

Appendix D

**San Francisco Bay Plan Consistency Analysis**

---

Bay Plan Policy	Land Use Consistency Analysis	Project Consistent With Policy?
<b>Protection of the Shoreline</b>		
<p><i>Policy 2:</i> Riprap revetments, the most common shoreline protective structure, should be constructed of properly sized and placed material that meet sound engineering criteria for durability, density, and porosity. Armor materials used in the revetment should be placed according to accepted engineering practice, and be free of extraneous material, such as debris and reinforcing steel. Generally, only engineered quarystone or concrete pieces that have either been specially cast or carefully selected for size, density, durability, and freedom of extraneous materials from demolition debris will meet these requirements. Riprap revetments constructed out of other debris materials should not be authorized.</p>	<p>The proposed project would construct a concrete secant pile wall, the details of which would be determined following geotechnical explorations and analysis. The seawall would be constructed of properly sized and placed material that meets engineering criteria for durability, density, and porosity. Construction methods and materials proposed would be required to comply with local, state, and federal regulations.</p>	Yes
<b>Water-Related Industry</b>		
<p><i>Policy 1:</i> Sites designated for both water-related industry and port uses in the Bay Plan should be reserved for those industries and port uses that require navigable, deep water for receiving materials or shipping products by water in order to gain a significant transportation cost advantage.</p>	<p>The project site is not designated as a water-related industry or port area (in Plan Map 4) in the Bay Plan.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Policy 3.</i> Land reserved for both water-related industry and port use will be developed over a period of years. Other uses may be allowed in the interim that, by their cost and duration, would not preempt future use of the site for waterrelated industry or port use.</p>	<p>The project site is not designated as a water-related industry or port area (in Plan Map 4) in the Bay Plan. However, the proposed project would construct a centralized facility that serves the maintenance requirements of the WETA ferry fleet, and is consistent with City of Alameda General Plan.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Policy 4:</i> Water-related industry and port sites should be planned and managed so as to avoid wasteful use of the limited supply of waterfront land. The following principles should be followed to the maximum extent feasible in planning for water-related industry and port use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Extensive use of the shoreline for storage of raw materials, fuel, products, or waste should not be permitted on a long-term basis. If required, such storage areas should generally either be at right angles to the main direction of the shoreline or be as far inland as feasible, so other use of the shoreline may be made possible.</li> <li>b) Where large acreages are available, site planning should strive to provide access to the shoreline for all future plants and port facilities that might locate in the same area. (As a general rule, therefore, the longest dimension of plant sites should be at right angles to the shoreline.) Marine terminals should also be shared</li> </ul>	<p>The project site is not designated as a water-related industry or port area (in Plan Map 4) in the Bay Plan. The proposed project would reuse a former industrial site consistent with City general planning designations at Alameda Point.</p>	Yes

Bay Plan Policy	Land Use Consistency Analysis	Project Consistent With Policy?
<p>as much as possible among industries and port uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) Waste treatment ponds for water-related industry and port uses should occupy as little land as possible, be above the highest recorded level of tidal action, and be as far removed from the shoreline as possible.</li> <li>d) Any new highways, railroads, or rapid transit lines in existing or future water-related industrial and port areas should be located sufficiently far away from the waterfront so as not to interfere with industrial use of the waterfront. New access roads to waterfront industrial and port areas should be approximately at right angles to the shoreline, topography permitting.</li> </ul>		
<p><i>Policy 5:</i> Water-related industry and port uses should be planned so as to make the sites attractive (as well as economically important) uses of the shoreline. The following criteria should be employed to the maximum extent possible:</p>	<p>The project site is not designated as a water-related industry or port area (in Plan Map 4) in the Bay Plan. Refer to Section III, Air Quality and Section IX, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> for a discussion of air and water regulatory compliance requirements.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Air and water pollution should be minimized through strict compliance with all relevant laws, policies and standards. Mitigation, consistent with the Commission’s policy concerning mitigation, should be provided for all unavoidable adverse environmental impacts.</li> <li>b) When bayfront hills are used for water-related industries, terracing should generally be required and leveling of the hills should not be permitted.</li> <li>c) Important Bay overlook points, and historic areas and structures that may be located in water-related industrial and port areas, should be preserved and incorporated into the site design, if at all feasible. In addition, shoreline not actually used for shipping facilities should be used for some type of public access or recreation, to the maximum extent feasible. Public areas need not be directly accessible by private automobiles with attendant parking lots and driveways; access may be provided by hiking paths or by forms of public transit such as elephant trains or aerial tramways.</li> <li>d) Regulations, tax arrangements, or other devices should be drawn in a manner that encourages industries and port uses to meet the</li> </ul>		

Bay Plan Policy foregoing objectives	Land Use Consistency Analysis	Project Consistent With Policy?
<p><i>Policy 6:</i> The Commission, together with the relevant local governments, should cooperatively plan for use of vacant and underutilized water-related industrial priority use areas. Such planning should include regional, state and federal interests where appropriate, as well as public and special interest groups. Resulting plans should include: (a) a program for joint use of waterfront facilities where this is beneficial and feasible; (b)-a regulatory or management program for reserving the entire waterfront site or parcel for water-related industrial and port use; and (c) a program for minimizing the environmental impacts of future industrial and port development. Such plans, if approved by the relevant local governments and by the Commission, could be amended into the Bay Plan as special area plans.</p>	<p>The project site is not located in a water-related industrial priority use area; however, the proposed project does include regional, state and federal interests by constructing a centralized facility to maintain WETA’s ferry fleet as well as an EOC to serve passengers and sustain water transit service for emergency response and recovery.</p>	Yes
<p><b>Transportation</b></p>		
<p><i>Policy 1:</i> Because of the continuing vulnerability of the Bay to filling for transportation projects, the Commission should continue to take an active role in Bay Area regional transportation and related land use planning affecting the Bay, particularly to encourage alternative methods of transportation and land use planning efforts that support transit and that do not require fill. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the California Department of Transportation, the California Transportation Commission, the Federal Highway Administration, county congestion management agencies and other public and private transportation authorities should avoid planning or funding roads that would require fill in the Bay and certain waterways.</p>	<p>The proposed project is part of WETA’s transbay ferry expansion program by constructing a centralized facility that serves WETA’s ferry fleet, OCC, and EOC, and therefore supports alternative methods of transportation.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Policy 4:</i> Transportation projects on the Bay shoreline and bridges over the Bay or certain waterways should include pedestrian and bicycle paths that will either be a part of the Bay Trail or connect the Bay Trail with other regional and community trails. Transportation projects should be designed to maintain and enhance visual and physical access to the Bay and along the Bay shoreline.</p>	<p>In consultation with BCDC, the project proposes to implement one, or a combination thereof, of the following three Bay Trail access improvement options to improve public access and recreational opportunities in and around Alameda Point:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contribute funding to provide signage, striping, and plastic bollards to connect the existing Bay Trail to an interim trail around the secure MARAD facilities.</li> <li>2. Establish a new Bay Trail overlook area that would include benches, a decorative fence, and landscaping</li> </ol>	Yes

Bay Plan Policy	Land Use Consistency Analysis	Project Consistent With Policy?
<p><i>Policy 5:</i> Ferry terminals should be sited at locations that are near navigable channels, would not rapidly fill with sediment and would not significantly impact tidal marshes, tidal flats or other valuable wildlife habitat. Wherever possible, terminals should be located near higher density, mixed-use development served by public transit. Terminal parking facilities should be set back from the shoreline to allow for public access and enjoyment of the Bay.</p>	<p>at the southeast portion of the existing park.</p> <p>3. Widen sidewalks on West Hornet Avenue (with landscaping) and provide an additional bike lane leading towards the current location of the USS Hornet.</p> <p>Refer to Section I, Aesthetics, for a discussion on impacts to visual resources in the project area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Public Access</b></p>	<p>Public access to the site would be inconsistent with public safety considerations. In compliance with US Coast Guard and WETA requirements the site would be fully fenced for safety and security. However, in partnership with the City of Alameda, WETA would make improvements to the Bay Trail to improve public access and trail connectivity throughout Alameda Point. The City of Alameda plans to complete the Bay Trail from the vicinity of the project through to the new location of USS Hornet outside the secure MARAD facility. Thus public access around the site would be maintained through West Hornet Avenue and the Bay Trail and access would be provided to the maximum extent feasible consistent with the appropriate need for safety and security relative to both WETA's facility and for MARAD.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Bay Plan Policy	Land Use Consistency Analysis	Project Consistent With Policy?
<p><i>Policy 3:</i> Public access to some natural areas should be provided to permit study and enjoyment of these areas. However, some wildlife are sensitive to human intrusion. For this reason, projects in such areas should be carefully evaluated in consultation with appropriate agencies to determine the appropriate location and type of access to be provided.</p>	<p>As part of the project, and in partnership with the City of Alameda, WETA would make improvements to the Bay Trail to improve public access and trail connectivity throughout Alameda Point, including providing signage and striping along the shoreline.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Policy 4:</i> Public access should be sited, designed and managed to prevent significant adverse effects on wildlife. To the extent necessary to understand the potential effects of public access on wildlife, information on the species and habitats of a proposed project site should be provided, and the likely human use of the access area analyzed. In determining the potential for significant adverse effects (such as impacts on endangered species, impacts on breeding and foraging areas, or fragmentation of wildlife corridors), site specific information provided by the project applicant, the best available scientific evidence, and expert advice should be used. In addition, the determination of significant adverse effects may also be considered within a regional context. Siting, design and management strategies should be employed to avoid or minimize adverse effects on wildlife, informed by the advisory principles in the Public Access Design Guidelines. If significant adverse effects cannot be avoided or reduced to a level below significance through siting, design and management strategies, then in lieu public access should be provided, consistent with the project and providing public access benefits equivalent to those that would have been achieved from on-site access. Where appropriate, effects of public access on wildlife should be monitored over time to determine whether revisions of management strategies are needed.</p>	<p>The proposed improvements to the Bay Trail would not cause significant adverse effects on wildlife. Refer to Section IV, <i>Biological Resources</i>, for a discussion on impacts to sensitive biological resources in the project area.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Policy 5:</i> Whenever public access to the Bay is provided as a condition of development, on fill or on the shoreline, the access should be permanently guaranteed. This should be done wherever appropriate by requiring dedication of fee title or easements at no cost to the public, in the same manner that streets, park sites, and school sites are dedicated to the public as part of the subdivision process in cities and counties.</p>	<p>The proposed project would implement one, or a combination thereof, three Bay Trail access improvement options to improve public access and recreational opportunities in and around Alameda Point. In addition, the project is required to obtain a BCDC permit as a condition of project approval; therefore, the project would be consistent with this Bay Plan policy.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Policy 6:</i> Public access improvements provided as a condition of any approval should be consistent with the project and the physical environment, including protection of Bay natural resources, such as aquatic life, wildlife and plant communities, and provide for the public's safety and convenience. The improvements should be designed and built</p>	<p>The proposed project would implement one, or a combination thereof, three Bay Trail access improvement options to improve public access and recreational opportunities in and around Alameda Point. In addition, the project is required to obtain a BCDC permit as a</p>	Yes

Bay Plan Policy	Land Use Consistency Analysis	Project Consistent With Policy?
<p>to encourage diverse Bay-related activities and movement to and along the shoreline, should permit barrier free access for the physically handicapped to the maximum feasible extent, should include an ongoing maintenance program, and should be identified with appropriate signs.</p>	<p>condition of project approval; therefore, the project would be consistent with this Bay Plan policy</p>	
<p><i>Policy 7:</i> In some areas, a small amount of fill may be allowed if the fill is necessary and is the minimum absolutely required to develop the project in accordance with the Commission’s public access requirements.</p>	<p>The overwater coverage of the existing structures at the project site is approximately 20,220 SF and the total overwater coverage of the new facility is estimated to be approximately 20,000 SF; therefore, the project would slightly decrease overwater coverage areas in the Bay.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Policy 8:</i> Access to and along the waterfront should be provided by walkways, trails, or other appropriate means and connect to the nearest public thoroughfare where convenient parking or public transportation may be available. Diverse and interesting public access experiences should be provided which would encourage users to remain in the designated access areas to avoid or minimize potential adverse effects on wildlife and their habitat.</p>	<p>The proposed project would implement one, or a combination thereof, three Bay Trail access improvement options to improve public access and recreational opportunities in and around Alameda Point.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Policy 10:</i> Federal, state, regional, and local jurisdictions, special districts, and the Commission should cooperate to provide appropriately sited, designed and managed public access, especially to link the entire series of shoreline parks, regional trail systems (such as the San Francisco Bay Trail) and existing public access areas to the extent feasible without additional Bay filling and without significant adverse effects on Bay natural resources. State, regional, and local agencies that approve projects should assure that provisions for public access to and along the shoreline are included as conditions of approval and that the access is consistent with the Commission’s requirements and guidelines.</p>	<p>The City of Alameda plans to complete the Bay Trail from the vicinity of the project through to the new location of USS Hornet outside the secure MARAD facility. As part of the proposed project, WETA would make improvements to the Bay Trail to maintain public access to the maximum extent feasible, consistent with the appropriate need for safety and security relative to both WETA’s facility and for MARAD.</p>	Yes
<p><i>Policy 11:</i> The Public Access Design Guidelines should be used as a guide to siting and designing public access consistent with a proposed project. The Design Review Board should advise the Commission regarding the adequacy of the public access proposed.</p>	<p>WETA would be required to obtain a permit from BCDC as a condition of project approval and BCDC’s Design Review Board would review, evaluate, and advise on the proposed design of the project to determine accordance with Bay Plan policies. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this Bay Plan policy.</p>	Yes
<b>Dredging</b>		
<p><i>Policy 1:</i> Dredging and dredged material disposal should be conducted in an environmentally and economically sound manner. Dredgers should reduce disposal in the Bay and certain waterways over time to achieve the</p>	<p>The proposed project would require approximately 26,000 cubic yards of dredged material; maintenance dredging would be required once every 5 to 10 years.</p>	Yes

Bay Plan Policy	Land Use Consistency Analysis	Project Consistent With Policy?
<p>LTMS goal of limiting in-Bay disposal volumes to a maximum of one million cubic yards per year. The LTMS agencies should implement a system of disposal allotments to individual dredgers to achieve this goal only if voluntary efforts are not effective in reaching the LTMS goal. In making its decision regarding disposal allocations, the Commission should confer with the LTMS agencies and consider the need for the dredging and the dredging projects, environmental impacts, regional economic impacts, efforts by the dredging community to implement and fund alternatives to in-Bay disposal, and other relevant factors. Small dredgers should be exempted from allotments, but all dredgers should comply with policies 2 through 12.</p>	<p>Dredge material would be disposed of in either the SF-DOD or Hamilton. Soil sampling would be conducted before disposal of dredged material. The amount of dredged material compared with the total estimated by the LTMS program is minimal and there is adequate capacity at potential disposal locations to accommodate a small increase in dredge material. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to comply with DMMO regulations.</p>	
<p><i>Policy 2:</i> Dredging should be authorized when the Commission can find: (a) the applicant has demonstrated that the dredging is needed to serve a water-oriented use or other important public purpose, such as navigational safety; (b) the materials to be dredged meet the water quality requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board; (c) important fisheries and Bay natural resources would be protected through seasonal restrictions established by the California Department of Fish and Game, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service, or through other appropriate measures; (d) the siting and design of the project will result in the minimum dredging volume necessary for the project; and (e) the materials would be disposed of in accordance with Policy 3.</p>	<p>The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable local, state, and federal requirements. WETA would obtain permits from BCDC, USACE, RWQCB, USFWS, and NMFS as a condition of project approval. Refer to Table 2-1 for permitting requirements.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><i>Policy 3:</i> Dredged materials should, if feasible, be reused or disposed outside the Bay and certain waterways. Except when reused in an approved fill project, dredged material should not be disposed in the Bay and certain waterways unless disposal outside these areas is infeasible and the Commission finds: (a) the volume to be disposed is consistent with applicable dredger disposal allocations and disposal site limits adopted by the Commission by regulation; (b) disposal would be at a site designated by the Commission; (c) the quality of the material disposed of is consistent with the advice of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board and the inter-agency Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO); and (d) the period of disposal is consistent with the advice of the California Department of Fish and Game, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service.</p>	<p>Dredge material would be disposed of in either the SF-DOD or Hamilton. WETA would be required to comply with BCDC and DMMO regulations.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Bay Plan Policy	Land Use Consistency Analysis	Project Consistent With Policy?
<p><i>Policy 4:</i> If an applicant proposes to dispose dredged material in tidal areas of the Bay and certain waterways that exceeds either disposal site limits or any disposal allocation that the Commission has adopted by regulation, the applicant must demonstrate that the potential for adverse environmental impact is insignificant and that non-tidal and ocean disposal is infeasible because there are no alternative sites available or likely to be available in a reasonable period, or because the cost of disposal at alternate sites is prohibitive. In making its decision whether to authorize such in-Bay disposal, the Commission should confer with the LTMS agencies and consider the factors listed in Policy 1.</p>	<p>Dredge material would be disposed of in either the SF-DOD or Hamilton. WETA would be required to comply with BCDC and DMMO regulations.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><i>Policy 5:</i> To ensure adequate capacity for necessary Bay dredging projects and to protect Bay natural resources, acceptable non-tidal disposal sites should be secured and the Deep Ocean Disposal Site should be maintained. Further, dredging projects should maximize use of dredged material as a resource consistent with protecting and enhancing Bay natural resources, such as creating, enhancing, or restoring tidal and managed wetlands, creating and maintaining levees and dikes, providing cover and sealing material for sanitary landfills, and filling at approved construction sites.</p>	<p>Dredge material would be disposed of in either the SF-DOD or Hamilton. WETA would be required to comply with BCDC and DMMO regulations.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><i>Policy 6:</i> Dredged materials disposed in the Bay and certain waterways should be carefully managed to ensure that the specific location, volumes, physical nature of the material, and timing of disposal do not create navigational hazards, adversely affect Bay sedimentation, currents or natural resources, or foreclose the use of the site for projects critical to the economy of the Bay Area.</p>	<p>Dredging (both new and maintenance) activities would be conducted during sensitive environmental work windows per LTMS guidance. WETA would obtain RWQCB, USACE, and BCDC permits as a condition of project approval.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><i>Policy 7:</i> All proposed channels, berths, turning basins, and other dredging projects should be carefully designed so as not to undermine the stability of any adjacent dikes, fills or fish and wildlife habitats</p>	<p>Dredging (both new and maintenance) activities would be conducted during sensitive environmental work windows per LTMS guidance. WETA would obtain RWQCB, USACE, and BCDC permits as a condition of project approval.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><i>Policy 9:</i> To protect underground fresh water reservoirs (aquifers): (a) all proposals for dredging or construction work that could penetrate the mud "cover" should be reviewed by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board and the State Department of Water Resources; and (b) dredging or construction work should not be permitted that might reasonably be expected to damage an underground water reservoir. Applicants for permission to dredge should provide additional data on</p>	<p>The proposed project would be required to comply with RWQCB and BCDC requirements as a condition of project approval.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Bay Plan Policy	Land Use Consistency Analysis	Project Consistent With Policy?
groundwater conditions in the area of construction to the extent necessary and reasonable in relation to the proposed project.		
<b>Fills in Accord with the Bay Plan</b>		
<p>Fills in Accord with Bay Plan. A proposed project should be approved if the filling is the minimum necessary to achieve its purpose, and if it meets one of the following three conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The filling is in accord with the Bay Plan policies as to the Bay-related purposes for which filling may be needed (i.e., ports, water-related industry, and water-related recreation) and is shown on the Bay Plan maps as likely to be needed; or</li> <li>b) The filling is in accord with Bay Plan policies as to purposes for which some fill may be needed if there is no other alternative (i.e., airports, roads, and utility routes); or</li> <li>c) The filling is in accord with the Bay Plan policies as to minor fills for improving shoreline appearance or public access.</li> </ul>	<p>The overwater coverage of the existing structures at the project site is approximately 20,220 SF and the total overwater coverage of the new facility is estimated to be approximately 20,000 SF; therefore, the project would slightly decrease overwater coverage areas in the Bay. The proposed project would be required to obtain a BCDC and USACE permit as a condition for project approval.</p>	Yes