

3.7 LAND USE

This section describes the existing land uses and communities around the Bay Area potentially involved with the project. The environmental setting of this report is divided into four sections: (1) the regional setting of the Bay Area; (2) the existing land use setting of each potential ferry terminal site; (3) a description of the land use and community resources potentially affected; and (4) the regulatory setting.

The regional setting is based largely on the data provided by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) in their publication *Projections 2002* (ABAG 2001). The existing land use setting of each proposed terminal location is based on a summary review of city and county general plans, regional census data, and other terminal site information already gathered by ARUP (ARUP 2001) for the WTA ferry expansion project. The data collection process focused primarily on the local settings.

A variety of land use and community attributes were identified for each community within which a potential ferry terminal facility is proposed or would be expanded as a result of the project. Most of the land use information was acquired from general plans. Existing land uses as well as planned future developments were identified. To expedite the data gathering process, a questionnaire was developed and mailed out to the planning department of each local jurisdiction (see Appendix LU-A). Planning agencies were requested to respond to the questionnaire. Follow-up phone calls were made to gather missing information.

Census data from the 2000 Census were reviewed to help describe the potentially affected communities with respect to race/ethnicity and income. Specifically, low-income and minority communities were identified to evaluate whether the proposed project could result in disproportionate adverse effects on these communities.

Table 3.7.1 contains a summary of the land use data collected for each potential terminal location. Table 3.7.2 contains the racial summary of each community potentially affected by the project. Table 3.7.3 compares the median income of each community potentially affected by the project to the low-income threshold for the county. Table 3.7.4 presents the census tracts considered to be minority and/or low-income communities.

3.7.1 Environmental Setting

3.7.1.1 Regional Setting

The San Francisco Bay Area consists of nine counties that cover roughly 4.5 million acres. According to ABAG, approximately 17 percent of this total acreage had been developed by the year 2000. Most of the Bay Area's population and economy is situated along the perimeter of San Francisco Bay (the Bay) in the older, larger cities such as San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose. However, the majority of new residential and commercial land use development is occurring in the peripheral cities located in the valleys surrounding the Bay, such as Santa Rosa, Fairfield, and Livermore (ABAG 2001).

The communities in the Bay Area situated along the waterfront, such as those that could be involved with the proposed project, were historically focused on industrial and commercial land use. Many of the rail lines that serviced these areas still run along large stretches of Bay

shoreline, and large areas of cities still have active industrial areas on the waterfront. More recently, portions of the Bay shoreline have been the focus of redevelopment projects and recreational projects to renew people's connection to the Bay. ABAG is working on the San Francisco Bay Trail, which will one day provide a continuous recreational trail around the Bay. Industrial and commercial land uses have also continued to develop, but in more select areas around the Bay.

3.7.1.2 Existing Land Uses at Proposed Terminal Sites

The expansion and enhancement of ferry services would affect a wide range of land uses and communities along the Bay shoreline. Brief descriptions of potential local settings for new or enhanced terminal locations are provided below. The descriptions note when planning departments have identified potential changes in land use for a particular area, as some areas may have changed by the time a ferry terminal site is considered. The numbers in parentheses correspond to terminal locations shown on Figure 2.1. More detail on each potential ferry terminal site is contained in Tables 3.7.1 through 3.7.3.

Alameda – Harbor Bay (14)	The existing ferry terminal at Harbor Bay Parkway and Mecartney Road on the northwest side of Bay Farm Island, Alameda, is located within a single-family residential area. The terminal was built as a requirement of the part of the Harbor Bay Business Park development, an employment center for 85 companies located approximately one-half mile south of the terminal site.
Alameda Main Street (15)	The existing ferry terminal is located on Main Street along the Oakland Estuary. The site is between the former U.S. Naval Air Station Alameda and the Alameda Gateway site. Due to redevelopment plans for these areas, significant changes will occur including mixed-use business park development with office, commercial, and light industrial uses.
Pittsburg/Antioch (46)	A potential ferry terminal could be located at the marina in Antioch. The site is surrounded by a parking lot, boat slips, restaurants, and commercial uses. Adjacent to the marina is a downtown setting with commercial, office, and residential land uses. Alternatively, a ferry terminal could be located at the Pittsburg Marina/Central Harbor, Contra Costa County. The waterfront area is immediately adjacent to the downtown core of Pittsburg with urban commercial and residential areas. There are few visual and physical connections between downtown and the water.
Berkeley/Albany (7)	This terminal site would be located at the foot of University Avenue. The area includes a marina, restaurants, and a hotel, as well as recreational uses.
Hercules/Rodeo (28)	Hercules is a rapidly growing city stretching from San Pablo Bay to the rolling coastal hills. The City of Hercules has proposed mixed-use development along the waterfront, primarily single-family residential and commercial. The Rodeo Marina is surrounded by a retail, commercial, and residential area and the Lone Tree Regional Shoreline.

- Larkspur (1)** The existing ferry terminal complex in Larkspur, Marin County, includes four vessel slips, a parking lot, bus parking, fuel storage, and maintenance and administration offices. Across the street is Larkspur Landing, an outdoor shopping complex with retail businesses and restaurants.
- Vallejo/Mare Island (25)** A ferry terminal is proposed for service to Mare Island, a former naval shipyard. The island currently has many old military buildings, some of which are occupied by businesses and some of which are vacant or closed. Reuse plans call for creating a job center with mixed land uses such as industrial and office as well as residential units, a regional park, expansion of the golf course, and the construction of a bridge at the southern end of the island.
- Martinez (24)** A ferry terminal is proposed in the vicinity of the Martinez Yacht Harbor at the end of North Court Street. The harbor extends into the Carquinez Strait and is surrounded by the Martinez Regional Shoreline Park to the east and west and the Martinez Waterfront Park to the south. The parks form a half-mile buffer between downtown Martinez and the harbor. Other potential sites could include areas near the Martinez Intermodal Station.
- Mission Bay (12)** Ferry service is proposed to the Mission Bay Redevelopment Area, approximately 1 mile southeast of downtown San Francisco. The site is currently an industrial area and former rail yard proposed for redevelopment as a dense urban neighborhood with housing, offices, retail, parks, and a school.
- Oakland/Jack London Square (16)** The existing ferry terminal is at the end of Clay Street within the commercial/retail district of Jack London Square. This active area includes restaurants, small shops, entertainment, residential units, and office space and is within walking distance of downtown Oakland.
- Oyster Point (19)** A ferry terminal is proposed at the end of Oyster Point Boulevard in the Oyster Point Marina/Park. The marina is surrounded by a shoreline park extending north and south along the Bay. The area inland of this park includes primarily low-density offices, technology parks, and light industrial areas with very few housing units.
- Redwood City (21)** The proposed ferry terminal site in Redwood City is on a narrow spit of land adjacent to Redwood Creek and surrounded by wetlands and salt evaporation beds. Commercial development is the primary land use planned for the area, including a large existing development at Pacific Shores. The Port of Redwood City is serving a growing industrial role for the delivery of bulk construction materials to the South Bay.
- Richmond (4)** Given Richmond's extensive waterfront, there are a variety of potential locations for a ferry terminal, including the existing decommissioned terminal at the end of Harbor Way South. The shoreline in the vicinity of the existing terminal includes a vacant parking lot, debilitated historical industrial factory, the Port of Richmond shipping yard, a small park, and R&D office facilities. Redevelopment of this area may include new land

- uses such as office, research and development, residential, mixed-use development, parks, promenades, and open space.
- Sausalito (3)** The existing ferry terminal is located in the middle of downtown Sausalito, Marin County, and is easily accessible from the shopping area of central downtown. The picturesque town includes boutiques, restaurants and public parks. Multifamily housing dominates the nearby residential area.
- San Francisco Ferry Building (20)** The historic San Francisco Ferry Building is currently being redeveloped as a major retail/commercial structure. The project will result in new and improved ferry terminal facilities and enhanced public access and aesthetic character. The surrounding area includes high-rise buildings with offices, retail, and restaurants.
- Tiburon (2)** The existing Tiburon ferry terminal is located on the west end of Tiburon near the Belvedere border and looks directly across to Angel Island. Main Street, the downtown retail area with boutiques, restaurants, and other small-scale retail, is directly adjacent to the terminal. An adjoining multiple-unit residential area quickly gives way to lower-density residential as the distance from downtown increases.
- Treasure Island (6)** A ferry terminal is proposed on Treasure Island, in San Francisco Bay between San Francisco and Oakland. The island is composed of the natural island of Yerba Buena and the artificial Treasure Island. The site is a decommissioned military base with offices, housing, warehouses, and other structures. The Draft Reuse Plan emphasizes publicly oriented uses such as recreation, entertainment, retail, and hospitality.
- Vallejo (25)** The existing Vallejo ferry terminal provides service from Mare Island Way in Memorial Park. The terminal is adjacent to Vallejo's city hall, main post office, and library and is close to downtown Vallejo. In addition, the redevelopment of Mare Island may generate increased ferry ridership. Buildout of the former base will include a variety of uses including residential, wetland research center, regional park, an 18-hole golf course, dredge ponds, schools, and light industrial.

3.7.1.3 *Potentially Affected Land Uses and Communities*

This section describes the range of identified land use and community attributes potentially affected by the Proposed Project. The discussions of the first three sections on land use designations, zoning, and future developments summarize the data presented in Table 3.7.1. The discussion on race and ethnicity is supported by Table 3.7.2, and the discussion on income is supported by Table 3.7.3.

Land Use Designations

The Proposed Project would potentially affect a wide range of land use designations. Most of the terminals that already exist are designated as Public Institutional, Public Facility, Public Trust, or Parks and Open Space, and are compatible with the policies of the local general plan.

The land use patterns along the waterfronts of the various cities and counties was generally consistent, with the Industrial and Open Space/Recreational land use designations being the most common. This is consistent with the historical uses and present goals for use along the Bay shoreline. Interestingly, many of the areas surrounding the existing ferry terminals had these same designations, which may be attributed to the fact that many city and county planning agencies consider ferry terminals to be consistent land uses in industrial and open space/recreation areas.

The exact locations of many of the proposed new ferry terminal sites are unknown at this time. These sites could be located in a variety of places along the shoreline within each city or county. However, most of the proposed new terminal locations are in areas with existing maritime characters and can be considered “mixed-use,” as more than one type of land use is designated along the waterfront. Most of the mixed uses are dominated by industrial uses, which are mixed with commercial and residential land uses.

Although most of the locations where new ferry service is proposed are defined by the presence of a population center, residential land uses are not common directly on the shoreline.

Zoning

Zoning ordinances support the land use designations in a local general plan. Zoning details the allowable use of a parcel, to ensure that it is used consistently with the general plan. Just as the proposed project would involve a large range of land use designations, it would also require compliance with a large range of related zoning regulations. As stated above, the existing ferry terminal facilities tend to be compatible with industrial and open space/recreation land uses. This may be attributed to the fact that ferry terminals are considered allowable uses in these areas by the local zoning ordinances. The zoning regulations that support commercially designated areas may also state ferry terminals as an allowable use.

Future Developments

Some of the proposed new ferry terminal sites would be located in areas where a Specific Plan, Master Plan, Management Plan, or other proposed local development plan has been proposed or adopted. When a large development or redevelopment project is proposed, involving more than one type of land use, the city or county responsible for adopting the development will usually require that a Specific Plan be prepared for incorporation into the local general plan. These types of local plans are opportunities for ferry services and terminals to be incorporated into the future land uses of an area.

It appears that some of the locations identified for potential new ferry terminals would be compatible with redevelopment plans that are currently being considered or have already been adopted by various city and county planning agencies. The Naval Air Station in Alameda is an example of a proposed redevelopment project that could incorporate a ferry terminal.

Other potential ferry terminal sites that could be incorporated into a local planning process under way include but are not limited to Richmond, whose planning department is currently considering plans to redevelop a part of the waterfront; Pittsburg, whose community development department is considering a new marine/waterfront commercial village; South San Francisco, whose planning department is expecting significant growth in the area east of U.S. 101 near Oyster Point; Antioch, whose community development department is currently

overseeing the development of a large mixed-use waterfront development called Rivertown; and Redwood City, whose planning and redevelopment agency is developing a new Waterfront Plan.

The GGNRA is conducting a separate study to address access to the various areas under their jurisdiction, including potentially increasing ferry services and creating new ferry terminals. Potential terminal sites, including existing piers, are being identified, along with encumbrances to landside access and potential transit linkages to support visitor flow. As part of the analysis, GGNRA is also examining the carrying capacity of the terminal sites and the natural resources which would be affected by water transit, along with the need for landside facilities once visitors arrive (GGNRA 2002). The exact sites being considered by GGNRA are still under study at this point. Although future GGNRA ferry terminals are still under study at this time, they may be compatible with three proposed ferry terminal locations, such as at Fort Mason, Fort Baker, and the Presidio. Federal environmental review and site-specific management planning is required before any development project is undertaken on GGRNA property. The GGNRA project is further described in Section 2.6.

In a few cases, such as at Alameda and Treasure Island, a new ferry terminal has been specifically proposed as part of an adopted Specific Plan or similar local plan. The City of Alameda Transportation Plan identifies the relocation of the existing ferry terminal to Seaplane Lagoon and the 1996 Reuse Plan for Treasure Island emphasizes the goal of making the island accessible to urban residents by ferry.

The proposed terminals at Alameda and Treasure Island are notable because the local agencies are already considering new ferry terminal facilities that may lead to a change in a land use designation and/or the construction of a ferry terminal facility independent of the WTA process.

Race and Ethnicity

The Bay Area is a diverse region in terms of race and ethnicity. According to the 2000 Census, the largest percentage (50 percent) of people in the nine-county Bay Area consider themselves white and not of Hispanic lineage. Twenty percent consider themselves Hispanic, 20 percent consider themselves Asian/Pacific Islander/Other, 7 percent consider themselves African American, and 3 percent consider themselves a mix of more than one race/ethnicity (U.S. Census Bureau 2001).

Race and ethnicity data were collected to determine whether the Proposed Project would have a disproportionate adverse impact on minority communities. Because the racial composition of a community or neighborhood can change drastically over small distances within one city's jurisdiction, racial and ethnic data were collected at the census tract level. Table 3.7.2 lists the 54 potentially affected census tracts and the top races/ethnicities for each census tract. In some instances, census tract information overlapped two potential ferry terminal sites; however, census tracts were only counted once. The Oakland Army Base and Treasure Island had no census data.

Although demographic surveys such as the U.S. Census categorize people generally and may not completely describe the level of diversity of a community, demographic data on race and ethnicity are important to consider in the analysis of potential impacts (both positive and negative) that may result from selecting the location of a transportation facility such as a ferry terminal.

Income

Income data are important to the environmental review process because, like race/ethnicity data, they help describe the community that could be served or adversely affected by constructing and operating a ferry terminal. Low-income neighborhoods are of particular concern because they tend to be more susceptible to redevelopment projects that deem these neighborhoods “blighted.” Although the decision to redevelop a low-income neighborhood can only be made by the city or county government, it can be encouraged by regional projects such as the Proposed Project.

Income data by census tract were collected to determine whether the Proposed Project could have a disproportionate adverse impact on low-income communities. For the purposes of this analysis, one census tract was considered to be one neighborhood/community. As stated above, in some instances census tract information overlapped two potential ferry terminal sites; however, census tracts were only counted once in the analysis.

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) recently published income limits for the year 2002 (HCD 2002). HCD establishes income limits by household for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) programs in the state of California. These limits are published by county, which administers federal and state housing programs at the local level.

Table 3.7.3 presents a comparison of median household income to the county low-income limit for all of the communities potentially affected. For the purposes of this analysis, when the median household income in a census tract is below the low-income limit for the county, the community is considered low income. Because the average household size in all of the counties potentially affected is between 2 and 3 persons, the low-income limit used is based on a 3-person household. As stated above, the Oakland Army Base and Treasure Island had no census data.

3.7.1.4 Regulatory Setting**National Environmental Policy Act of 1972**

Although the Proposed Project does not currently have federal involvement, it is possible that future actions at the local level may require compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1972 (NEPA). NEPA is the federal process through which environmental effects are analyzed. It is required when a proposed action requires a federal permit or entitlement, is jointly carried out by a federal agency, will be federally funded, or will occur on federal land. For example, potential routes and terminals may be funded in part by a federal grant or agency, which would require the local project sponsor to comply with NEPA. Construction of new docks could require permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). Such permits could trigger environmental review under NEPA.

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations, was issued to all federal departments on February 11, 1994. This order requires federal lead agencies to ensure rights established under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 are considered as part of analyzing environmental effects. Therefore, any proposed action under NEPA requires an Environmental Justice analysis to determine impacts to low income and minority communities.

California Environmental Quality Act

At the state level, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000-21178) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] 15000-15387) are the primary policies that require projects to analyze potential impacts to land uses and communities. Essentially, CEQA requires that projects identify all potential impacts to environment and reduce their significance to a less-than-significant level. Unlike NEPA, however, CEQA does not require an environmental impact analysis to consider potential community impacts that are not physical in nature. In particular, land use impacts must be considered under CEQA; however, consideration of impacts to low-income or minority populations is not required.

CEQA requires that every project determine its consistency with local plans. Consistency with the adopted local general plan is one of several criteria for determining whether a project will have a significant effect under the provisions of CEQA. Specifically, an Initial Study must contain an examination of whether the project would be consistent with existing zoning, plans, and other applicable land use controls (Section 15063(d)(5) of the CEQA Guidelines). Please refer to City and County General Plans and Ordinances, below, for more discussion on the local land use controls.

San Francisco Bay Plan

Development in or within 100 feet of the San Francisco Bay is subject to the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) and would require BCDC approval. The goals and policies of BCDC are described in the San Francisco Bay Plan (Bay Plan), which was adopted in 1968 and incorporated by the California Legislature into the McAteer-Petris Act in 1969 (BCDC 2002). The Bay Plan contains findings about the value of the Bay, policies to guide future uses of the Bay, and maps that apply these policies to the Bay and its shoreline. Part Four of the Bay Plan contains findings and policies pertinent to development of the Bay and shoreline. Policies from the “Recreation” and “Public Access” subsections are described below.

Recreation (last amended October 2002)

This section states that as the population of the Bay region increases, more people are expected to use their leisure time in water-oriented recreational activities. It predicts that many more water-oriented recreational facilities will be needed to accommodate the needs of Bay Area residents and visitors. The Bay Plan maps include about 5,800 acres of potential new parks along the approximately 1,000-mile shoreline, as well as 4,400 acres of parkland that could be created if military use of the properties ceases (particularly near the Golden Gate). The Bay Plan states that water-oriented recreational facilities should be well distributed around the shores of the Bay, to the extent consistent with criteria specified elsewhere in the Bay Plan. Recreational facilities should not, however, preempt sites needed for ports, waterfront industry, or airports, but efforts should be made to integrate recreational uses into these facilities to the extent that they might be compatible. The Bay Plan also advises that waterfront land needed for parks and beaches by the year 2020 should be reserved now to preserve them from being used for other purposes. These facilities need not be built all at once, however.

Public Access (last amended March 2001)

This section states that, although public access to the Bay shoreline has increased since adoption of the Bay Plan in 1968, additional public access is still needed. Public agencies have limited funds for providing or improving shoreline access, but private capital can provide public access in association with a wide variety of shoreline developments. Any proposed fill project should enhance public access to the Bay to the maximum extent feasible in accordance with Bay Plan policies. In addition to the public access provided by waterfront parks, beaches, marinas, and fishing piers, maximum feasible access to and along the waterfront and on any permitted fills should be provided in and through every new development in the Bay or on the shoreline, including airport development. In those cases where public access is inconsistent with the project because of public safety considerations or significant use conflicts (such as significant adverse effects on wildlife), in-lieu public access should be provided, preferably near the project site.

Public access as a condition of development should be permanently guaranteed and should be consistent with the development project, as well as with the physical environment of the Bay and shoreline. Access to and along the waterfront should be provided by walkways or trails and should be convenient to parking and/or public transit. In addition, the BCDC, special districts, and federal, state, regional, and local jurisdictions should cooperate to provide new public access areas, especially to link the entire series of shoreline parks, regional trail systems, and existing public access areas to the extent feasible, without additional Bay filling or adversely affecting natural resources. BCDC's *Public Access Design Guidelines* (BCDC 2001) should be used in siting and designing public access associated with a proposed project. The Design Review Board should advise the BCDC on the adequacy of the public access proposed.

City and County General Plans and Ordinances

The California State Legislature, pursuant to Government Code Section 65300, requires each city and county jurisdiction in the state to prepare a local general plan. The general plan is the primary planning document that establishes policies to regulate the development, function, and use of land within the boundaries of each city or county jurisdiction. With respect to the proposed project, the enhancement of an existing terminal or the development of a new one must conform to the policies of the local general plan.

General plans are required to contain the following elements or chapters: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. Although all seven elements carry equal weight, the land use element is integral to carrying out local planning because it designates the pattern and scope of development. Land use designations are one of the primary tools cities and counties use to establish a comprehensive plan that is used to guide development. Examples of land use designations include Low Density Residential, Open Space, General Agriculture, and Light Industrial. Land use designations are supported by general plan policies that generally define how land can and cannot be used.

General plan policies are supported by local ordinances, such as zoning ordinances, which describe the specific requirements for developing a parcel within an identified land use designation. Zoning ordinances are important to the planning process because they define the specific allowable uses for each type of land use designation. Land uses may be classified in the zoning ordinance as principally permitted, conditionally permitted, or permitted under other

special circumstances. Under most zoning ordinances, principally permitted land uses require a simplified land use permitting process, whereas Conditional Use Permits and other special circumstance use permits have additional criteria for being considered allowable.

When a city or county desires to amend its general plan to make a change to an existing land use designation, it must go through an environmental review under CEQA to address the potential impacts that may occur as a result. More specifically, if any aspect of a general plan, element, or amendment, either individually or cumulatively, may lead to a significant impact on the environment, regardless of whether the overall impact of a project is adverse or beneficial, the city or county must prepare a draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (14 CCR 15063(b)). Furthermore, even if a proposed project is consistent with the land use designation, if it requires a Conditional Use Permit or similar special circumstance permit under the zoning ordinance, then CEQA compliance is required. These CEQA entitlements are an important step in the local planning process because they require local agencies to comply with state environmental regulations when making changes to the pattern or scope of planned development within their jurisdiction.

The local policies regarding either a Conditional Use Permit for allowing an otherwise noncompatible designation, or CEQA compliance due to a change in land use designations, could influence the local planning process with respect to the Proposed Project. This is especially true in areas where new ferry terminals are proposed because they may not be compatible with the existing land use designations.

3.7.2 Impacts and Mitigation

3.7.2.1 *Significance Criteria*

Impacts would be considered significant if they would:

- **Cause community displacement.** Implementation of the Proposed Project would have a potentially significant impact if it would result in the displacement of existing houses or businesses, either directly or indirectly.
- **Disrupt community cohesion.** Implementation of the Proposed Project would have a potentially significant impact if it would physically divide or otherwise substantially disrupt a community, either directly or indirectly.
- **Result in disproportionate physical impacts to low-income or minority communities.** Implementation of the project would have a potentially significant impact if the Proposed Project would cause adverse physical impacts to low-income or minority persons. The following criteria were used for determining low-income and minority communities:
 - **Low-income:** A community is defined as low-income when the median household income of a census tract is below the 2002 California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) low-income limit for the parent county.
 - **Minority Community:** A minority community is defined as having at least 70 percent of the population belong to of one or more minority groups (as compared to a 50 percent average for the Bay Area as a whole) (MTC 2001).

Because formal federal environmental review and compliance is not required at this Program EIR stage, these definitions are not based strictly on federal guidelines. In terms of low-income, the most recent HCD data were used, based on federal (HUD) standards for determining low-income. The definition of a minority community was taken from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) EIR for their 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which is the most recent analysis of potential adverse environmental impacts to minority communities conducted by a regional transportation agency in the Bay Area.

3.7.2.2 Impacts

Construction and Operational Impacts

Proposed Project ferry terminal locations are primarily located at existing port or maritime facilities. Nine of the proposed new terminal locations for the Proposed Project would require construction of new ferry terminals. Treasure Island is the only location identified that has already adopted plans for developing a new ferry terminal. In most cases the development of a new terminal would require revising or amending local land use policies, such as land use designations and zoning ordinances.

As discussed in Section 3.7.1.4 (Environmental Setting), CEQA review is required for general plan amendments to change a land use designation, or to issue Conditional Use Permits (or similar permits) required under local zoning ordinances. Therefore, any impact to an existing land use that may occur as a result of constructing a new ferry terminal or other facility would require additional CEQA review. The development and implementation of a specific terminal would require site-specific CEQA review for proposed new terminals.

Of the seventeen ferry terminal locations included in the Proposed Project, eight currently have ferry service (Table 3.7.1). All but one of the potential new terminal locations (Hercules/Rodeo) already have port or maritime land uses at the site. Depending on the specific land uses and the objectives for land use planning at and near each terminal location, a waterfront planning process should be used to consider surrounding land uses and local objectives to ensure that terminals will be a compatible use.

Impact LU-1 **The Proposed Project includes ferry terminal locations in developed urban areas that primarily have port or maritime land uses, but do not currently have ferry terminal facilities. The development of new ferry terminals in urban locations could result in the displacement of existing land uses.**

New water transit facilities in developed areas without existing operational ferry terminals may result in the displacement of residences, offices, or industrial facilities. The possible expansion of existing terminal facilities as a result of the Proposed Project could also result in displacement impacts; however, it is anticipated that this would occur in limited circumstances. As discussed below, planning for terminals would be performed in conjunction with local planning to minimize these effects.

As noted previously, eight of the seventeen terminal locations already have ferry terminals and service, and all but one of the seventeen have existing port or maritime facilities that may be relatively compatible for adding new service. One example is the Richmond location, where previous ferry service has been provided and there are plans for the revitalization of the waterfront area, which could be compatible and potentially enhanced with ferry service. It is

also noted that the area needed for new or expanded ferry transit terminals is not substantial, on a regional level. For example, the maximum total affected shoreline area for the Proposed Project is less than one half of one percent of the Bay Area shoreline.

Because the specific size, type, configuration, and location of each proposed new terminal and its associated facilities are unknown, potential displacement impacts cannot be determined. However, in the event it is necessary, it is important to note how displacement impacts might occur generally, and to identify the considerations that the project proponent(s) and local agencies would need to incorporate into future site-specific environmental review under CEQA.

The terminal locations included in the Proposed Project were selected based on favorable ridership projections, cost effectiveness, potential for local support, and/or potential for implementation related to existing or planned land uses. Implementation of the Proposed Project would have a very low potential for displacement impacts to people or businesses.

Some ferry terminals could be developed as an amenity to or in conjunction with other developments that have displacement impacts of their own, such as a Specific Plan or Redevelopment Plan. If the construction of a ferry terminal is adopted as part of a larger development, it will be the responsibility of the project sponsor to consider displacement impacts for that entire project, including the terminal. The potential impacts associated with these larger development projects may require analysis as part of an environmental review process. Specific displacement impacts would be considered at that time.

Although property acquisition impacts could occur for ferry services, they could also occur as an indirect or cumulative impact due to street widening or reconfiguration to provide better access to a terminal.

If people and businesses do not own the property or unit where they live or work (i.e., renters), they may not be able to obtain the benefits afforded to displaced property owners. When required to move out of a rental property as a result of a redevelopment project, relocation can be made difficult by the high cost of living in the Bay Area or an increase in time spent traveling to and from a job. When considering a terminal location, proponents of specific projects would have to take into account the potential impacts to renters that can result from displacing homes and businesses, especially in low-income neighborhoods.

Summary of Impact LU-1

- The Proposed Project minimizes land use conflicts and potential displacement issues by focusing expansion on only the most promising new terminal locations, which are primarily in existing port or maritime areas. However, its implementation could still involve acquisition of property necessary to expand or create ferry passenger terminals or other facilities. This action could potentially include residential or business properties. Although the significance of displacement impacts cannot be quantified at the regional level due to a lack of site-specific information, it remains a potentially significant impact. The decision to displace homes or businesses must be made with the participation of local governments. Displacement impacts most often result from redevelopment or property acquisition requirements. While at this time, no information indicates that any displacements will be required, until site-specific analysis is conducted, this remains a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation LU-1.1: Site-specific projects shall consider project alternatives that avoid displacement of homes or businesses. Displacement impacts to homes and businesses shall be addressed as part of the terminal site selection process, and be avoided through design measures. Proposals for terminals with potentially significant impacts due to the displacement of homes and/or businesses will likely not be approved without appropriate mitigation.

In the unusual circumstance that displacement is unavoidable, project proponents shall prepare and execute mitigation in the form of a relocation assistance plan or equivalent. If federal transportation funds will be used for a ferry terminal project, compliance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, as amended, shall be required. Relocation plans typically consider:

- Criteria for replacement housing;
- Reimbursement criteria for moving costs and/or differential housing costs (including rents); and
- Reimbursement criteria for businesses, including costs associated with searching for a new space, and business (i.e., patronage) lost due to the relocation.

Impact After Mitigation: With implementation of Mitigation Measure LU-1.1, this impact is considered less than significant.

Impact LU-2 Construction of new ferry terminals and associated landside facilities could disrupt or divide established neighborhoods. This impact has the potential to be significantly adverse or beneficial, depending on how much the community supports or opposes the location of the terminal.

The Proposed Project terminal locations are primarily within existing port, maritime, and waterfront areas. Therefore, disruption to existing neighborhoods should be avoidable or minimal. Nine proposed new terminals are included with the Proposed Project. It is anticipated that significant neighborhood or community disruption or division impacts would not occur at Proposed Project terminal locations. These types of impacts would still have to be determined or verified with each local terminal planning process. At a regional level, they are not expected to be significant.

Construction may also disrupt existing neighborhoods due to noise, dust, and traffic. These potentially disruptive impacts will be analyzed on a project-by-project basis as part of the environmental review under CEQA, but are most often minimized to a less than significant level through project design features and best management practices. Furthermore, construction-related impacts are temporary and would not result in permanent changes in an established community.

Because most of the ferry terminals will be “origin” terminals (they will be places where trips originate), people from around the Bay Area will need access to the terminals by private vehicle, bus, or other forms of transit. The following locations were identified where trips might travel through residential areas:

Facility	Nearest Highways	Approximate Driving Distance to Nearest Highway (miles)	Approximate Percent of Driving Distance in Residential Area
Hercules/Rodeo	I-80	1 – 1.5	100
Martinez	SR 4; I-680	3; 2.5	100; 25
Mission Bay	I-280; US 101	> 1	75
Pittsburg/Antioch	SR 4	1.5	50
Richmond	I-580	1	50

The volume of riders, the dispersed locations of the existing and planned ferry terminals, and the frequency of ferry transits are not expected to result in any substantial change to the regional highways listed above. In the event that existing local roadways must be widened or modified for access to a terminal or parking facilities are planned, there is a potential need for right-of-way acquisition. In some cases, this may involve impacts to existing local land uses. The need for property acquisition would be determined at the time each terminal is advanced for specific planning and further environmental and community review. At a regional level, it is not anticipated that significant right-of-way or property acquisition would be required for the Proposed Project, and planning and implementation of the Proposed Project terminals and any needed access improvements are unlikely to occur simultaneously.

Summary of Impact LU-2

- The Proposed Project includes nine new ferry terminals located within South San Francisco and Treasure Island, the Peninsula, and the East Bay. With the exception of one terminal (Hercules/Rodeo), all are within existing ports or maritime areas. At a regional level, the implementation of these terminals is not considered a significant impact to existing communities. Specific community impacts may occur at a local level related to some necessary property acquisition and land use changes, depending on each terminal site. These effects must be evaluated when each of the terminal plans is advanced for further review. Based on the terminals included in the Proposed Project, these impacts are not anticipated to be significant, but should be considered at the time each route and terminal are advanced for implementation. This is a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation LU-2.1: Local agencies desiring ferry service should identify parcels along their waterfronts that would facilitate a ferry terminal through a waterfront planning process or other type of terminal location study. Any potential terminal site must be analyzed with consideration to the surrounding land uses in order to ensure the terminal will be a compatible use and will minimize land use impacts. Projects should include project design elements that improve terminal accessibility while maintaining community cohesion.

Impact After Mitigation: With implementation of Mitigation Measure LU-2.1, this impact is considered less than significant.

Impact LU-3 Implementation of the Proposed Project could result in disproportionate adverse impacts to low-income and minority communities. These impacts would occur primarily as a result of the displacement of homes or businesses in low-income and minority communities, or substantial disruption of those neighborhoods.

As the regional transportation agency, MTC identified low-income and minority neighborhoods (referred to as “Disadvantaged Communities”) in the Bay Area to determine whether funding for the 2001 RTP would result in an inequitable allocation of funds to non-disadvantaged communities. MTC’s Equity Analysis found that the 2001 RTP would increase spending in disadvantaged communities as compared to the previous plan. As did the MTC, the WTA analyzed the potential for the Proposed Project to result in disproportionate adverse impacts to low-income and minority neighborhoods in the Bay Area.

Community impacts from implementation of the Proposed Project could be beneficial or adverse. Increased transit opportunities would be a positive impact to a community, especially if ferry service were integrated with other transportation modes. In addition, if a new terminal was constructed, low-income and minority communities could benefit from increased local economic opportunity. Potential adverse impacts to low-income and minority communities include displacement of homes and businesses, or community disruption.

The Proposed Project could result in disproportionate adverse impacts to low-income and minority communities if care is not taken to minimize or avoid the displacement of homes and businesses or substantial disruption of these communities. As discussed under Impacts LU-2 and LU-3, there is a potential for these community impacts to occur.

Table 3.7.4 presents the census tracts considered to be minority and/or low-income communities. These could potentially be affected by the Proposed Project, either directly by the construction of a new terminal or expansion of an existing terminal, or indirectly by growth that could occur as a result of installing a terminal. Of the 54 census tracts potentially affected by the Proposed Project, 23 (42.6 percent) are considered low-income communities and 9 (16.6 percent) are considered minority communities. Information on income and poverty levels are only reported by the U.S. Census at the tract level, making further assessment of the type of communities potentially affected near the terminal locations difficult at this program EIR level of evaluation without further site-specific information gathering.

As shown, the Proposed Project could impact low-income or minority communities. Because at this time it cannot be determined where physical impacts would occur as a result of implementing the project, disproportionate adverse impacts cannot be assessed at this time. However, new terminal locations should be recognized not only for the potential to adversely impact low-income or minority neighborhoods, but also for the potential to positively impact the local community by creating a new form of accessible regional transportation. Locations where there is a potential beneficial impact include Berkeley/Albany, Hercules/Rodeo, Martinez, Mission Bay, Pittsburg/Antioch, Redwood City, and Richmond.

Summary of Impact LU-3

- Implementation of the Proposed Project could result in positive or adverse impacts to low-income and minority communities. Specific site location characteristics have not yet been analyzed for this program-level analysis, although some of the overall communities where

new terminals are included in the Proposed Project are identified as low-income. The physical displacement of homes and/or businesses (if any) or the substantial disruption of an established neighborhood could have an adverse impact, while increased transportation options and potential for greater economic opportunities would be positive impacts.

Mitigation LU-3.1: The terminal site selection process shall consider project alternatives to avoid adverse physical impacts to the low-income and minority neighborhoods. This would include site and terminal access design that minimizes residential acquisition. Terminal planning shall also involve local community input to help identify opportunities to avoid adverse impacts and enhance local planning efforts. Depending on the specific site and local land use planning, the project proponent may work with the local, city, or county to develop specific plans that address appropriate land use designations in the vicinity of the terminals.

If federal money will be used for the construction of a ferry terminal, compliance with NEPA will be required, and the federal lead agency's guidelines for addressing Environmental Justice shall be adhered to. If required, the federal Environmental Justice process will supersede the requirement to comply with adopted WTA criteria.

Mitigation LU-3.2: Implement Mitigations LU-1.1 and LU-2.1.

Impact After Mitigation: Implementation of Mitigations LU-1.1, LU-2.1, and LU-3.1 would reduce Impact LU-3 to a less than significant level. However, until further study at the local level is conducted to identify site-specific criteria or standards for identifying and mitigating impacts to low-income and minority communities, this impact remains potentially significant.

Impact LU-4 **New or modified ferry terminals would be located along the shoreline, and could affect and/or enhance existing public use and access to and along the Bay shoreline.**

Policies to protect and enhance public and recreational use and access to and along the Bay shoreline are included in the Bay Plan (BCDC 2002) and BCDC's *Public Access Design Guidelines* (BCDC 2001), as well as some local and general plans. New and expanded ferry terminal facilities could provide public access to the shoreline, and would impact shoreline access only where it would interfere with existing pathways, trails, parking, viewpoints, or other access locations along the shoreline. As each terminal is advanced forward for local approval and development, public access will be evaluated and included to meet the requirements of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission and local land use authorities.

Summary of Impact LU-4

- Adverse impacts to existing shoreline access and recreational uses from expansion or development of ferry terminal facilities is not considered a significant impact at the regional level, as no direct impacts to parks or trails are identified at this stage of evaluation. Terminal plans will potentially have to include measures for public access to gain regulatory permit approvals from BCDC or local authorities, depending on individual site conditions. This impact is not considered significant, but should be evaluated as terminal planning is advanced. Any public access would have to be appropriate and compatible with safe ferry operations.

Mitigation LU-4.1: Incorporate public access to and/or along the Bay shoreline in the planning for terminal locations or expansion. This may include trails, parking set aside for shoreline users, viewpoints, disabled access, etc.

Mitigation LU-4.2: Incorporate the shoreline access guidelines described in *The Terminal Architecture and Engineering – Terminal Design Guidelines* prepared for the WTA (Parsons Brinkerhoff 2002). The guidelines include Shoreline Access for pedestrians and bicycles, and viewpoints to provide views of the shore, bay, and the loading/ unloading of the ferries

Impacts After Mitigation: With implementation of Mitigation Measure LU-4.1, this impact is considered less than significant.

References

- ARUP. 2001. Draft Working Paper: Intermodal and Terminal Access Study Terminal Good Practice Design Guidelines. Prepared for Water Transit Authority. November.
- Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). 2001. Projections 2002. Oakland, California. December.
- San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). 2002. San Francisco Bay Plan. October.
- BCDC. 2001. Public Access Design Guidelines.
- California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). 2002. 2002 Income Limits Memorandum. February.
- City of Richmond. 2002. Personal Correspondence between M. Kim of URS Corporation and Richmond Planning Department. May.
- County of San Mateo. 2002. Personal Correspondence between M. Kim of URS Corporation and San Mateo County Environmental Services Agency, Planning and Building Division. May.
- County of Sonoma. 2002. Personal Correspondence between M. Kim of URS Corporation and Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department. May.
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). 2001. Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan. Oakland, California.
- Parsons Brinkerhoff. 2002. Draft Working Paper – Terminal Architecture and Engineering - Terminal Design Guidelines. Prepared for the WTA. July.

Please refer to Appendix LU-A for a comprehensive list of planning departments contacted for this report.

**Table 3.7.1
Land Use and Community Matrix**

Facility	Local Agency	Location	G.P. Designation(s)	Pertinent Policies	Zoning	Existing Port? (Y/N)	Existing Ferry Service? (Y/N)	Mixed Uses? (Y/N)	Predominant Use(s)	Redevelopment Plan?	Pertinent Visual/Aesthetic Policies
Alameda	Alameda Planning and Building Department	Alameda	Public Institutional	Expansion of the ferry is proposed in the Transportation Plan, including relocation to the Seaplane Lagoon at Alameda Point to avoid Estuary marine traffic and provide a better connection with the Mission Bay development area	M-2 Manufacturing	Y	Y	Y	Parking; Maritime uses; small manufacturing buildings	This location is adjacent to the Alameda Point redevelopment area, and significant changes are expected here as a result. Tentative plans include a business park, residential, community and mixed-use land uses	None Identified
Alameda Harbor Bay Isle	Alameda Planning and Building Department	Alameda	Residential; Commercial Retail	Ferry service required for business park	R-1-PD Residential, Planned Development	Y	Y	Y	Harbor Bay Business Park; Residential; Commercial	There are still vacant areas where new office buildings could be built	All new developments have to adhere to Harbor Bay Business Park Association's guidelines for signage, height, size, etc.
Antioch	Antioch Community Development Department	Antioch	Rivertown	Upgrade the Marina area for better connection between people and commercial areas	M2 – Industrial District (in the process of trying to change zoning in the City)	Y	N	Y	Parking lot, boat slips, restaurants, commercial uses at the Marina. Adjacent downtown with commercial, office, and residential land uses	Focus Policy Area in the General Plan to bring more commercial uses to the area. An application for a 2-story office building in downtown was approved.	Design Review Board reviews all new buildings. General Plan design guidelines are very generic. Design requirements are site dependent, usually takes in elements from the surrounding area.
Berkeley/Albany	Berkeley Planning and Development Department	Berkeley	Waterfront/ Marina	Policy 9 – ferry service	SP – Specific Plan (from 1986 Waterfront Specific Plan)	Y	N	Y	Marina, restaurants, hotel, and recreational uses	None Identified	None Identified
Ferry Building (SF)	San Francisco Planning Department	San Francisco	General Commercial/ Public Trust	Reinforce recreational use of this area as terminus of Market St. and terminal for commuter and recreational ferries. Improve physical access to the waterfront.	C2 – Community Business District	Y	Y	Y	Facilities for ferry service; Golden Gate Transit operates from north of the BART ventilation structure behind the Ferry Building. Adjacent is Pier One, a commercial development that also houses the Port of SF office. Across the Embarcadero is Justin Herman Plaza, a major public gathering spot and open space.	Currently undergoing renovations and redevelopments to include major retail/commercial uses. New facilities for ferry passengers will include covered and accessible landing facilities and newly designed structures. Also, new promenades for public access and new terminals for increased commuter ferry service capacity are planned.	Create a plaza with a strong urban design setting for the Ferry Building.
Hercules/Rodeo	Contra Costa County, Community Development Agency	Contra Costa County	Mixed-Use (downtown), Commercial Recreation, Parks and Recreation, Industrial, Commercial	Rodeo: Establish mixed uses along waterfront and downtown to make it a community “focal point”	Data not available	N	N	Y	Railroad tracks run along the entire shoreline. Waterfront has mixed uses; residential, industrial and commercial.	Hercules: New Town Center, Rodeo: redevelopment of the mixed-use area downtown.	Development along the shoreline must improve access. Shoreline is Rodeo's most prominent natural resource.
Larkspur	Larkspur Planning Department	Larkspur	Ferry Terminal; Public Facilities; Commercial; Shoreline/Marsh conservation	None Identified	Terminal; Study District; PD – Planned Development	Y	Y	Y	Commercial, office buildings	Mixed-use redevelopment proposal for hotel, offices, residential unit, and corporation yard for the City Sanitary District	According to City of Larkspur staff, there could be visual and aesthetic issues at this site.
Martinez	Martinez Community Development Department	Martinez	Park and Recreation, Special Study Area	General Plan 30.721: Contains policies pertaining to the waterfront. Highest priority placed on conservation, park, and recreational uses along the waterfront.	M-OS/RF Mix Use Open Space and Rec. Facilities. Surrounding area is Light Industrial, Institutional, Single-Family Residential, Medium Density Residential, and Central Commercial	Y	N	Y	Martinez Waterfront Park and the Martinez Regional Shoreline Park form a 0.5-mile buffer between downtown Martinez and the Yacht Harbor. Nearby urban land use is mostly commercial and some residential with some light industrial parcels to the southwest of the possible terminal site.	A Marina Development Area is being contemplated (i.e., the Special Study Area land use designation), but no redevelopment plans have been adopted.	Any waterfront development must be consistent with the recreational and park land uses promoted within the Waterfront Park and Marina area.
Mission Bay	San Francisco Planning Department	San Francisco	Residential/ Commercial	This site must incorporate walkable, bikeable, and transit-friendly elements.	Low-, medium- and high-density residential, office, commercial-industrial, neighborhood shopping, and open space.	Y	N	Y	Currently in transition from an industrial area and former rail yard into a mix-use community with housing, jobs, retail, open space, parks, and a school	First of the development blocks currently under construction, including housing units, corporate science and technical campus, health science campus for UCSF, retail space, hotel, and a public school.	Public access to the shoreline and adequate parks and public open space.

**Table 3.7.1 -Continued
Land Use and Community Matrix**

Facility	Local Agency	Location	G.P. Designation(s)	Pertinent Policies	Zoning	Existing Port? (Y/N)	Existing Ferry Service? (Y/N)	Mixed Uses? (Y/N)	Predominant Use(s)	Redevelopment Plan?	Pertinent Visual/Aesthetic Policies
Oyster Point	South San Francisco Planning Department	South San Francisco	Coastal Commercial	The City would like new developments to include uses that generate high revenues (i.e., hotels) that can help pay for maintenance of the Marina area and its debts. The City is supportive of introducing ferry service to this area.	Surrounding area is Coastal Commercial.	Y	N	Y	Shoreline park, small hotel, restaurants, office park, R&D buildings, and some parking lots	Part of the City's "East of 101" planning area, where significant potential growth is expected. Permit has been approved for 2 small office buildings, and plan underway for full service hotel. New developments will require adequate parking, especially if water transit services are introduced.	Policies allude to enhancement of waterfront shoreline and its accessibility. The City does not have specific details about design guidelines such as waterfront view preservation.
Pittsburg	Pittsburg Community Development Department	Pittsburg	Marine Commercial; Residential	5-P-13 to 16 of the General Plan: Undertake efforts to develop a waterfront activity center featuring a cluster of Marine Commercial uses with pedestrian amenities, focus on visitor attractions and traditional marine services, and provide access to the waterfront and open space at the center of the new Marine Commercial center	Downtown Medium and High Density Residential; Marine Commercial facilities	Y	N	Y	Mainly residential at the harbor, waterfront downtown is mostly commercial, office, residential. Across the slough from the waterfront area is Brown's Island Regional Shoreline Preserve.	A proposed marine/waterfront commercial village may feature marine-oriented repair and sales, restaurants, professional offices, industrial incubators, and specialty retail activities	Development standards (Floor Area Ratios, max building heights, etc.) in Table 5-2 of General Plan; Preservation and enhancement of historic structures unique to downtown
Redwood City	Redwood City Planning and Redevelopment Agency	Redwood City	R&D office uses; light and heavy industrial	A future Waterfront Plan is under consideration	IP – Industrial Park, GI – General Industrial	Y	N	Y	Seaport Conference Center, wetlands, salt evaporation beds, delivery of bulk construction materials and bulk recycling for the Port of Redwood City	Waterfront Plan is the only redevelopment plan under consideration.	None Identified
Richmond	Richmond Planning Department	Richmond	Industrial; Commercial; Residential; Recreation	Richmond Redevelopment Agency will consider new direction for waterfront land use, will likely recommend denser development than has been considered previously	None Identified	Y	N	Y	Vacant parking lot, debilitated historical industrial factory. Nearby, Port of Richmond shipping yard, small park, and R&D office facilities in the 0.25 mi radius, but isolated from waterfront.	Focus of extensive revitalization and planning effort by the City. Plan includes significant increase of R&D/office, residential and mixed-use land uses, as well as parks, promenades, open spaces, a Westshore business park, and historical preservation.	Focus of waterfront amenities
Sausalito	Sausalito Community Development Department	Sausalito	Public Institutional	CP-3.2.1-2 of General Plan: Promote increase patronage of ferries while protecting the area from overuse, support ferry providers for better service and efficient loading area, increase ferry information provided to passengers as alternatives to automobiles	Public	Y	Y	Y	Small park/plaza (open space) on either side of the ferry terminal, parking lot, commercial downtown across the street. Residential units beyond commercial downtown.	Possible proposal for building restroom facilities near the ferry terminal/downtown, but no applications yet.	Any new development will have to go through the design review; generally preserve waterfront views; and fit with existing architectural characteristics.
Tiburon	Tiburon Planning and Building Department	Tiburon	VC (Village Commercial) and P (Public/Quasi-Public)	Office use not allowed on ground floor of Main Street in this area	VC – typical comm. uses w/ a conditional use permit; P- allows public parks and open space	Y	Y	Y	Restaurants and retail stores (small); Public park		Downtown Design Handbook provides specific guidelines for all private and public improvements in the downtown area. A ferry access project was constructed in Spring 2002. The project improved pedestrian and bike access to the existing ferry landing.
Treasure Island	San Francisco Planning Department	San Francisco	Public/Marina	1996 Draft Reuse Plan emphasizes publicly oriented recreational, entertainment, retail, and hospitality uses that can take advantage of the island's location. Goal is to make island accessible to urban residents by ferry	Marina	Y	N	Y	Closed Naval Station, some historic buildings	New ferry terminal, waterfront promenades, bike and pedestrian paths, recreational and entertainment facilities, and residential community.	Preserve historic structures and island's waterfront views; public promenade and open area around the entire island with parks and plazas to help connect the island to the bay setting
Vallejo	Vallejo City Hall Planning Department	Vallejo	Waterfront Commercial	Waterfront Downtown Plan (under EIR process) would increase the intensity of development, connect waterfront area with downtown, and make the waterfront area more accessible to the walking public	CW – Waterfront shopping and service. If Waterfront Downtown Plan is approved, rezoning to Planned Development Zoning.	Y	Y	Y	Surface parking for ferry passengers; Public facilities; commercial; high- density residential	The Waterfront Downtown Plan would result in a multi-level parking structure, 1,400 residential units, commercial uses, hotel, office space, new open space, emphasis on new walkable business district. Georgia St. would go from downtown to waterfront.	Reopening old grid of streets (e.g., opening Georgia St.) and establishing new street corridors; keeping waterfront view open for hill residents; make sure new developments (e.g., large parking structure) are visually attractive

Notes: 1) A new terminal would be located at Pittsburg or Antioch.

**Table 3.7.2
Race/Ethnicity Analysis**

Facility	Census Tract # ¹	Top Four Ethnicities (%) ¹				Minority Community? ³
		African American	Asian ²	Caucasian	Hispanic	
Alameda Point	4277.00	0.00	29.30	54.00	9.20	No
Alameda Point	4286.00	0.00	34.70	49.00	8.30	No
Alameda/Harbor Bay Isle	4283.01	0.00	32.00	52.00	6.50	No
Alameda/Harbor Bay Isle	4283.02	0.00	40.00	51.00	3.80	No
Alameda/Main St.	4274.00	10.00	0.00	66.70	14.20	No
Alameda/Main St.	4275.00	4.70	0.00	67.50	12.20	No
Alameda/Main St.	4276.00	30.60	33.40	20.80	0.00	Yes
Antioch	3050.00	6.00	0.00	63.00	35.00	No
Antioch	3060.01	5.30	0.00	76.60	20.80	No
Antioch	3060.02	4.10	0.00	73.70	20.60	No
Berkeley/Albany	4204.00	0.00	47.80	27.30	13.80	Yes
Berkeley/Albany	4219.00	13.20	15.00	61.50	0.00	No
Berkeley/Albany	4220.00	26.80	0.00	46.80	13.50	No
Berkeley/Albany	4221.00	25.60	0.00	42.40	25.20	No
Berkeley/Albany	4222.00	16.60	15.20	55.50	0.00	No
Ferry Building	105.00	0.00	17.10	77.90	3.20	No
Ferry Building	106.00	0.00	62.20	33.50	3.00	No
Ferry Building	115.00	0.00	69.40	21.70	3.40	Yes
Ferry Building	179.01	8.20	16.30	67.30	0.00	No
Hercules/Rodeo	3580.00	0.00	14.60	62.50	17.00	No
Hercules/Rodeo	3591.01	17.70	27.70	43.00	0.00	No
Hercules/Rodeo	3592.03	20.20	38.60	29.20	0.00	Yes
Hercules/Rodeo	3592.04	15.60	53.70	21.60	0.00	Yes
Larkspur	1192.00	0.00	4.00	92.00	2.90	No
Larkspur	1200.00	0.00	2.90	93.10	3.70	No
Larkspur	1211.00	0.00	4.30	89.00	5.40	No
Larkspur	1212.00	0.00	7.10	85.70	5.50	No
Martinez	3160.00	22.50	0.00	56.70	15.60	No
Martinez	3170.00	0.00	2.40	83.40	11.10	No
Martinez	3200.01	0.00	2.30	76.10	2.40	No
Mission Bay	226.00	11.50	9.60	71.80	0.00	No
Mission Bay	607.00	10.60	24.20	56.30	0.00	No
Oakland (Jack London Square)	4020.00	25.00	0.00	25.00	35.70	Yes
Oakland (Jack London Square)	4032.00	15.80	19.00	47.60	0.00	No
Oakland (Jack London Square)	4033.00	8.40	77.40	8.70	0.00	Yes
Oyster Point	6023.00	0.00	16.90	46.60	43.50	No
Pittsburg	3090.00	32.70	0.00	42.10	19.20	No
Pittsburg	3100.00	15.90	0.00	38.60	59.00	No
Redwood City	6102.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	No
Redwood City	6102.02	14.00	0.00	51.00	40.00	No
Redwood City	6103.02	5.00	0.00	71.00	24.00	No
Richmond	3780.00	8.10	0.00	80.60	9.10	No
Richmond	3790.00	68.00	0.00	11.00	23.00	Yes
Richmond	3800.00	31.80	0.00	35.50	18.90	No
Richmond	3820.00	68.00	0.00	11.60	10.90	Yes

**Table 3.7.2 - Continued
Race/Ethnicity Analysis**

Facility	Census Tract # ¹	Top Four Ethnicities (%) ¹				Minority Community? ³
		African American	Asian ²	Caucasian	Hispanic	
Sausalito	1290.00	45.90	0.00	36.40	8.20	No
Tiburon	1230.00	0.00	1.80	94.90	2.10	No
Tiburon	1242.00	0.00	3.20	89.50	4.00	No
Treasure Island	No Data	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	No
Vallejo	2507.01	33.20	0.00	30.90	32.30	No
Vallejo	2509.00	35.50	0.00	31.20	19.90	No
Vallejo	2515.00	25.20	0.00	41.30	25.70	No
Vallejo	2516.00	23.20	0.00	42.60	27.50	No
Vallejo	2517.01	23.70	0.00	40.70	18.10	No
Total Average:		13.40	13.50	50.79	12.76	

Notes: 1) 2000 US Census Data

2) Includes Pacific Islander and Other

3) Based on MTC Equity Analysis. A minority community is defined as a having at least 70 percent of the population share be one or more minority group (as compared to a 50 percent average for the Bay Area as a whole). (MTC 2001)

4) A new terminal would be located at Pittsburg or Antioch.

**Table 3.7.3
Low Income Analysis**

Facility	County	Census Tract No.	Median Household Income (\$)¹	County Low Income Limit (\$)²	Potentially Low Income?
Alameda Point	Alameda	4277.00	77,047	52,200	No
Alameda Point	Alameda	4286.00	82,873	52,200	No
Alameda/Harbor Bay Isle	Alameda	4283.01	121,754	52,200	No
Alameda/Harbor Bay Isle	Alameda	4283.02	121,754	52,200	No
Alameda/Main St.	Alameda	4274.00	42,804	52,200	Yes
Alameda/Main St.	Alameda	4275.00	52,197	52,200	Yes
Alameda/Main St.	Alameda	4276.00	43,993	52,200	Yes
Antioch⁴	Contra Costa	3050.00	47,798	52,200	Yes
Antioch⁴	Contra Costa	3060.01	58,974	52,200	No
Antioch⁴	Contra Costa	3060.02	88,818	52,200	No
Berkeley/Albany	Alameda	4204.00	36,383	52,200	Yes
Berkeley/Albany	Alameda	4219.00	69,081	52,200	No
Berkeley/Albany	Alameda	4220.00	44,588	52,200	Yes
Berkeley/Albany	Alameda	4221.00	49,106	52,200	Yes
Berkeley/Albany	Alameda	4222.00	56,359	52,200	No
Ferry Building	San Francisco	105.00	160,753	73,300	No
Ferry Building	San Francisco	106.00	52,554	73,300	Yes
Ferry Building	San Francisco	115.00	32,698	73,300	Yes
Ferry Building	San Francisco	179.01	86,916	73,300	No
Hercules/Rodeo	Contra Costa	3580.00	53,981	52,200	No
Hercules/Rodeo	Contra Costa	3591.01	81,565	52,200	No
Hercules/Rodeo	Contra Costa	3592.03	91,553	52,200	No
Hercules/Rodeo	Contra Costa	3592.04	93,337	52,200	No
Larkspur	Marin	1192.00	133,049	73,300	No
Larkspur	Marin	1200.00	118,068	73,300	No
Larkspur	Marin	1211.00	101,422	73,300	No
Larkspur	Marin	1212.00	89,056	73,300	No
Martinez	Contra Costa	3160.00	41,972	52,200	Yes
Martinez	Contra Costa	3170.00	46,728	52,200	Yes
Martinez	Contra Costa	3200.01	76,096	52,200	No
Mission Bay	San Francisco	226.00	67,179	73,300	Yes
Mission Bay	San Francisco	607.00	55,526	73,300	Yes
Oakland (Jack London Square)	Alameda	4020.00	80,852	52,200	No
Oakland (Jack London Square)	Alameda	4032.00	50,651	52,200	Yes
Oakland (Jack London Square)	Alameda	4033.00	50,889	52,200	Yes
Oyster Point	San Mateo	6023.00	76,334	73,300	No
Pittsburg	Contra Costa	3090.00	60,639	52,200	No
Pittsburg	Contra Costa	3100.00	48,155	52,200	Yes

**Table 3.7.3 - Continued
Low Income Analysis**

Facility	County	Census Tract No.	Median Household Income (\$)¹	County Low Income Limit (\$)²	Potentially Low Income?
Redwood City	San Mateo	6102.00	57,191	73,300	Yes
Redwood City	San Mateo	6102.02 ³	57,191	73,300	Yes
Redwood City	San Mateo	6103.02	64,682	73,300	Yes
Richmond	Contra Costa	3780.00	108,199	52,200	No
Richmond	Contra Costa	3790.00	38,880	52,200	Yes
Richmond	Contra Costa	3800.00	64,325	52,200	No
Richmond	Contra Costa	3820.00	57,904	52,200	Yes
Sausalito	Marin	1290.00	60,758	73,300	Yes
Tiburon	Marin	1230.00	280,842	73,300	No
Tiburon	Marin	1242.00	218,657	73,300	No
Treasure Island	San Francisco	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data
Vallejo	Solano	2507.01	51,959	41,200	No
Vallejo	Solano	2509.00	26,515	41,200	Yes
Vallejo	Solano	2515.00	46,847	41,200	No
Vallejo	Solano	2516.00	44,706	41,200	No
Vallejo	Solano	2517.01	92,504	41,200	No

Notes:

- 1) ABAG data. Median Income based on 1995 dollars. Projection to 2000 dollars was made using a 1.189 multiplier.
- 2) Low Income Limit for a 3-person household published February 2002 by the Calif. Dept. HCD. Since the average persons per household in every county potentially affected by the project was between 2 and 3, a 3-person household low income limit was used. HUD bases low income limits on a 4-person household, and uses a factor of 0.9 to determine low income limits for 3-person households.
- 3) Census tracts that were split up into two tracts for the 2000 US Census from one 1990 US Census tract. Partial census tracts. Data presented are from larger tract from the 1990 US Census.

**Table 3.7.4
Minority and/or Low-Income Communities**

Facility	Census Tract No.	Low-Income Community?	Minority Community?
Alameda Point	4277.00	No	No
Alameda Point	4286.00	No	No
Alameda/Harbor Bay Isle	4283.01	No	No
Alameda/Harbor Bay Isle	4283.02	No	No
Alameda/Main St.	4274.00	Yes	No
Alameda/Main St.	4275.00	Yes	No
Alameda/Main St.	4276.00	Yes	Yes
Antioch	3050.00	Yes	No
Antioch	3060.01	No	No
Antioch	3060.02	No	No
Berkeley/Albany	4204.00	Yes	Yes
Berkeley/Albany	4219.00	No	No
Berkeley/Albany	4220.00	Yes	No
Berkeley/Albany	4221.00	Yes	No
Berkeley/Albany	4222.00	No	No
Ferry Building	105.00	No	No
Ferry Building	106.00	Yes	No
Ferry Building	115.00	Yes	Yes
Ferry Building	179.01	No	No
Hercules/Rodeo	3580.00	No	No
Hercules/Rodeo	3591.01	No	No
Hercules/Rodeo	3592.03	No	Yes
Hercules/Rodeo	3592.04	No	Yes
Larkspur	1192.00	No	No
Larkspur	1200.00	No	No
Larkspur	1211.00	No	No
Larkspur	1212.00	No	No
Martinez	3160.00	Yes	No
Martinez	3170.00	Yes	No
Martinez	3200.01	No	No
Mission Bay	226.00	Yes	No
Mission Bay	607.00	Yes	No
Oakland (Jack London Square)	4020.00	No	Yes
Oakland (Jack London Square)	4032.00	Yes	No
Oakland (Jack London Square)	4033.00	Yes	Yes
Oyster Point	6023.00	No	No
Pittsburg	3090.00	No	No
Pittsburg	3100.00	Yes	No
Redwood City	6102.00	Yes	No
Redwood City	6102.02	Yes	No
Redwood City	6103.02	Yes	No
Richmond	3780.00	No	No
Richmond	3790.00	Yes	Yes
Richmond	3800.00	No	No
Richmond	3820.00	Yes	Yes
Sausalito	1290.00	Yes	No
Tiburon	1230.00	No	No
Tiburon	1242.00	No	No
Treasure Island	No Data	No Data	No
Vallejo	2507.01	No	No
Vallejo	2509.00	Yes	No
Vallejo	2515.00	No	No
Vallejo	2516.00	No	No
Vallejo	2517.01	No	No
TOTALS		23 = Yes	9 = Yes
PROJECT TOTALS	54 Project Tracts	42.6% of project total	16.6% of project total