside of Formal Cemeteries

A review of previous environmental documents for projects in the Port’s maritime area that was performed during preparation of the ND did not identify the presence of significant historic or prehistoric resources that were likely to be affected by the utility upgrade project at the following locations: Berths 20-24 (Ports America Outer Harbor Terminal), Berths 25-26 (Transbay), Berth 30 (TraPac), Berths 35-38 (Ben E. Nutter Terminal), Berths 55-56 (Hanjin), Berths 57-59 (Oakland International Container Terminal), Berths 60-63 (Global Gateway Central), Berths 67-68 (Charles P. Howard Terminal), or the Harbor Facilities Complex. Trenching and digging activities for the MUUP were planned to occur in areas that had been previously disturbed and were currently paved. The ND indicated that the MUUP was unlikely to result in substantial adverse changes in the significance of historic, archaeological, or paleontological resources at the site and there is no record of human remains interred at the site. The possibility was identified, however, that historical archaeological materials could be encountered during excavation. The Contractor would then be required to follow protocols specified in the Port’s Emergency Plan of Action for Discoveries of Unknown Historic or Archaeological Resources, June 2002 should workers encounter any unidentified resources during digging/trenching activities. Project construction workers would be required to stop activities within fifty (50) feet of the find if they encounter material that may have cultural, historic, archeological, and or paleontological value. The contractor would also be required to notify the Port and a qualified cultural resources specialist to evaluate the item(s) before continuing with digging activities. Impacts to all cultural resources from implementation of the utility upgrade project were found to be less than significant. The MUUP was also considered unlikely to encounter any interred human remains. Therefore, impacts associated with this issue would found to be less than significant.

2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under this 2012 SSA proposal will similarly result in less than significant cultural resource impacts and raise no new substantial issues for cultural resources. Should workers encounter any unidentified resources during digging/trenching activities for the 2012 SSA proposed action, they will be required to follow protocols specified in the Port’s Emergency Plan of Action for Discoveries of Unknown Historic or Archaeological Resources (June 2002). Cultural resource impacts from the 2012 SSA proposed action represents no substantial change from the previous analysis.

3.1.6 Geology and Soils
Environmental Setting
The May 2010 Adopted ND (pages 52-56) addresses geology and soils and describes the geology and soils setting for the MUUP site. The ND indicates that the MUUP site and surrounding area is located in a seismically active region of California. The nearest major active fault is the Hayward Fault, located approximately 6 miles to the northeast. Other active faults in the region include the San Andreas Fault, located approximately 13 miles to the west, and the Calaveras Fault, which is located approximately 20 miles to the east. The faults in the region are capable of generating earthquakes of at least 7.0 in magnitude; therefore, it can be expected that earthquakes would produce very strong ground shaking at the MUUP site and within the Port.

Soils in the project vicinity are unconsolidated, loose sediments and are susceptible to earthquake-induced differential settlement and secondary ground failures (ground lurching, liquefaction).

The project area consisted of open bay waters and tidal mudflats prior to 1889. The area was successively filled throughout the 1900s. The fill materials are highly variable and range from local industrial sources, consisting of discolored soils, slag, tar, and brick pieces, and imported soils derived from the nearby East Bay hills, to dredged clean sands derived from the San Francisco Bay.

The existing terminal areas and adjacent streets and other proposed utility corridors are completely paved, with four to thirty inches of asphalt concrete on the terminals. Fill thickness ranges from six to fourteen feet in the inland portions to more than thirty-seven feet near the Inner Harbor.

Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP
a) Exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:
  i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault

The ND indicated that the MUUP site is located within Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, R32. Faults within the vicinity of the Port that are included in the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map include the San Andreas Fault (13 miles west), Hayward Fault (approximately 6 miles north east), and the Calaveras Fault (approximately 20 miles east). These faults are considered to be active and present a moderate fault rupture hazard to developments in their vicinity. The ND indicated that the distance of the MUUP site from these...
faults and the nearest Fault Zone precluded the occurrence of fault rupture on the MUUP site and as such, no impact would occur.

ii) and iii) **Strong seismic ground shaking and Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction**

The Port of Oakland is located in an area that has experienced historical seismic activity and is subject to potentially strong ground shaking. According to the Alameda County General Plan, the County is categorized by the Uniform Building Code (UBC) as Seismic Zone IV, the most stringent category for seismic design. Because of the MUUP site’s proximity to nearby faults, particularly the Hayward Fault, severe ground shaking has the potential to occur. Appropriate construction practices would be implemented during construction to ensure safety of workers and/or equipment during strong seismic shaking. The ND indicated that implementation of all applicable standards of the 2007 UBC coupled with the Port’s current standards for seismic safety will insure impacts from ground shaking are less than significant. Compliance with recommendations contained in the final geotechnical evaluation would minimize the potential for structural deformation during liquefaction. Impacts related to liquefaction were found to be less than significant.

iv) **Landslides**

Areas susceptible to landslides are typically characterized by steep, unstable slopes in weak soil or bedrock units. The topography of the site and surrounding area is relatively flat, therefore it is not susceptible to slope failures and landslides. The ND found that the MUUP project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death. As such, no impact was expected.

b) **Soil Erosion or the Loss of Topsoil**

The ND indicated that construction activities associated with the utility upgrade project would involve minor grading and trenching activities that could expose barren soils to sources of wind or water, resulting in the potential for erosion and sedimentation on and off the MUUP site. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permitting programs regulate stormwater quality from construction sites, which includes erosion and sedimentation. Under the NPDES permitting program, the preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required for construction activities that would disturb an area of 1 acre or more. Typical SWPPP BMPs intended to control erosion include sand bags, detention basins, silt fencing, storm drain inlet protection, street sweeping, and monitoring of water bodies. Preparation of a SWPPP in compliance with the Port's NPDES permit would be completed as described in the BMPs that would have been implemented as part of the utility upgrade project. As such, impacts were anticipated to be less than significant.

c) **Geologic unit or Soil that is Unstable, or that would become Unstable**

Loose to medium loose soils existing in the subsurface at the MUUP site and within the broader boundaries of the Port could be subject to liquefaction and lurching during strong ground shaking. Implementation of the MUUP would not lead to instability, however. The utility upgrade project involved subsurface depths of up to 7 feet. The MUUP was found to have no impact in terms of leading to unstable conditions in geologic units or soil.
d) Expansive Soil
The MUUP site is located on bay-derived fill, overlain by imported fill, with a relatively low expansion potential. No substantial risk to life or property was identified in the ND, and hence no impact was anticipated.

e) Septic Tanks or Alternative Wastewater Disposal Systems
The utility upgrade project did not include the installation or use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Wastewater from the MUUP was to be directed to the existing wastewater disposal system. As such, no impact to soils or wastewater disposal was anticipated.

2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The improvements to the Port Security System proposed as part of the 2010 project involved trenching at subsurface depths of up to 7 feet. The geology and soils impacts of the MUUP, adequately and fully evaluated in the Adopted ND, were determined to be less than significant for thresholds 6(a)(ii) and 6(a)(iii). All other geology and soils impacts were determined to have no impact. The current SSA proposed action involves trenching at subsurface depths of 3 feet on average. Implementing
fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will result in similar impacts on geology and soils, and raises no new substantial issues for geology and soils. Geology and soil impacts from the 2012 SSA proposal represent no substantial change from the previous analysis.

3.1.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Environmental Setting
The May 2010 Adopted ND (pages 57-61) addresses GHG emissions and describes the GHG setting for the MUUP site. Greenhouse gases include, but are not limited to: carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide N₂O, hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆).

The ND describes the legislative/regulatory setting for GHG, referencing Executive Order S-3-05 (EO), signed by the Governor of California in June 2005, which established statewide reduction targets for greenhouse gases. Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act, 2006 (AB 32), signed into law in September 2006, establishes a state goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020, representing a 25 percent reduction from forecasted emission levels. The State of California has identified shore power as a discrete early action measure to meet the goals of AB 32.

Senate Bill 97 (SB 97) was approved by the Governor of California in August 2007. SB 97 requires the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to prepare, develop, and transmit guidelines to the Resources Agency for the feasible mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions or the effects of greenhouse gas emissions, as required by CEQA. Adopted Amendments were filed with the Secretary of State, and became effective March 18, 2010. These CEQA Guidelines amendments provide guidance to public agencies regarding the analysis and mitigation of the effects of greenhouse gas emissions in draft CEQA documents. The greenhouse gas guidelines fit within the existing CEQA framework by amending existing Guidelines to reference climate change.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 assists agencies in determining the significance of greenhouse gas emissions, and calls for a “good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate or estimate the amount of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project.” The amendments encourage lead agencies to consider many factors in performing a CEQA analysis and preserve lead agencies’ discretion to make their own determinations based upon substantial evidence. The amendments also encourage public agencies to make sure of programmatic mitigation plans and programs from which to tier when they perform individual project analyses.

Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP
a) Greenhouse Gas Emissions through Direct or Indirect Generation that may have a Significant Impact on the Environment

Shore Power
The purpose of the MUUP shore power element was to reduce emissions of air quality pollutants at the Port related to auxiliary diesel engines running while vessels are berthed at the Port. Limited quantities of greenhouse gas emissions were estimated to occur during the construction period. However, these emissions would considered minimal and temporary. During the operation of the utility upgrade project, the use of electrical power from the grid or alternate fuels to replace the use of shipboard diesel auxiliary engines would result in an overall
substantial net reduction of greenhouse gas emissions for Port-related activities. Moreover, the MUUP would not increase the terminal operating area; therefore, it would not increase throughput capacity. Therefore, the ND found that implementation of the MUUP would not generate greenhouse gas emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment, and impacts associated with this issue would found to be less than significant.

**Intrusion Detection System**

Limited quantities of greenhouse gas emissions were estimated to occur during the construction period of the IDS. However, these emissions were considered to be minimal and temporary. During the operation of the project, some electricity would be required to operate the security system.

**b) Conflict with Any Applicable Plan, Policy or Regulation of an Agency Adopted for the Purpose of Reducing the Emissions of Greenhouse Gases**

The ND determined that the utility upgrade project would result in a net reduction of greenhouse gas emissions during operation, which would ensure that the MUUP would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation which has been adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Therefore, impacts associated with this issue were considered less than significant.

**2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

- □
- □
- ☒
- □

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

- □
- □
- ☒
- □

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** The GHG emission impacts of the MUUP, adequately and fully evaluated in the Adopted ND, were determined to be less than significant. Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will similarly result in less than significant impacts on GHG emissions, and raises no new substantial issues for GHG emissions. GHG impacts from the 2012 SSA proposal represent no substantial change from the previous analysis.

**3.1.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

**Environmental Setting**

The May 2010 Adopted ND (pages 62-68) addresses hazards and hazardous materials and describes hazards and hazardous materials the setting for the MUUP site. As noted, some of the Port’s property associated with the Howard Terminal is listed on the DTSC Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (also known as the Cortese List). The Cortese List is compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and is administered by the California
Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

The ND indicates that underlying soil and groundwater at certain locations in the Port area were contaminated from previous industrial activities conducted during the early 1900s and from former leaking underground storage tanks (USTs). Chemical compounds identified in the underlying materials include polynuclear aromatic compounds (PAHs), petroleum hydrocarbons (from gasoline, diesel), cyanide, methane, chlorinated hydrocarbons (from solvents), and metals. The Port has been investigating the extent of these compounds in the soil and groundwater since the 1990s with oversight from regulatory agencies including DTSC, RWQCB, Board, and Alameda County Department of Environmental Health. Varying degrees of soil contamination may be encountered during construction trenching activities. The Port has specific guidelines for working in the Maritime area in its Maritime Environmental Health and Safety Plan for Shallow Excavations for Port Facilities Staff and Port Contractors (EH&SP, 2009). The EH&SP contains guidelines and protocols to ensure health and safety of workers and individuals in areas under construction. The EH&SP also identifies approximate locations where varying degrees of soil contamination may be encountered during construction.

The ND also indicates that hazardous materials from past industrial activities and fuel use may potentially be found in subsurface areas of the marine terminals. Written safety and environmental plans and programs are required. These include a Health and Safety Plan that incorporates measures to reduce potential hazards and to protect employees and the public. The contractor is required to follow protocols as specified in the Port’s EH&SP. Some sites currently under the oversight of a regulatory agency or with institutional controls in place may require additional protocols to ensure safety. Those shall be identified in a project manual for the contractor. A Soil and Groundwater Plan is required to describe how potentially contaminated material will be handled. The MUUP included protocols to test and dispose of potentially contaminated soils and water that may be encountered during construction, for example, in electrical vaults. Contaminated water is pumped out and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements from the California DTSC and the RWQCB. Contaminated soil, if and when encountered, is stockpiled on heavy plastic sheets to avoid mixing it with uncontaminated soils. Contaminated soil is to be further secured by an additional covering of heavy plastic to keep the soil contained until it can be picked up and disposed of by a qualified sub-contractor. Any removed soil is to be replaced with uncontaminated soil.

Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP

a) Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials; Reasonably Foreseeable Upset and Accident Conditions Involving the Likely Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment

Construction and operation of the MUUP involved the routine transport and handling of hazardous substances such as diesel fuels, lubricants, solvents, and asphalt. The ND noted that handling and transport of these materials could result in the exposure of workers to hazardous materials. However, the ND found that the MUUP would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, because project construction and operation would be in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws pertaining to the safe handling and transport of hazardous materials, including California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal OSHA) requirements.
Construction of the utility upgrade project involved a combination of micro-trenching, directional boring, and deeper trenching (greater than three feet or more, i.e., for camera pole foundations and shore power vaults) and for installing electrical infrastructure. Measures to avoid or substantially reduce environmental impacts were incorporated into the 2010 project and are repeated in this IS/Addendum in Table 2. The Contractor was required to use these BMPs, as defined in project plans and specifications.

The ND cites Howard Terminal (Berths 67-68) as among those locations having Risk Management Plans (RMPs) or deed restrictions in place, or are otherwise undergoing remediation and oversight. Where applicable, all excavated soil in this location would be managed in accordance with an RMP, contained in a Final Removal Action Work plan approved by the DTSC.

The same protocols described in the ND would be applied to the current 2012 SSA proposed action. Temporary stockpiles would be placed on and under plastic (if required). All project activities, particularly trenching and soil disturbances, would also be conducted in accordance with a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Side-cast soils from trenching, micro-trenching, and digging would be used as backfill, to the extent possible. Excess soils, if any, would be characterized and disposed of off-site at an appropriate facility as needed, in accordance with the regulatory requirements.

The ND found that the MUUP would not result in hazards or generate hazardous materials while in operation. The utility upgrade project does not include transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials on a routine basis nor would it involve foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions that would release hazardous materials into the environment. It would, therefore, not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The ND anticipated no impact.

b) Proximity to an existing or proposed school

No existing or proposed school is located within one-quarter mile of the MUUP site; and the project would not result in hazardous emissions or entail handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste. No impact was anticipated.

c) Listing of hazardous materials sites on lists compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5

The MUUP requires extensive trenching for utilities that may disturb soil on and around the Port's marine terminals. As noted, some locations within the MUUP site are recorded on lists prepared pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code. Existing site-specific RMPs and the Port's EH&SP are then applied. Workers implementing any removal activities that may occur in such sites would use personal protective equipment to minimize exposure to contaminants, as required by the applicable regulatory agencies. If required, provisions for monitoring air quality at the MUUP boundary would be included and would ensure that activities at hazardous materials sites do not exceed air quality action levels. The ND also indicated that hazardous materials sites would also be fenced to prevent the public from entering when materials are exposed. The ND found that the proposed project would not create a significant hazard because the potential for exposing the public to hazardous materials at the sites would be limited by the RMPs, the EH&SP, and BMPs. The locations currently under regulatory oversight already have restrictions in place on how the property can be used. The ND anticipated a less than significant impact.
d) Airport land use plan, public airport or public use airport, or private airstrip

The closest airport to the Port is Oakland International Airport, which is approximately 9 miles away. Additionally, the MUUP project features were considered low profile in nature and would not affect air traffic. The Port is not within the vicinity of private landing facility. The ND found that the MUUP would not result in a safety hazard for people living or working in the area, and no impact would occur.

e) Emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan

The ND determined that the MUUP would not result in interference with any adopted emergency response plans or evacuation plans. During construction, road access may be disrupted temporarily on or around the Port, but alternative routing would be provided for emergency access. Therefore, implementation of the utility upgrade project would not physically interfere with or impair implementation of the emergency response plan. To the contrary, it was found that the upgraded intrusion detection system element provides necessary access and communication for securing Port property and tenants in the event of an emergency. No impacts would found to occur.

f) Wildland fires

There are no wildlands surrounding or proximate to the Port facilities and supporting structures. The MUUP site is not located within or adjacent to a State Responsibility Area managed by the California Department of Forestry (CDF); therefore, the site is not ranked by the CDF. The MUUP site, following construction, would consist primarily of concrete structures and paving materials, which are not associated with the generation or spread of wildland fire. According to the California Fire Alliance’s Fire Planning and Mapping Tools database, the MUUP site is in an area dominated by fuels classified as low to moderate in terms of wildland fire risk. The closest natural area is the adjacent San Francisco Bay and Middle Harbor Shoreline Park. Neither of these areas is heavily vegetated nor do they have the type of fuel source or habitat that is susceptible to wild fires. In summary, MUUP implementation was found to have no impact on the risk of wildland fire.

2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Hazards / Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The hazards/hazardous materials impacts of the MUUP were adequately and fully evaluated in the Adopted ND. All impacts were assessed as “no impact” with the exception of the impact associated with significance threshold 8(d), which was found to be less than significant. Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will result in similar impacts on hazards and hazardous materials. The SSA proposal will not raise any new substantial issues for hazards/hazardous materials, nor would it result in any new hazards/hazardous materials impacts or increase the severity of hazards/hazardous materials impacts of identified in the Adopted ND.

As previously stated, the area occupied by Howard Terminal is regulated for significant soil and groundwater contamination. At the Howard Terminal, the conduit will either be placed inside existing conduit or be routed above ground; hence, the conduit will not breach the cap over the Howard Terminal nor disturb the potentially hazardous material underneath. The Contractor will be required to follow protocols as specified in the 2009 Maritime Environmental Health and Safety Plan for Shallow Excavations Guidelines to ensure health and safety of workers and nearby individuals in areas under construction. The 2012 SSA proposal will also adopt the Health and Safety Plan previously prepared and approved by the Port of Oakland for work at the Howard Terminal (Model Health and Safety Plans A and B, Baseline Environmental Consulting, September 2005), which include specific measures to reduce potential health and safety hazards and to protect employees and nearby individuals. Impacts from the 2012 SSA proposal on hazards and hazardous materials represent no substantial change from the previous analysis.

3.1.9 Hydrology/Water Quality
Environmental Setting
The May 2010 Adopted ND (pages 69-76) addresses hydrology and water quality and describes the hydrology and water quality setting for the MUUP site and Port of Oakland. The Port's
Outer Harbor lies in the eastern portion of San Francisco Bay that is referred to as the East Bay Plain groundwater basin. The Inner Harbor is connected to central San Francisco Bay, located approximately 2.5 miles to the west. Water levels in the channel experience significant tidal fluctuations. Storm water on the MUUP site flows into existing storm drains and is discharged into the Inner and Outer Harbors. The MUUP site is located in an area that is not within the 100-year Floodplain; however, the Outer Harbor area is mapped as a Tsunami Run-up Zone. A complete discussion of the regulatory setting at the federal (Clean Water Act) and state (Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act) can be found in the Adopted ND (pages 70-72).

Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP

a) Water Quality Standards and Waste Discharge Requirements; Water Quality Degradation

The ND found that short-term impacts to water quality standards may occur during construction of the MUUP due to minor grading and trenching. Grading and construction activities may potentially allow surface water to carry sediment from onsite erosion and small quantities of pollutants into the stormwater system and local waterways. Control measures, such as perimeter protection (fiber rolls, silt fencing) and drainage inlet protection would be utilized to protect water quality. Because the area of ground disturbance affected by MUUP construction was in excess of 1 acre, the MUUP site is subject to the requirements of the General Permit (see IS/Addendum Table 2 for a listing of MUUP required BMPs that also would be applied to the 2012 SSA proposed action). Post-construction runoff would consist largely of rainfall runoff from the previously paved services throughout the MUUP site. Runoff was expected to be minimal, but would still be conveyed into the existing stormwater drainage system.

The MUUP contractor is required to prepare a project-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) according to the RMP for the Howard Terminal, and the Port’s Maritime Health and Safety Plan for Shallow Excavations for Port Facilities, Staff and Port Contractors (2009). The SWPPP would include an erosion and sedimentation control element to be used, as necessary, during construction activities. A Notice of Intent (NOI) to comply with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System General Construction Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity would be submitted by the Port to the State Water Resources Control Board. BMPs employed during construction may include measures to protect the site and construction materials from rain. The ND found these impacts to be considered no impact because: 1) preparing and implementing a SWPPP is part of the MUUP project and would sufficiently lessen the impact of water quality degradation from project-related construction activities; and 2) post-construction runoff would ultimately be conveyed into the existing storm water drainage system. These same requirements will be imposed on the 2012 SSA proposed action.

b) Groundwater Supplies and Groundwater Recharge

Shallow groundwater underlying the MUUP site is not currently used as a source of drinking water due to its poor quality (high total solids and poor chemical quality). No groundwater would be utilized at the MUUP site, and the amount of precipitation that currently infiltrates to the shallow groundwater table would not be substantially changed. No Impact is anticipated.
c) Existing Drainage Pattern of the Area and Existing Stormwater Drainage System; Erosion, Siltation, or Flooding On or Offsite

The MUUP site is primarily covered with impervious surfaces (buildings and pavement); additionally, there are no streams or rivers in the vicinity. However, the MUUP site is directly adjacent to the Oakland Inner Harbor and San Francisco Bay. The ND found that the utility upgrade project would not physically alter any water body or an existing drainage course, therefore, would not result in on or offsite erosion or siltation. MUUP construction would alter minimal amounts of previously disturbed areas, although not changing existing absorption rates, drainage patterns, and/or rate and amount of surface water runoff on the MUUP site. In addition, as discussed under Item (a) above, implementation of a SWPPP would ensure that stormwater would be directed to designated facilities, thereby inhibiting any erosion or flooding on or offsite. As such, impacts were determined to have no impact.

The ND also found that the MUUP would not result in a net increase in impervious surface area. The proposed shore power improvements and perimeter intrusion detection system would not increase the rate or amount of surface runoff to or from the site. Precipitation would continue to run off into the existing storm sewer system, and would not result in flooding on or offsite. No impact was anticipated.

The ND determined that the MUUP would not create runoff that exceeds the capacity of the existing storm drainage system, and that the amount of impermeable surface would not be substantially increased or changed. The BMPs, the SWPPP, which are part of the MUUP (as well as the 2012 SSA proposed action), and compliance with existing RMPs, would eliminate the potential for providing substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The MUUP would not result in creating a new source of polluted runoff after it is in operation, and no impact is anticipated.

e) 100-year Flood Hazard Area as Mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other Flood Hazard Delineation Map; Levee or Dam Failure

Flood zones are geographic areas that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has defined according to varying levels of flood risk. Zones are depicted on a community’s Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) or Flood Hazard Boundary Map that reflect the severity or type of flooding in the area. The Safety Element of the City of Oakland General Plan indicates that the MUUP site is not located in an area subject to potential flooding and/or dam inundation. No residential structures were proposed as part of the utility upgrade project, and residential uses are not allowed in the Seaport area. None of the structures proposed as part of the MUUP would impede or redirect flood flows. No impacts were anticipated to occur.

The improvements to be implemented as part of the MUUP would not result in exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. Therefore, no impacts related to this issue would occur.

f) Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

Seiches are earthquake-generated waves within enclosed or restricted bodies of water such as lakes and reservoirs. A tsunami is a sea wave produced by an offshore earthquake, volcanic eruption, or landslide. The ND indicated that the MUUP site is unlikely to result in impacts from seiche because the site is not located near an enclosed body of water that would be prone to
seiche. The MUUP site is also not located within a volcanic hazard zone or large unstable slopes that could cause a mudflow. No impact for seiche or mudflow would occur.

The Safety Element of the City of Oakland General Plan shows that the MUUP site is located in an area mapped as a “Tsunami Run-up Zone”; therefore, it is potentially subject to inundation by tsunami. The highest tsunami recorded in the San Francisco Bay area by the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, reaching a height of 7.5 feet at Fort Point in San Francisco, occurred in March 1964 as a result of the Alaskan earthquake.

The ND identified several mitigating factors relating to tsunami occurrence in the San Francisco Bay Area that would result in a less than significant risk of damage due to tsunamis in the project area. The types of offshore earthquakes that are likely to occur in the Bay Area tend to have relatively small amounts of vertical offset, and are not typically associated with high tsunami risk. Sites located adjacent to the Bay, as well as other harbor or cove water areas are likely to be buffered by their location – tsunamis tend to dissipate once they move from open, deep waters to shallower Bay waters. There are existing tsunami early warning programs implemented by the United States Geological Survey and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and emergency evacuation plans and procedures already in place, which would likely provide sufficient warning to any employees at the Port or MUUP site of the potential risk of tsunami after an offshore earthquake. The ND found that the MUUP project would not change the amount of risk associated with the occurrence of a tsunami in the area or at the MUUP site. Therefore, impacts associated with this issue would found to be less than significant.

### 2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Hydrology/Water Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Would the project:</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environmental Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will result in similar impacts for hydrology and water quality, and will raise no new substantial issues for hydrology and water quality. The adopted ND found all hydrology/water quality impacts for the MUUP to have no impact, with the exception of the significance threshold 9(j), which was determined to have a less than significant impact. Hydrology and water quality impacts from the 2012 SSA proposed action represent no substantial change from the previous analysis.

### 3.1.10 Land Use and Planning

**Environmental Setting**

The May 2010 Adopted ND (pages 77-79) addresses land use and planning, and describes the land use and planning setting for the MUUP site and Port of Oakland. A detailed discussion of planning jurisdiction within the Port is contained on these pages of the ND and summarized below.

The Port of Oakland is an independent department of the City of Oakland, as established by Section 700 of the Charter of the City of Oakland. Pursuant to Section 601 and 701 of the Charter, the Oakland City Council created the Board of Port Commissioners (Board) to preside over the Port. The following plans have planning jurisdiction within the area of the Estuary:

- **Oakland General Plan** – Port uses must be consistent with the Oakland General Plan;
- **San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) Bay Plan** – The Bay Plan designates the MUUP site and surrounding area as “Oakland Port Area,” and states that the planning goals for this area include “Redevelop[ing] Outer, Middle, and Inner Harbors for modern marine terminals”; and
- **San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan.**

The MUUP site is located within the jurisdictional area of the Seaport Plan, and within an area designated as a Port Priority Use area. Port Priority Use areas are determined to be necessary
for future port development, and are to be reserved for port-related and other uses that will not impede development of the sites for port purposes.

**Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP**

**a) Division of an Established Community**

The MUUP site is within an industrial area. No established community would be physically divided by implementation of the utility upgrade project and no Impact will occur.

**b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project; or any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan**

As discussed in the Hazards/Hazardous Materials section of this IS/Addendum, some areas are under regulatory oversight. Current use of the MUUP site is limited to industrial/commercial purposes only. The MUUP is consistent with allowable uses. The ND indications that Implementation of the utility upgrade project will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the property. The MUUP site is not located within any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area. No impact will occur.

**2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Land Use / Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The land use and planning impacts of the MUUP were adequately and fully evaluated in the Adopted ND. All impacts were assessed as no impact. Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will result in similar impacts on land use and planning. The SSA proposal will not raise any new substantial issues for land use and planning, nor would it result in any new land use and planning impacts or increase the severity of land use and planning impacts identified in the Adopted ND. Impacts from the 2012 SSA proposal on land use and planning represent no substantial change from the previous analysis.

**3.1.11 Mineral Resources**

**Environmental Setting**

The May 2010 Adopted ND (page 80) addresses mineral resources. The mineral resources setting for the MUUP site and Port of Oakland area is briefly characterized in that, according to
the USGS mineral mapping, there are no known mineral resources within the MUUP site or Port area.

**Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP**

a) **Known Mineral Resources with Regional, Statewide, or Local Importance**

No known mineral resources were identified in the ND as occurring within the MUUP site. The utility upgrade project would not result in loss of availability of mineral resource or a locally important resource recovery site. No impacts are anticipated.

**2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Mineral Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** The mineral resource impacts of the MUUP were evaluated in the Adopted ND. Impacts for mineral resources were assessed as no impact. Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will result in similar impacts on mineral resources. The SSA proposal will not raise any new substantial issues for mineral resources, nor would it result in any new mineral resource impacts or increase the severity of mineral resource impacts identified in the Adopted ND. Impacts from the 2012 SSA proposal on mineral resources represent no substantial change from the previous analysis.

**3.1.12 Noise**

**Environmental Setting**

The May 2010 Adopted ND (pages 81-85) addresses noise and describes the noise setting for the MUUP site and the Port of Oakland. The MUUP site is characterized in the ND as having multiple locations and being more than 1,500 feet from sensitive receptors, such as schools, hospitals, or residences. Commercial and industrial uses border the Port terminals to the north, east, and south. San Francisco Bay is located westerly of the terminal areas. West Oakland is the closest neighboring community to the Port; it is situated adjacent to the Port, separated from the marine terminals by freeways and rail lines. Potential noise sources that occur within the Port area include airplane over-flights, truck and car traffic, train traffic and horns, crane operations, and ship and boat traffic in the Inner Harbor. Noise levels fluctuate constantly, depending on the time, day, noise source and location at the time it is generated. Current Port noise-generating activities were described as ship loading and unloading, cargo trucking within the terminals, freight and passenger train movements, and truck traffic along roadways used to access the site.
Sound levels in the ND for the MUUP and in the SSA-specific noise analysis addressed below are presented in logarithmic decibels (dB). The dB is a logarithmic unit, which expresses the ratio of the sound pressure level being measured to a standard reference level. A-weighted decibels (dBA) approximate the subjective response of the human ear and are adjusted to reflect only those frequencies that are audible to the human ear. The equivalent sound level ($L_{eq}$) represents a steady-state sound level containing the same total energy as a time varying signal over a given sample period.

Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP

a) Noise Levels Potentially in Excess of Standards Established in the Local General Plan or Noise Ordinance, or Applicable Standards of Other Agencies; Ambient Noise Levels

The Port area is not subject to the City of Oakland’s zoning designations because it is an autonomous City department governed by the City Charter; however, Port uses must be consistent with the Oakland General Plan. For the MUUP and other projects, the Port requires the Contractor to meet the City of Oakland construction noise standards. Chapter 17.120.050(H) of the City of Oakland Planning Code requires that short-term construction or demolition operation in industrial land uses should not exceed 85 dBA during the daytime and 70 dBA during the weekends. The Construction Specifications for the MUUP requires the Contractor to comply with the City noise standards during demolition and construction activities at the MUUP site. Construction workers are also required to use hearing protection equipment and comply with OSHA standards for working in conditions where noise levels exceed the established standards.

Heavy equipment planned to be used during onsite MUUP construction was anticipated to generate short-term increases of localized ambient noise levels during normal working hours. Pavement comprised of concrete and asphalt was planned for partial or complete removal. It was anticipated that construction workers would use a pneumatic, manually-operated, jackhammer and/or diesel-powered heavy equipment such as a backhoe or skid steer, with an impact hammer attachment. Noise levels associated with MUUP construction at fifty feet from the sources would range from 82 to 101 dBA ($L_{eq}$) for activities requiring impact equipment (jackhammers) and from 72 to 95 dBA ($L_{eq}$) for activities requiring operation of earthmoving equipment (excavators, backhoes, and trucks), based on U.S. EPA data on typical noise levels generated by construction equipment.

For the MUUP, a residence on 2nd Street is located within 1,500 feet of a portion of the IDS at the perimeter of the Howard Terminal. The ND determined that, given the anticipated length of MUUP construction, the linear nature of the utility project, coupled with the already impacted noise environment, the temporary increased noise levels during demolition and construction of the MUUP would not be considered a significant impact.

Noise generated by the MUUP would be during the construction phase and would be primarily from the operation of construction equipment and trucks over a short period of time. MUUP operational noise levels were not expected to significantly contribute to ambient noise levels on the MUUP site; hence, there would be no significant changes in noise levels after the MUUP is implemented. Current noise-generating activities, such as ship loading and unloading, cargo trucking within the terminal, freight and passenger train movements and truck traffic along roadways used to access the site would continue.
The ND found that noise levels associated with operation of the MUUP would not substantially differ from noise levels currently generated at marine terminals, and that no permanent significant increase in ambient noise levels would occur. The types of noise associated with loading and unloading of vessels, cargo trucking activities, freight train activity and truck traffic along nearby roadways and freeways would not be significantly increased due to MUUP implementation. Impacts associated with noise levels from the MUUP were considered less than significant.

b) Groundborne Vibration and Groundborne Noise Levels
Groundborne vibrations consist of rapidly fluctuating motions within the ground that have an average motion of zero. The effects of groundborne vibrations typically only cause a nuisance to people, but at extreme vibration levels, damage to buildings may occur. Construction activities utilizing jackhammers and large bulldozers can produce vibration that may be felt by adjacent uses. Vibration levels associated with the MUUP were analyzed in the ND (pages 83, 84). The closest vibration-sensitive land use for the MUUP is identified as a residence on 2nd Street that is within 1,500 feet of the MUUP site. The ND anticipated that the vibration levels caused by a large bulldozer operating on the edge of the site would be 0.02 inches per second PPV or 81 VdB at 25 feet which is below the 0.2 inch per second or 94 VdB vibration threshold. Additionally, the ND noted that the public would not be exposed to direct groundborne construction vibration because most of the construction sites are within secured terminal areas that do not allow public access; some fence-line utility installation will take place outside the terminals within the industrial and transportation environment of a working seaport. Therefore, construction-related vibration impacts were determined to be less than significant.

c) Airport Land Use Plan, Public Airport or Public Use Airport, or Private Airstrip
The MUUP site is not within two miles of an airport or within an airport land use plan area, nor is it located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Thus, the ND determined that the utility upgrade project would not result in the exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive airstrip noise levels. As a result, a finding of no impact with made in respect to airport and airstrip noise.

2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** A site-specific noise analysis was conducted as part of this IS/Addendum for the 2012 SSA proposed action. The following 2012 analysis is organized according to the CEQA noise thresholds listed above. The analysis confirms that the 2012 SSA proposal represents no substantial change from the previous 2010 analysis. Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will result in similar impacts for noise. The SSA proposal will not raise any new substantial issues for noise, nor would it result in any new noise impacts or increase the severity of noise impacts identified in the Adopted ND. Impacts from the 2012 SSA proposal on noise represent no substantial change from the previous analysis. The SSA site-specific analysis is as follows:

a) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** As previously stated, the Port area is not subject to the City of Oakland’s zoning designations because it is an autonomous City department governed by the City Charter; however, Port uses must be consistent with the Oakland General Plan. The Port would require the SSA Contractor to meet the City of Oakland construction noise standards. Chapter 17.120.050(H) of the City of Oakland Planning Code limits short-term construction or demolition operation occurring within industrial land uses to a level not-to-exceed 85 dBA during the daytime and 70 dBA during the weekends. The Construction Specifications for the proposed work stipulates that the SSA Contractor complies with the City noise standards during demolition and construction activities. Construction workers shall also be required to use hearing protection equipment and comply with OSHA standards for working in conditions where noise levels exceed the established standards.

The sound levels resulting from construction activities may vary significantly depending on several factors such as the type and age of equipment, the specific equipment manufacturer and model, the operations being performed, and the overall condition of the equipment and exhaust system mufflers. The list of construction equipment that may be used on the SSA project and estimates of near and far sound source levels are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3: Estimated L_max Sound Pressure Levels from Construction Equipment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Estimated Sound Pressure Level at 50 feet (dBA)</th>
<th>Estimated Sound Pressure Level at 1000 feet (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ditch Witch JT2020 Directional Drill</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobcat (Base Tractor Unit)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe (Case 580)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Dump Truck (Chevy C4500)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A screening-level acoustic modeling analysis of construction noise was conducted using CadnaA, the computer-aided noise abatement program (v 4.2.140). CadnaA is a comprehensive 3-dimensional acoustic software model that conforms to the Organization for International Standardization (ISO) standard ISO 9613-2 Attenuation of Sound during Propagation Outdoors. The engineering methods specified in this standard consist of full (1/1) octave band algorithms that incorporate geometric spreading due to wave divergence, reflection from surfaces, atmospheric absorption, screening by topography and obstacles, ground effects, source directivity, heights of both sources and receptors, and meteorological conditions.

Terrain conditions, vegetation type, and ground cover can influence the absorption that occurs when sound waves travel over land. The ISO 9613-2 standard accounts for ground absorption rates by assigning a numerical coefficient of G=0 for acoustically hard, reflective surfaces and G=1 for absorptive surfaces and soft ground. If the ground between the source and receiver is pavement or hard-packed dirt, as is typically found in industrial complexes or for sound traveling over bodies of water, the absorption coefficient is defined as G=0 to account for the reduced sound attenuation and higher reflectivity. In contrast, ground covered in vegetation, such as suburban lawns and agricultural fields, will be acoustically absorptive and aid in sound attenuation (i.e., G=1). For this 2012 acoustic modeling analysis, a conservative ground absorption rate was selected to account for a hard surfaces found within the immediate Port area and a semi-reflective ground surface in the area surrounding the Port. Topographical information was imported into the acoustic model using the official USGS digital elevation dataset to accurately represent terrain in three dimensions. Sound attenuation through foliage and diffraction around and over existing anthropogenic structures such as buildings were conservatively ignored.

The SSA construction site, as described in Section 2.1, consists of the 5,700 foot (1.08 mile) disturbance area required for fiber optic cable installation as well as a proposed laydown yard (approximately .23 acres in size) planned to the west. The closest noise sensitive receptors (i.e., residences) to the SSA site are identified as the Phoenix Lofts at 737 2nd Street (near Brush Street and Embarcadero West), residences in Jack London Square at Broadway between 2nd and 3rd Streets, as well as residences near 3rd and Henry Street north of the railroad tracks and a few blocks north of 5th Street and Interstate 880. These receptors are approximately 708 feet, 2,850 feet and 1,757 feet, respectively, from the SSA fiber optic cable installation disturbance area.

The calculation methodology requires the input of the number and type of construction equipment as well as typical noise source levels associated with that equipment. For the
acoustic modeling analysis, it was assumed that all equipment listed in Table 3 were operating concurrently at a maximum 100 percent load usage within the disturbance area, which are conservative assumptions. Under actual conditions, construction activity will vary in duration, noise levels and location.

Results from acoustic modeling are presented in 5 dBA increments projected on a scaled USGS orthophoto map, as shown in Figure 7. The sound contour isopleths are plotted at a height of 1.52 meters above ground level, which is approximately the ear height of a standing person.

Construction may generate noise levels that exceed ambient sound levels and has the potential to cause a temporary and short term disturbance at receptors. Reasonable efforts will be undertaken to minimize the impact of noise resulting from construction activities. Work in proximity to any single sensitive noise receptor will likely last no more than a few days, as construction activities move along the cable installation disturbance area. Therefore, no one receptor will be exposed to significant noise levels for any extended period of time. Similar to the MUUP, given the anticipated length of construction for the SSA Project, the linear nature of the utility project, coupled with the already elevated noise environment, the temporary increased noise levels during construction associated with the SSA proposed action would not be considered a significant impact of the project.

No adverse noise impacts are expected as a result of the future operation of the SSA proposal. The results of this current 2012 analysis specific to the SSA proposal are consistent with the results of the acoustic analysis completed in March 2010 as a part of the IS/ND, which are that impacts associated with noise levels would be less than significant.

b) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. Ground-borne vibrations can be a source of annoyance to people or a source of structural damage to some types of buildings. Ground-borne vibration related to human annoyance is generally related to root mean square (rms) velocity levels expressed in VdB. Building damage, which is a concern related to construction vibration, is generally assessed in terms of peak particle velocity (PPV). The relationship of PPV to rms velocity is expressed in terms of the “crest factor,” defined as the ratio of the PPV amplitude to the rms amplitude. Peak particle velocity is typically a factor of 1.7 to 6 times greater than rms vibration velocity.

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has identified vibration impact criteria for both building damage potential and human annoyance. Both human annoyance effects and building damage effects depend in part on whether vibration events are isolated, discrete events or a relatively continuous episode of vibrations. In general, there is less sensitivity to single, discrete events than to continuous events or frequently repeated discrete events. Table 4 summarizes Caltrans criteria for assessing the effects of ground-borne vibration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Criteria</th>
<th>Threshold Condition</th>
<th>Peak Particle Velocity, inches/second Transient Sources</th>
<th>Peak Particle Velocity, inches/second Continuous or Frequent Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Response</td>
<td>Barely perceptible</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Response</td>
<td>Distinctly perceptible</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction activity can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the equipment and methods employed. Operation of construction equipment causes ground vibrations that propagate through the ground and diminish in strength with distance. Buildings founded on the soil in the vicinity of a construction site respond to these vibrations, with varying results ranging from no perceptible effects at the lowest levels, low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, and slight damage at the highest levels. In cases such as the 2012 SSA proposed action, where prolonged annoyance or damage from construction vibrations are not expected, a qualitative assessment is appropriate. Table 5 identifies some common sources of vibration, corresponding VdB levels and associated human perception and potential for structural damage.

**Table 5: Typical Levels of Groundborne Vibration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human/Structural Response</th>
<th>Velocity Level, VdB</th>
<th>Typical Events (at 50 feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Threshold, minor cosmetic damage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Blasting, pile driving, heavy tracked vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty with tasks such as reading a video or computer screen</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Commuter rail, upper range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential annoyance, infrequent</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Rapid transit, upper range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential annoyance, occasional</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Commuter rail, typical bus or track over bump or on rough roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential annoyance frequent</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Rapid transit, typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate human threshold of perception to vibration</td>
<td>60 – 70</td>
<td>Buses, trucks, and heavy street traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction of the 2012 proposed action will require the use of equipment such as jackhammers, small bulldozers, and rollers. The ground vibration levels associated with construction equipment that will be used during SSA construction are presented in Table 6.
Table 6: Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Peak Particle Velocity (inches/second)</th>
<th>Approximate Vibration Level (VdB) at 25 feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Roller</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large bulldozer</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded trucks</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bulldozer</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For the purposes of this 2012 SSA noise impact analysis, construction-related and operations-related vibration impacts would be considered significant if they involve any construction or ongoing operations activities that would create a vibration in excess of 0.2 inch per second or 94 VdB at the nearby sensitive receptors. The closest sensitive receptor is located approximately 708 feet away from the fiber optic cable installation disturbance area; therefore, it is expected that anticipated vibration levels generated by any onsite SSA construction equipment would attenuate to levels well below the vibration design goal of 0.2 inch per second or 94 VdB. Additionally, the public will not be exposed to direct groundborne construction vibration because most of the construction sites are within secured terminal areas that do not allow public access; some fence-line utility installation will take place outside the terminals within the industrial and transportation environment of the Port. The results of this current 2012 analysis are consistent with the results of the vibration analysis completed in March 2010 as a part of the IS/ND, which are that impacts associated with ground borne vibration levels would be less than significant.

c) Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. See preceding impact analysis a). The noise levels associated with operation of the SSA proposed action would not substantially differ from noise levels currently generated at marine terminals. The types of noise associated with loading and unloading of vessels, cargo trucking activities, freight train activity and truck traffic along nearby roadways and freeways would not be significantly increased with the SSA proposal. Therefore, impacts associated with a permanent increase in ambient noise levels would be less than significant.

d) Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. See impact analysis 12a), b), and c).

3.1.13 Population and Housing Environmental Setting

The May 2010 Adopted ND (pages 86, 87) addresses population and housing. The population and housing setting for the MUUP site is briefly described as an urban, industrial/developed area. The designated land use for the MUUP site is for General Industrial/Transportation-related uses. There are no residences located within the MUUP site.
Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP

a) Direct and Indirect Population Growth
The ND indicates that the MUUP would not involve constructing new housing or infrastructure that could directly or indirectly induce a substantial growth in population or housing. The proposed work would require construction personnel onsite, but workers would be onsite temporarily to work on the MUUP project, and would be expected to live within commuting distance. Construction methods would be industry standard, and it is expected that the need for construction personnel would be met in the Bay Area; thus, the utility upgrade project is not expected to increase local population by attracting specialized construction personnel to the area. Improvements associated with the MUUP are not expected to significantly change the number of employees working at the terminals; thus, it would not result in an increase in transplants to the area attracted by new job opportunities. The utility upgrade project is not expected to affect population and or housing growth. No impacts associated with this issue would occur.

b) Population and Housing Displacement
The MUUP site is currently used for industrial and transportation-related activities. No existing housing or people would be displaced as a result of the project implementation. No impact will occur.

2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Population / Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The population and housing impacts of the MUUP were evaluated in the Adopted ND. Impacts for population and housing were assessed as no impact. Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will result in similar impacts on population and housing. The SSA proposal will not raise any new substantial issues for population and housing, nor would it result in any new population and housing impacts or increase the severity of population and housing impacts identified in the Adopted ND. Impacts from the 2012 SSA proposal on population and housing represent no substantial change from the previous analysis.
3.1.14 Public Services

Environmental Setting
The May 2010 Adopted ND (pages 88, 89) addresses public services in relation to the MUUP site. The site is located in the City of Oakland. The City provides police and fire protection services for the Port area, with additional security provided by the U. S. Department of Homeland Security, U. S. Customs, and the U. S. Coast Guard. Each marine terminal also has an internal security system. The response times vary dependent upon the number of calls, at any given time, and the distance that responders have to travel. The police response time to the MUUP site for life threatening emergencies is usually less than five minutes and for the fire department it is approximately three to five minutes. There are no schools or parks located within the MUUP site. Middle Harbor Shoreline Park and Port View Park are Port-owned parks located at the Middle Harbor shoreline, and are surrounded by the Seaport.

Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP
a) Fire and Police Protection
The utility upgrade project would not result in a significant impact on the current level of public services for the area. The upgraded security system to be implemented as part of the MUUP is expected to reduce the occurrence of false alarms; thereby decreasing the number of incidents that would require police response. The utility upgrade project is not expected to increase the demand for fire and police protection for the Seaport because it is not expected to significantly increase the number of people working in the area on a permanent basis. No impact is anticipated.

b) Schools, Parks, and Other Public Facilities
The MUUP would not result in a significant impact on the current level of public services for the area. No increase in demand for school services, parks or other recreational facilities, or other public facilities (e.g., libraries) would occur as a result of the MUUP project. No impact would occur.

2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Public Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire Protection?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police Protection?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The impacts of the MUUP were evaluated in the Adopted ND. Impacts for public services were assessed as no impact. Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will result in similar impacts on public services. The SSA proposal will not raise any new substantial issues for public services, nor would it result in any new public service impacts or increase the severity of public service impacts identified in the Adopted ND. Impacts from the 2012 SSA proposal on public services represent no substantial change from the previous analysis.

3.1.15 Recreation
Environmental Setting
The May 2010 Adopted ND (page 90) addresses recreation in relation to the MUUP site. The MUUP site is designated a General Industrial/Transportation-related use area. There are no recreational facilities located within the MUUP site. The two closest parks in the vicinity are Middle Harbor Shoreline Park and Port View Park, which are Port-owned parks located along the Middle Harbor shoreline and surrounded by Port facilities.

Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP
a) Existing or Planned Neighborhood and Regional Parks and Other Recreational Facilities
The ND found that the MUUP would not cause a substantial increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other nearby recreational facilities. The utility upgrade project is not expected to affect population growth and would not significantly alter the number of employees working at the Port; thus, an increased demand on recreational facilities would not result. The proposed project does not include construction of new or an expansion of existing recreational facilities. No impact is anticipated to occur.

2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The recreation impacts of the MUUP were evaluated in the Adopted ND. Impacts for recreation were assessed as no impact. Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will result in similar impacts on recreation. The SSA proposal will not raise any new substantial issues for recreation, nor would it result in any new impacts or increase the severity of impacts identified in the Adopted ND. Impacts from the 2012 SSA proposal on recreation represent no substantial change from the previous analysis.
3.1.16 Transportation/Traffic

Environmental Setting

The May 2010 Adopted ND (pages 91-93) addresses transportation and traffic in relation to the MUUP site. Access to and from the MUUP site is via West Grand Ave., 7th Street, Middle Harbor Road, Maritime Street, Adeline Street and Market Street. Truck traffic follows local routes as designated in Section 10.52.070, of the City of Oakland Municipal Code. Trucks that serve the marine terminals can easily reach I-880 and I-980 via the access streets.

Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP

a) Applicable Plans, Ordinances or Policies Establishing Measures of Effectiveness for the Performance of the Circulation System; Applicable Congestion Management Program

The ND estimated that construction for the MUUP would require twenty to fifty construction workers on the site between 7:00 a.m. and 4:00 or 5:30 p.m. The proposed work is not expected to generate construction waste material, such as excess aggregate base or asphalt. However, should material need to be disposed of, it could be hauled to the Port's Materials Management Program maritime site that is currently located at the former Oakland Army Base, or to another approved facility.

The construction phase of the shore power element of the MUUP was estimated to generate more than 200 truck trips over a 12-month construction period. The intrusion detection system element was estimated to generate 50 truck trips over a 9-month construction period. Most of these trips would be less than 100 miles long, transporting project materials and supplies, or construction equipment, and would generally occur during normal working hours. The later phases of the shore power element would have similar impacts.

The utility upgrade project is not expected to result in additional maritime-related vehicle trips to and from the site after construction is completed because use of the site would not change. Throughput capacity is not expected to increase as a result of the MUUP, nor is the number of employees working at the terminal. Traffic would not be increased overall by construction of the improvements, therefore the utility upgrade project is not expected to have an impact on roadway capacity or create increased congestion in nearby intersections.

Truck traffic from the MUUP is not expected to increase enough to result in impacts on traffic flows during peak construction periods. No equipment would be parked on the street. Access to the surrounding properties would not be blocked as a result of the utility upgrade project. Temporary parking for vehicles and equipment associated with constructing the MUUP would be accommodated onsite during activities. Impacts are less than significant.

The MUUP was not expected to result in an impact on the level-of-service standards on nearby roadways or highways. Impacts were determined to be less than significant.

b) Air Traffic Patterns

No increase or change in air traffic would occur as a result of the MUUP. No impact would, therefore, occur.
c) Hazards due to a Design Feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or Incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); Inadequate Emergency Access

No design feature of the MUUP would substantially increase hazards to vehicular circulation or access to the site. The utility upgrade project is an industrial transportation-related use of the site. The infrastructure for the shore power and the upgraded perimeter security system would be located within the maritime area. Neither element of the MUUP would involve design changes to existing roadways or intersections.

The MUUP would not have an effect on emergency access as the proposed work would not change existing emergency access for the project site. No impact will occur.

d) Parking Capacity

The MUUP would not have an effect on parking capacity because it would not result in a permanent, significant increase in vehicular use of the utility upgrade project site or the within the project area. No impact was anticipated.

e) Potential Conflict with Adopted Policies, Plans or Programs supporting Alternative Transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)

The proposed project would not affect nor be affected by adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. No impact was anticipated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Transportation / Traffic</td>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Issues</td>
<td>New Significant Impact</td>
<td>More Severe Impacts</td>
<td>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The transportation/traffic impacts of the MUUP were evaluated in the Adopted ND. Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will result in similar or lesser impacts for transportation and traffic, and will raise no new substantial issues for transportation and traffic. The adopted ND found all transportation/traffic impacts for the MUUP to have no impact, with the exception of significance threshold 16(a) and (b), which were determined to have less than significant impacts.

The construction phase for the SSA proposal to install the fiber optic infrastructure is anticipated to last only 18 weeks, a much shorter duration than the MUUP. An estimated maximum 10 construction workers are expected to be onsite for SSA construction during the construction phase. This represents one-fifth to one-half of the 20 to 50 workers required for MUUP construction. Transportation/traffic impacts from the 2012 SSA proposed action represent no substantial change from the previous analysis.

3.1.17 Utilities and Service Systems

Environmental Setting

The May 2010 Adopted ND (pages 94-96) addresses utilities and service systems in relation to the MUUP site, and describes the utilities and service systems setting for the MUUP site and Port of Oakland. The Port serves as an electric utility company at Berths 55-59, the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway intermodal rail terminal and surrounding properties. Pacific Gas and Electric Company provides all other electricity and natural gas service in the seaport area. The East Bay Municipal Utility District provides water and sewer service.

The MUUP includes the potential for modifications to the existing electricity and natural gas infrastructure at the Port. During construction for the MUUP, it is expected that temporary disruptions to electricity and/or natural gas service in the immediate vicinity could occur as the improvements are made. These disruptions would be short-term in duration, and normal electricity and/or natural gas service would resume upon the completion of the improvements. These disruptions are not expected to occur during SSA construction.

Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP

a) Wastewater Treatment Requirements of the Applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board; Water or Wastewater Treatment Facilities or Expansion of Existing Facilities

The MUUP contractor would be required to implement Best Management Practices (Table 2 in this IS/Addendum) and follow the provisions of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to minimize any impact from storm water runoff during construction activities. Improvements to the berths and the perimeter areas would not result in increased flow of waste water or storm water runoff after construction is complete, and would not exceed existing capacity. The MUUP
improvements would not generate a demand for water or wastewater services greater than the existing demand for current terminal operations. No impacts are expected.

b) Storm Water Drainage Facilities; Water Supply

See analysis for item a) above. No impact is expected.

c) Landfill Capacity and Compliance with Statutes and Regulations Related to Solid Waste

Solid waste demand is not expected to increase from implementation of the MUUP. The utility upgrade project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. No impact would occur.

2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Utilities / Service Systems</td>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The utility and service system impacts of the MUUP were evaluated in the Adopted ND. Impacts for utilities and service systems were assessed as no impact. Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will result in similar impacts on utilities and service systems. The SSA proposal will not raise any new substantial issues for utilities and service systems, nor would it result in any new impacts or increase the severity of impacts identified in the Adopted ND. Impacts from
the 2012 SSA proposal on utilities and service systems represent no substantial change from the previous analysis.

3.1.18 Mandatory Findings of Significance

Summary of Adopted ND Analysis for MUUP

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

The ND states (page 97) that all impacts associated with the MUUP were fully identified in the ND. The utility upgrade project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, all impacts associated with the MUUP for this CEQA threshold would be less than significant.

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

The ND states (page 98) that all impacts associated with the MUUP have been fully identified in the ND. No impacts have been identified that would be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation is required. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

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

No environmental effects from the MUUP would occur that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, impacts associated with this issue were determined to be less than significant.

2012 SSA Project Discussion and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
<td>□️</td>
<td>□️</td>
<td>□️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change From Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** The impacts of MUUP development were evaluated in the Adopted ND. MUUP biological resource impacts were mostly no impact, with a single less than significant determination. Implementing fiber optic infrastructure improvements under the 2012 SSA proposal will result in similar impacts on biological resources, and will have no cumulatively considerable or substantially adverse impacts in any category. The SSA proposal does not raise any new substantial issues, nor would it result in any new impacts or increase the severity of impacts identified in the Adopted ND. Impacts from the 2012 SSA proposal result in no substantial change from the previous analysis detailed in the Adopted ND.
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For Information Only to Provide Historical Context. No Shore-Side Electrical System Improvements are Proposed as Part of the 2012 SSA Proposed Action.
PORT OF OAKLAND
MARITIME UTILITIES UPGRADE
PROJECT
ADDENDUM

FIGURE 6
ADOPTED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
PERIMETER INTRUSION DETECTION
SYSTEM
FIBER INFRASTRUCTURE OVERVIEW
PORT OF OAKLAND
MARITIME UTILITIES UPGRADE
PROJECT ADDENDUM

FIGURE 7
PROJECT CONSTRUCTION RECEIVED SOUND LEVELS

Legend
- Proposed Fiber Optic Line
- Proposed Laydown Yard
- Noise Sensitive Receptors

Sound Levels
- 46 - 50 dBA
- 50 - 55 dBA
- 55 - 60 dBA
- 60 - 65 dBA
- 65 - 70 dBA
- >70 dBA

Date: 3/16/2012 3:37:30 PM
Path: P:\GIS\Projects\8111_Port_of_Oakland\7_Sound_Levels.mxd