

## 5.7 LAND USE

### 5.7.1 Significance Criteria

Impacts would be considered significant if they would:

- **Cause community displacement.** Implementation of the project would have a potentially significant impact if an alternative could result in the displacement of existing houses or businesses, either directly or indirectly.
- **Disrupt community cohesion.** Implementation of the project would have a potentially significant impact if an alternative physically divides, or otherwise substantially disrupts, 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 an alternative disproportionately causes adverse physical impacts to low-income or minority persons. 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 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).

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 was used, which are based on federal (HUD) standards for determining low income. The definition of a minority community was used 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.

### 5.7.2 Impacts

#### 5.7.2.1 Construction and Operational Impacts

Potential WTA ferry terminal locations can be divided into locations that have existing, operating terminals, and locations that do not currently have operating terminals. The expansion and enhancement of ferry services would affect a wide range of land uses and communities along the Bay shoreline. The majority of the potential terminal locations for Alternatives 1 and 2 would require construction of new ferry terminals. 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 in Figures 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3. More detail on each potential ferry terminal site is contained in Tables 5.7.1 through 5.7.3.

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.
Alameda Point (13)	A ferry could be located on the decommissioned Naval Air Station Alameda, which is under redevelopment as a mixed-use residential/commercial neighborhood. The area will include residential units, industrial/office space, retail businesses, and cultural/institutional facilities.
Alcatraz Island (38)	The existing ferry terminal is on the northeast side of Alcatraz Island. The terminal is next to a visitor’s center and visitor amenities and is downhill from the cellblock buildings of the penitentiary. The island retains its historic buildings and appearance as a former prison, and the ferry terminal facilities and surroundings are the first facilities that visitors see when approaching the island.
Angel Island (5)	There is existing ferry service to Angel Island—the largest island in San Francisco Bay and a California State Park. The terminal is located at Ayala Cove on the north side of the island in Marin County. The island is composed of hilly grasslands and forest with recreational facilities, trails, and sites of historical interest including the Immigration Station, Fort McDowell, and the West Garrison.
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.
Benicia (40)	The potential terminal site would be located adjacent to the downtown area. It would be near the commercial core as well as single- and multi-family housing.
Berkeley/Albany (7)	This terminal site would be located south of Golden Gate Fields, or at the foot of University Avenue. A hotel and conference center is proposed just north of the terminal location, and retail space is proposed to the south. The remaining shoreline would be part of the Eastshore State Park.

- Candlestick Park (34) The San Francisco Planning Department stated that a new marina complex with space for a ferry landing and concessions is planned near Candlestick (3Com) Park. The football stadium is surrounded by a large parking lot and nearby mudflats that are planned for restoration to natural salt marsh habitat. An interpretive center is proposed to promote environmental education.
- China Basin/  
Pac Bell Park (11) A potential location is just south of the ballpark in the South of Market neighborhood of San Francisco, a light industrial area of the city with numerous high-technology firms and multiple-unit residential buildings. This highly developed and active area of San Francisco includes the Moscone Convention Center, the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, and the Yerba Buena Center for the Arts.
- Coyote Point (35) This ferry terminal would be in San Mateo at Coyote Point. There is an existing marina, open space park, public museum, and golf course at this location. The nearest residential units are to the south of East Poplar Avenue.
- Crockett (27) Railroad tracks run along the entire shoreline of Crockett, and uses along the waterfront include residential, industrial, and commercial. Downtown Crockett has many historical buildings and narrow streets. The City of Crockett discourages cars downtown.
- East Palo Alto (37) Although there is currently no marina in East Palo Alto, a potential location for a new terminal in this area is Cooley Landing. The area is currently a junkyard/scrap yard with wetland habitat nearby. Extensive redevelopment is proposed for this area, which would include residential, retail, commercial, and office uses.
- Fort Baker (8) The proposed ferry terminal would be located at Fort Baker, on Horseshoe Bay just east of the Golden Gate Bridge in Sausalito. The site is within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and the scenic Marin Headlands. The ferry would service the proposed conference and retreat center in the rehabilitated historic structures.
- Fort Mason (31) Ferry service is proposed to Fort Mason Center in San Francisco. The site is a converted military base with a variety of nonprofit organizations and activities including arts, education, ecology, and recreation. It is part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, near major tourist attractions like Ghirardelli Square, and surrounded by dense urban neighborhoods.
- Foster City (36) The waterfront in the vicinity of a potential Foster City terminal site includes a park that is currently closed and used as staging area for work on the San Mateo Bridge, a residential area, and office uses.
- Gnoss Field (44) A potential ferry terminal could be located northeast of Novato along the Petaluma River. The site is on a slough near the Marin County Gnoss Field general aviation airport, the Northwestern Pacific railroad tracks, and Highway 101.

- Half Moon Bay (43) The Half Moon Bay terminal would be located at an existing harbor that is surrounded by a golf course, beaches, and natural reserves along the coastline. Recent real estate development has made Half Moon Bay into a new bedroom community serving San Francisco and the Peninsula.
- 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.
- Hunters Point (33) This potential ferry terminal site could be at the decommissioned Hunters Point Shipyard in the southeast corner of San Francisco. The shipyard consists primarily of abandoned industrial and residential buildings, which are being used in limited capacities. The proposed redevelopment of the former U.S. naval base is conversion to civilian use as a waterfront mixed-use, live-work community.
- 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.
- 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 are 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.
- Moffett Field (22) Ferry service is proposed for Moffett Field in Mountain View/Sunnyvale, Santa Clara County. This decommissioned base along the South Bay shore includes two runways, barracks, administrative buildings, aircraft hangars, military housing, and the NASA/Ames research center. Reuse plans are being developed and may include a NASA Research Park, a California Air and Space Center, and other intensified land uses.

Oakland Army Base (OARB) (32)	The former OARB is currently a mix of maritime, industrial, and former army base facilities. A redevelopment plan is being prepared for this area which would include business parks, light industrial, maritime support, new marine terminals, and public parks. A new terminal to serve this area would be located along the Inner Harbor.
Oakland International Airport/Coliseum (42)	A potential ferry terminal could be located either on the west side of San Leandro Bay adjacent to the Oakland International Airport or on the east side near the Oakland Coliseum. The area is a mix of industrial, business parks, airport-related services, and low-density commercial/office.
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.
Pittsburg (26)	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.
Point Molate (29)	A ferry terminal could be located at Point Molate, a decommissioned Navy contaminated site (brownfield). The area is currently vacant with some shoreline recreational uses.
Port Sonoma (45)	A ferry terminal could be located at the existing Port Sonoma Marina, along the Petaluma River in Sonoma County. The surrounding area is under agricultural use (some of which has conservation easements) and provides important wildlife habitat. The site is also near Route 37 and the former Northwestern Pacific Railroad, but it is miles away from urban centers.
Presidio (10)	A former military base, the Presidio is now part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. It includes public open space, residential uses, historic buildings, and office space. New construction at the Presidio is limited to maintain the significant open space and preserve natural, historic, scenic, and recreational features.
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.
- San Rafael (30) A ferry terminal could be located at the marina in San Rafael. The area surrounding area includes a supermarket, a neighborhood shopping/commercial area, and residential units (including houseboats).
- 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.
- Sausalito/  
Bay Model (3) A second ferry in Sausalito could serve the Bay Model, a public museum of the Bay Ecosystem. The area surrounding the museum is industrial. The location is within the Marinship Specific Plan Area (1983), the intent of which is to preserve water-oriented areas and prevent large-scale development.
- 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.
- San Francisco,  
Pier 41-43 (9) Ferry service is currently provided from Pier 41 in San Francisco, which is a major tourism center due to its location next to Pier 39, a year-round festival marketplace. The neighborhood adjacent to the terminal includes tourist and residential uses including retail, restaurants, other services, and single-family and multifamily housing.
- San Francisco  
International  
Airport (18) A ferry terminal could directly serve San Francisco International Airport in Millbrae, San Mateo County. The airport has seen rapid growth in air traffic and is continuing to explore means for expanding services, such as potential runway expansion.
- San Leandro  
Marina/East Bay  
(17) The City of San Leandro's marina is a potential location for a new ferry terminal. The waterfront in San Leandro is primarily devoted to open space in the form of parks and golf courses. The city has identified the marina as the focus of future development activity, including a potential hotel development.
- 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.

Alameda, Candlestick Park, and Treasure Island are the only locations identified that have already adopted plans for developing a new ferry terminal. In most cases, however, the development of a new terminal would not be compatible with local land use policies such as land use designations and zoning ordinances. Although Alternative 3 would only result in terminal enhancement, some activities may result in the need to change a land use designation or require a Conditional Use Permit.

As discussed in Section 3.7.1.4, analysis under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is required for general plan amendments to change a land use designation, or Conditional Use Permits (or similar permit) needed by 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. As such, the development and implementation of a specific route(s) would require site-specific CEQA review for most of the new terminals proposed.

Based on the land use data collected and analyzed for the project, it appears that the large majority of proposed terminal locations would not be consistent with local land use policies. However, until such time that parcels are identified for potential ferry terminals, the compatibility of each proposed terminal with existing land uses and zoning ordinances remains unknown.

Any potential terminal site must be identified using some level of analysis or waterfront planning process with consideration to the surrounding land uses in order to adequately ensure the terminal will be a compatible use. This can be accomplished under CEQA or conducted as an independent analysis. This requirement for the WTA and local proponents of specific ferry expansion projects to comply with CEQA is not identified herein as a formal "impact." These projects could not proceed without complying with this already required process.

***Impact LU-1*** Many of the ferry terminal locations are proposed in developed urban areas that do not currently have ferry terminal facilities. The development of new ferry terminals in urban locations could result in the displacement of existing residential, commercial, or industrial buildings.

Water transit facilities in areas without existing operational ferry terminals that are already developed may result in the displacement of residences, offices, or industrial facilities. The possible expansion of existing terminal facilities as a result of the proposed enhancement 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. It is also noted that the area needed for new or expanded transit terminals is not a substantial amount at a regional level. For example, the maximum total affected shoreline for Alternative 1, if fully implemented, is less than 1 percent of the Bay Area shoreline area.

Because the specific size, type, and location of each proposed new terminal proposed is unknown, the significance of displacement impacts that occur as a result of the proposed project cannot be determined. In other words, the conceptual nature of the ferry expansion plan prevents the assessment of the significance of potential displacement impacts at a regional scale. However, it is important to note how displacement impacts might occur generally, and clearly identify the considerations that the WTA and local agencies will need to incorporate into site-specific environmental review under CEQA.

Significant displacement impacts to people or businesses can be minimized by locating new terminals in areas that are already identified by a local redevelopment agency, or need to be removed for safety reasons (e.g., that are known to be structurally deficient or contain hazardous materials that need to be removed). The installation of water transit facilities could also take advantage of the older, derelict industrial areas that occur in some locations throughout Bay shoreline communities to avoid impacting residential areas and minimize the number of business relocations. Note that planning for facilities in industrial areas, or for any location, will be performed with evaluations of each site for potential existing soil or water contamination. The presence of these site conditions can be addressed through avoidance, construction methods, or site remediation.

Some ferry terminals could be developed as an amenity to or in conjunction with other developments that have displacement impacts, 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 local city or county to consider displacement impacts for that entire project including the terminal. The potential impacts associated with these larger development projects may require partial 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 they live or work in (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, specific project proponents 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

- Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could 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 due to a lack of site-specific information, it remains a potentially significant impact.
- The decision to displace homes or businesses must be made in participation with local city and county governments.
- Displacement impacts most often result from redevelopment or property acquisition requirements.

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

If a displacement is unavoidable, project proponents will be required to 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)
- Reimbursement criteria for businesses, including costs associated with searching for a new space, and business (i.e., patronage) lost due to the relocation

**Impacts After Mitigation:** Relocation of a resident or business can be a significant impact to those affected, and sometimes to the community. Required relocation assistance and compensation has typically offset this impact. It is not significant at a regional level due to the expected low number of people and businesses likely affected. However, it is identified here as a potentially remaining significant effect until site-specific locations are identified and conceptually defined.

***Impact LU-2*** **Installation of new ferry terminals could disrupt or divide already established neighborhoods. This impact has the potential to be significantly negative or positive, depending on how much the community supports or opposes the location of the terminal.**

The construction and operation of a ferry terminal where one does not currently exist could, in some cases, result in potentially significant impacts as a result of disrupting or dividing an already established neighborhood. It is unlikely that Alternative 3 would have regionally

significant impacts due to a permanent disruption or division of an established neighborhood because the ferry terminals are already integrated into the community. An expansion of ferry service or terminal facilities could have significant impacts on the neighborhoods adjacent to the existing terminals, however this would not be a significant impact at the regional level.

Construction-related impacts could disrupt existing neighborhoods due to construction noise, dust, and traffic. Examples of these impacts include trucks driving through neighborhoods on the way to a construction site, noise increases related to pile driving or other noisy construction activity, or particulate matter blowing into neighborhoods from a project site. These potentially disruptive impacts will be analyzed on a project-by-project basis as part of the environmental review under CEQA. Although potentially significant, these impacts are most often minimized to less-than-significant level through project design features or best management practices. Furthermore, construction-related impacts are temporary and would not result in permanent change in an established community.

Operational impacts that could permanently disrupt or divide existing neighborhoods are potentially significant. Alternatives 1 and 2 have the greatest potential to permanently alter already established neighborhoods in communities around the Bay, especially in terminal locations proposed in urban or suburban settings where terminals do not currently exist. Divisions could occur primarily due to potential roadway expansion that may be required in order to accommodate anticipated changes in traffic patterns to and from a new terminal. Disruption could occur as a result of changes in land use and development adjacent to a new ferry terminal in a neighborhood where this growth would not have otherwise occurred (see discussion under Impact LU-2 for potential growth inducement impacts). The project could also disrupt an established community by displacing a community center, place of worship, or other gathering place, however this impact is unlikely to occur nor would it be regional significant. 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 and from the terminals by vehicle, bus, or other form of transit.

For purposes of this analysis, new terminal locations were identified that would potentially require vehicles to utilize roads through established residential areas to access the site. The following locations were identified:

Facility	Nearest Highways	Approx. Driving Distance to Nearest Highway (mi)	Approx. % of Driving Distance in Residential Area
Antioch	SR 4	1.5	50
Benicia	I-780	> 1	75
Crockett	I-80	> 1	75
East Palo Alto	US 101; SR 84	1.5; 1.5	75; 50
Half Moon Bay	SR 1	> 1	50
Hercules/Rodeo	I-80	1 – 1.5	100
Hunters Point	US 101	2	75
Mare Island	I-80, SR29; SR 37	3.5; 3; 3	50; 50; 50
Martinez	SR 4; I-680	3; 2.5	100; 25
Mission Bay	I-280; US 101	> 1	75
Pittsburg	SR 4	1.5	50
Richmond	I-580	1	50
San Leandro	I-880	1.5	75
Sausalito/Bay Model	US 101/SR 1	1.5	75

These locations could result in significant community impacts if it is determined that existing roadways must be widened to accommodate an increase in traffic due to the installation of a ferry terminal. Roadway widening could result in the relocation of homes or businesses. The result of larger roadways with more traffic could potentially impact community cohesion by increasing noise, light, glare, and aesthetic impacts in the community; could make it less desirable to live there; and may adversely affect property values. Due to the speculative nature of these impacts, adequate analysis cannot be conducted at this time. Therefore, as stated above, it is important that local planning agencies consider implementing new ferry service only after environmental review under CEQA and/or some comprehensive planning has been conducted to analyze these potential impacts.

Localized impacts that result in the disruption or division of established neighborhoods due to the implementation of Alternatives 1 or 2 could cumulatively result in a potentially significant impact at the regional level. It is possible that many terminals could be constructed simultaneously. Also, the permanent changes that occur as a result of implementing Alternative 1 or 2 could be considered potentially significant at the regional level if many of the adopted plans result in changes that are considered disruptive or divisive of an established neighborhood.

#### **Summary of Impact LU-2**

- Impacts that disrupt or divide established communities could take place during the construction and operation of a ferry terminal.
- Cumulatively, local projects that result from the implementation of Alternatives 1 or 2 could result in potentially significant impacts at the regional level.
- Implementation of Alternative 3 may potentially disrupt or divide an established neighborhood; however, these impacts would be less-than-significant at the regional level.
- As with Impact LU-1, community impacts must be considered at the local level when a city or county adopts plans to construct and operate a ferry terminal.

**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 terminal location study. Any potential terminal site must be identified using some level of analysis with consideration to the surrounding land uses in order to adequately ensure the terminal will be a compatible use and will minimize land use impacts, as is required under CEQA. Site-specific projects should consider project design elements that improve terminal accessibility while maintaining community cohesion.

**Impacts After Mitigation:** Although the implementation of Mitigation LU-2.1 would reduce Impact LU-2 to a less-than-significant level, until further study at the local level is conducted to identify site-specific criteria or standards for identifying and mitigating disruptive or divisive community impacts, Impact LU-2 remains a potentially significant impact.

***Impact LU-3*** The implementation of the program alternatives 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 established low-income or minority neighborhoods.

As the regional transportation agency, MTC identified low-income and minority neighborhoods (referred to as Disadvantaged Communities) in the Bay Area to determine if 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. Like 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 that result from implementing the WTA Initiative could result in negative or positive impacts. Positive impacts could potentially occur in every community, where a new terminal is proposed, as a result of increased transit opportunities. More specifically, site-specific terminal projects, if constructed and operated carefully, could greatly benefit low-income and minority communities by providing economic opportunity locally as well as greater access to the region. By integrating with other forms of transportation at new and existing terminal locations, the proposed program could improve the mobility of low-income and minority communities.

These positive impacts could be offset by adverse impacts that disproportionately affect low-income and minority communities. Although displacement of homes and businesses or community disruption by a site-specific ferry project may be a significant impact to any community, such impacts could potentially have a greater adverse impact on low-income and minority communities. As MTC points out in their 2001 RTP EIR, "[P]ersons in these communities may be more constrained in finding appropriate new living situations, paying for the costs of relocation, getting to businesses that are relocated, or establishing new businesses" (MTC 2001).

Alternatives 1 and 2 could result in disproportionate adverse impacts to low-income and minority communities if discretion is not taken to avoid the displacement of homes and businesses or substantial disruption of these communities. Disproportionate adverse impacts could occur if a large portion of an alternative's total displacement impacts occurred in low-income or minority neighborhoods. This is also true if a disproportionate number of the total community disruption impacts occur in these communities. As discussed under Impacts LU-2 and LU-3, there is a potential for these community impacts to be significant, regardless of income or race/ethnicity. Alternative 3 would not cause disproportionate adverse impacts to low-income or minority communities because it would only enhance existing terminals.

The following shows those census tracts considered to be minority and/or low-income communities that could be potentially affected by the proposed project either directly by the terminal or indirectly by the growth that could occur as a result of installing a terminal. "Yes" means that the census tract data indicated that the community met or exceeded the criteria for defining a low-income and/or minority community. "No" means that the community did not meet the criteria.

As shown in Table 5.7.3, the proposed project would not disproportionately impact low-income or minority communities. Because it cannot be determined at this time where physical impacts would occur as a result of implementing the project, disproportionate adverse impacts cannot be assessed at this time. However, the following proposed terminal locations should be recognized not only for their potential to adversely impact low-income or minority neighborhoods, but for their potential to positively impact the local community by creating a new form of accessible regional transportation:

Alameda/Main Street	Oakland (Ninth Ave)
Antioch	Oakland (Jack London Square)
Berkeley/Albany	PacBell/China Basin
Candlestick	Pittsburg
East Palo Alto	Presidio
Ferry Building	Redwood City
Hercules/Rodeo	Richmond
Hunters Point	San Francisco (Pier 41-43)
Martinez	San Rafael
Mission Bay	Sausalito
Moffett Field	Vallejo

### **Summary of Impact LU-3**

- Impacts to low-income and minority communities could be positive or adverse.
- The physical displacement of homes and/or businesses or the substantial disruption of an established neighborhood could have a greater adverse effect when it occurs in a low-income or minority neighborhood.
- Implementing Alternatives 1, 2, or 3 could potentially result in a locally significant impact to low-income and minority neighborhoods. However, impacts to low-income and/or minority communities would be considered adverse only if they would result in a physical adverse impact such as the displacement of a home or business, or the division of an established community.

**Mitigation LU-3.1:** The terminal site selection process should consider project alternatives to avoid adverse physical impacts to the low-income and minority neighborhoods identified in this EIR.

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.

**Impacts After Mitigation:** Although the implementation of Mitigations LU-1.1, LU-2.1, and LU-3.1 would reduce Impact LU-3 to a less-than-significant level, 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, Impact LU-2 remains a potentially significant impact.

### References

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). 2001. Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan.

**Table 5.7.1  
Land Use and Community Matrix – Alternatives 1 Through 4**

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
<b>Alameda</b>	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
<b>Alameda Harbor Bay Isle</b>	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.
<b>Alameda Point</b>	Alameda Planning and Building Department	Alameda	Public Institutional	1996 NAS Reuse Plan identifies a number of priorities for land use, employment, economic development, housing, public use, and social service.	M-2-G Manufacturing and special government district	Y	N	Y	Decommissioned naval station. Currently, little activity on site. Least tern colony on runway portion of site.	Under redevelopment as mixed-use, residential, and commercial neighborhood. A golf course, hotel, and convention center are being considered.	Most of the older Navy buildings are in the art-deco style, so this theme/core would be preserved. Keep historically significant buildings, keep old runway as a wildlife refuge
<b>Alcatraz Island</b>	GGNRA	San Francisco	Park and Open Space	Maintain as public open space for rec. use. Preserve historic structures. Protect bird and marine wildlife habitats.	Park/Public Land	Y	Y	N	Tourist Attraction	None Identified.	None Identified.
<b>Angel Island</b>	California State Parks	San Francisco	Park and Open Space	Data not available	Park/Public Land	Y	Y	Y	Tourist Attraction/ Recreation	None Identified.	
<b>Antioch</b>	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.
<b>Benicia</b>	Benicia Planning Department	Benicia	Residential	See the General Plan	E - Light Industrial; Residential	Y	N	Y	Light Industrial area is vacant. Wastewater treatment plant on 5th/G Streets. Along the waterfront is Rancho Benicia Mobile Home Park and Portside Village (condos)	Proposed 10-acre development east of wastewater treatment plant, but no applications yet.	Many policies regarding conformance with existing architectural characteristics.
<b>Berkeley/Albany</b>	Berkeley Planning and Development Department	Berkeley	Waterfront/ Marina	Policy 9 – ferry service	SP – Specific Plan (from 1986 Waterfront Specific Plan)	Y	N	Y	Golden Gate Fields Parking	None Identified	None Identified
<b>Candlestick</b>	San Francisco Planning Department	San Francisco	Parks and Open Space; Public Facilities	Enhance wildlife habitat and develop water-oriented and recreational uses.	M-2 Industrial	N	N	Y	Stadium, previously for baseball, now for football. Large parking lot.	Natural marsh to be restored near the mudflat. Indigenous vegetation will be recreated by planting native trees, shrubs, and ground cover. Construction of an interpretive center to promote environmental education. A marina complex is planned with space for ferry landing and concessions.	Preserve wildlife habitat and waterfront environment.
<b>Coyote Point</b>	City of San Mateo Planning Department	San Mateo	Parks and Open Space	None Identified specific to Coyote Point. Bay shoreline policy goals are to enhance wildlife habitats and promote public awareness of the environment with on-site programs and presentations.	S - Shoreline District (allows for parks facility)	Y	N	Y	A marina, open space park, public museum, and golf course. Residential units to the south of E. Poplar Ave.	No plans	City design review guidelines.
<b>Crockett</b>	Contra Costa County, Community Development Agency	Contra Costa County	Heavy Industrial, Commercial Recreation, Low-Density Residential	New development cannot encourage cars to use downtown. Mixed uses encouraged along Loring Ave.	Data not available.	Y	N	Y	Railroad tracks run along the entire shoreline. Waterfront has mixed uses; residential, industrial and commercial	Mixed uses encouraged along Loring Ave (near shoreline).	Many Victorian structures in downtown.

**Table 5.7.1 - Continued**  
**Land Use and Community Matrix – Alternatives 1 Through 4**

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
<b>East Palo Alto</b>	East Palo Alto Community Development Department, Planning Division	East Palo Alto	Industrial	Currently, there are no marinas in EPA. Cooley Landing is being considered for one, with extensive redevelopment in the surrounding area.	Will require rezoning to allow for residential, commercial, office land uses	N	N	Y	Junkyard, scrap yard, wetlands	Urban Design Plan has been adopted and will be going through an EIR process. Redevelopment in the area will include residential, retail, commercial and office land uses.	City has design review policies.
<b>Ferry Building (SF)</b>	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.
<b>Fort Baker</b>	GGNRA	Sausalito	Public Institutional	Promote the continued recreational and educational uses and preservation of existing facilities in East Fort Baker within the GGNRA area	Park/Public Land	Y	N	Y	Public, commercial, and some historical buildings	Limited redevelopment plans	Majority of lands are to remain open space; preservation of the environment
<b>Fort Mason</b>	GGNRA	San Francisco	Public Open Space	Protect natural vegetation and marine wildlife habitat. Encourage continued programming of special events and activities.	Public	N	N	Y	Public, residential, some historical buildings	Large redevelopment unlikely, however Lucas Company's commercial development is to the west of the Fort.	None Identified.
<b>Foster City</b>	Foster City Community Development Department	Foster City	General Commercial, Office Park	None Identified	None Identified	Y	N	Y	Park facilities currently closed; used as staging area for work on the San Mateo Bridge. Mostly residential area across Beach Park Blvd, with office uses to the west	None Identified	None Identified
<b>Gross Field/Port Sonoma</b>	Sonoma County Permit & Resource Management Department	Sonoma County	Data not available.	Environmental and ecological importance of this area makes it difficult for any kind of development in this area.	Data not available.	Y	N	N	Agricultural use that supports a large wildlife habitat. Adjacent to Route 37 and the Northwestern Pacific Railroad.	None Identified.	None Identified.
<b>Half Moon Bay</b>	Half Moon Bay Planning Department	Half Moon Bay	Data not available.	Data not available	Data not available	Y	N	Y	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
<b>Hercules/ Rodeo</b>	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.
<b>Hunters Point (Shipyard)</b>	San Francisco Planning Department	San Francisco	Industrial/ Support Facilities, Naval Shipyard	Environmental remediation req'd (in progress)	Not yet determined	N	N	Y	Abandoned residential and industrial buildings.	Convert from naval to civilian uses	Increase public access to the shipyard without interfering with maritime use.
<b>Larkspur</b>	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	None Identified

**Table 5.7.1 - Continued**  
**Land Use and Community Matrix – Alternatives 1 Through 4**

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
<b>Mare Island</b>	Vallejo City Hall Planning Department	Vallejo	Reuse Plan – Planned District	Will be built out according to the Reuse Plan; emphasis on making Mare Island primarily a job center, an economic engine for the City of Vallejo.	Planned District	N	N	Y	Currently there are many old military buildings, some of which are occupied by businesses. Some buildings vacant, or closed.	Reuse Plan focuses on creating a job center with mixed land uses (i.e. industrial and office uses). The Plan also calls for development of a regional park, expansion of the golf course to 18 holes, relocation of the rifle range, reactivation of the dredge pond, and the construction of a bridge at the southern end of the island. New residential development and marina built nearby.	Focus is on making this an economic center, not a bedroom community of Vallejo. Preserve waterfront areas.
<b>Martinez</b>	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.
<b>Mission Bay</b>	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.
<b>Moffett Field</b>	Federal Military Property	Moffett Field	Data not available.	Data not available	Data not available		N		Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
<b>Oakland Airport/ Coliseum</b>	City of Oakland Community and Economic Development Agency	Oakland	Business Mix and General Industrial/ Transportation (for airport)	Business Mix – Broad mix of commercial, light industrial, R&D, office, air & rail transportation services. General Industrial/ Transportation: industrial and manufacturing, transportation, warehousing	Most of area is regulated by the Port of Oakland, with no zoning regulations imposed by the city; some development along Hegenberger Road is within city's zoning jurisdiction	N	N	Y	Oakland International Airport, business park, and travel-related commercial land uses along Hegenberger Rd.	Continued airport and business development with improved public access along the Estuary. The Proposed BART Coliseum-Airport connector with 2 interim stations near Hegenberger will increase intermodal access in area.	City and Port design review policies for new development. Airport proximity issues (i.e. height).
<b>Oakland Army Base</b>	City of Oakland Community and Economic Development Agency	Oakland	General Industrial / Transportation	The Oakland Army Base is subject to a Re-Use Plan that is not yet finalized. The Oakland Base Reuse Authority (OBRA) maintains authority over future redevelopment of the base	M-40 General/Heavy Industrial (redevelopment as per the Re-Use Plan may require rezoning)	Y	N	Y	Currently a mix of maritime, industrial, and former army base facilities. Future plans for redevelopment are not finalized.	Subject to Oakland Army Base Re-Use Plan, under authority of OBRA. Re-Use Plan not yet finalized.	Subject to Army Base Re-Use Plan, and potential historic preservation issues with certain base structures.
<b>Oakland/ 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue</b>	City of Oakland Community and Economic Development Agency	Oakland	Planned Waterfront Development	The Estuary Policy Plan calls for the transformation of this area from maritime and marine industrial uses to a public-oriented waterfront district with significant open space	M-40 General/Heavy Industrial (redevelopment will require rezoning to mixed use district)	Y	N	Y	Currently, this area is dominated by the Ninth Ave. Terminal, a break-bulk maritime facility. Other uses include light industrial land uses, furniture sales, and trucking companies.	A specific plan will be prepared within the next 12-18 months for the Oak to Ninth District	The Ninth Ave. Terminal is a potentially designated historic property. Water views and significant public access to the waterfront is required with new development
<b>Oakland/ Jack London Square (Alice St.)</b>	City of Oakland Community and Economic Development Agency	Oakland	Waterfront Commercial Recreation	Public-oriented waterfront activities are encouraged, including retail, restaurant, hotel, and commercial recreation uses, with significant public access and open space along the estuary.	R-80 High Density Residential (may be changed to a mixed-use/commercial district as part of the Jack London Sq. II development)	Y	Y	Y	Previously Jack London Village – now demolished; future commercial and hotel uses as part of Jack London Square II development; nearby are several restaurants, Barnes & Noble bookstore, other retail and hotels	Future redevelopment as part of Jack London Square II includes approx 300,000 sq. ft. office space; 119,000 sq.ft. retail and a 240-room hotel w/ conference facilities; Port of Oakland owns this land	The Estuary Policy Plan requires preservation and enhancement of view corridors to the estuary; and sensitive treatment along the water's edge
<b>Oyster Point</b>	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.
<b>PacBell Park/China Basin</b>	San Francisco Planning Department	San Francisco	Ballpark, Heavy Industrial/ Public Trust	Create a new public park and small boat marina east of the Embarcadero Roadway. Include a public boat launching ramp if possible.	Public	Y	Y	Y	Recreational, commercial, residential, light industrial.	Mission Bay redevelopment plans	Provide broad lawn areas and landscaped grounds. Provision for bike trail and pedestrian promenade linking open space along the waterfront.

**Table 5.7.1 - Continued**  
**Land Use and Community Matrix – Alternatives 1 Through 4**

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
<b>Pier 41 - 43 (SF)</b>	San Francisco Planning Department	San Francisco	General Commercial/ Public Trust	Develop a new fishing harbor in the vicinity of Hyde St, create a cenral open space, and maintain/create opportunities for new water-oriented commercial recreational development.	M-1 Light Industrial, 40- foot height limit	Y	Y	Y	Mixed tourist uses including retail, restaurants, and other attractions	None Identified	Public Plaza
<b>Pittsburg</b>	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
<b>Point Molate</b>	Richmond Planning Department	Richmond	Open Space Recreation	None.	CRR - Community Regional Recreation	N	N	N	Vacant, with some shoreline recreational uses	This is a closed down Navy brown field. City's redevelopment office may have some plans, but viable implementation of any plans is unlikely. Very narrow one-lane road makes access difficult and redevelopment would require great financial resources. There are also issues with accessibility to public services.	None Identified.
<b>Presidio</b>	GGNRA	San Francisco	Public Open Space	Attractively maintain the significant open space. Permit more intensive recreational uses without significantly altering the character of its open landscape (e.g. Crissy Field)	Park/Public Land	N	N	Y	Public open space, residential, some historic buildings		Preserve open space and natural historic, scenic and recreational features of the Presidio. No new structures with adverse effects on natural characteristics of the Presidio; limited new construction
<b>Redwood City</b>	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
<b>Richmond</b>	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
<b>San Francisco Int'l Airport (SFO)</b>	San Francisco Planning Department	San Francisco	Airport	Various FAA regulations, safety	Self- Permitting	N	N	Y	Airport uses	Considering runway expansion or other means of expanding services at the airport.	Airport-related issues and regulations
<b>San Leandro Marina/ East Bay</b>	San Leandro Planning Division	San Leandro	General Commercial (Marina); Parks and Recreation and Garden Density Residential in the surrounding areas	Policy 15.09 of General Plan: Support continued study of the feasibility of ferry service from SL to other destinations around SF Bay. Policy 9.01-09 of General Plan: enhance the Marina area and support water-oriented development.	CR - Commercial Recreation	Y	N	Y	Mix of active recreational and commercial uses, including a 466-slip public marina, two yacht clubs, a hotel, and two large restaurants. Nearby, two golf courses and the 30-acre Marina Park.	No formal applications for redevelopment. City is supportive of new developments in this area that include full service hotel, conference center, and more commercial uses that will encourage more people to use the Marina.	Due to the Marina's unique status in the City's park system, high design standards will be required for future developments; new building and landscape design will tie together the commercial and recreational uses and reinforce the sense of the Marina.
<b>San Rafael (Loch Lomond Marina)</b>	San Rafael Community Development Department	San Rafael	Marina	New General Plan coming out in the next 1-2 years. No current pertinent policies.	Marina. Nearby is Neighborhood Commercial.	Y	N	Y	Marina uses (boat slips, etc.), supermarket, neighborhood shopping/ commercial area, surrounded by residential units across the streets.	No plans	City design review guideline criteria, and conformance with neighborhood plans.

**Table 5.7.1 - Continued**  
**Land Use and Community Matrix – Alternatives 1 Through 4**

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
<b>Sausalito</b>	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.
<b>Sausalito/Bay Model</b>	Sausalito Community Development Department	Sausalito	Public Institutional	Part of Marine Ships Specific Plan Area (1983). Major policy of Specific Plan is to preserve water-oriented areas. Any development here has to be done in parcels (no large developments).	Public	N	N	Y	Location is a public museum of Bay Area Ecosystem. Industrial uses in the area.	None Identified	Similar to Sausalito
<b>Tiburon</b>	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.
<b>Treasure Island</b>	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
<b>Vallejo</b>	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 5.7.2  
Race/Ethnicity Analysis for Alternatives 1 Through 4**

Facility	Census Tract No. <sup>1</sup>	Top Four Ethnicities (%) <sup>1</sup>				Minority Community? <sup>3</sup>
		African American	Asian <sup>2</sup>	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.
Alcatraz Island	No Data	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	No.
Angel Island	No Data	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	No.
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.
Benicia	2520.00	0.00	0.00	85.70	8.00	No.
Benicia	2521.02	4.80	0.00	81.10	11.70	No.
Benicia	2521.07	5.50	0.00	81.90	8.30	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.
Candlestick	610.00	19.00	54.20	15.70	9.00	Yes.
Coyote Point	6054.00	0.00	10.40	65.50	16.40	No.
Coyote Point	6061.00	0.00	12.00	53.10	33.30	No.
Crockett	3570.00	2.90	0.00	85.70	11.90	No.
East Palo Alto	6018.00	0.00	20.30	58.70	23.70	No.
East Palo Alto	6019.00	0.00	26.00	45.30	30.90	No.
East Palo Alto	6119.00	29.30	0.00	24.10	54.60	Yes.
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.
Fort Baker	1310.00	0.00	3.00	89.80	6.10	No.
Fort Mason	126.00	8.80	0.00	87.50	3.30	No.
Fort Mason	127.00	0.00	9.40	87.20	3.50	No.
Fort Mason	129.00	0.00	10.90	84.10	4.80	No.

**Table 5.7.2 - Continued**  
**Race/Ethnicity Analysis for Alternatives 1 Through 4**

Foster City	6081.00	0.00	29.30	61.00	6.90	No.
Foster City	6082.00	0.00	28.40	61.60	5.90	No.
Foster City	6083.00	0.00	34.60	56.80	5.20	No.
Foster City	6103.03	0.00	35.30	58.30	4.30	No.
Gross Field/Point Sonoma	1011.00	0.00	3.10	91.60	3.40	No.
Gross Field/Point Sonoma	1330.00	0.00	1.00	87.90	14.40	No.
Gross Field/Point Sonoma	1506.06	0.00	5.40	84.60	13.10	No.
Half Moon Bay	6135.01	0.00	8.00	69.00	29.00	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.
Hunters Point	231.01	46.80	23.70	0.00	20.50	Yes.
Hunters Point	231.02	73.60	0.00	8.90	11.60	Yes.
Hunters Point	232.00	58.20	10.90	0.00	22.50	Yes.
Hunters Point	234.00	46.10	14.00	0.00	25.30	Yes.
Hunters Point	606.00	59.60	20.10	0.00	12.60	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.
Mare Island	2508.00	20.10	20.10	42.20	0.00	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.
Moffett Field	5046.01	0.00	10.10	66.20	15.40	No.
Moffett Field	5046.02	0.00	11.30	60.60	16.00	No.
Moffett Field	5047.00	0.00	3.30	41.70	75.30	No.
Oakland (9 <sup>th</sup> Ave)	4060.00	0.00	44.00	19.70	30.20	Yes.
Oakland (Airport)	No Data	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	No.
Oakland (Army Base)	No Data	0.00	0.00	0.00	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.

**Table 5.7.2 - Continued**  
**Race/Ethnicity Analysis for Alternatives 1 Through 4**

PacBell/China Basin	180.00	29.30	0.00	45.70	18.40	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.
Point Molate	No Data	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	No.
Presidio	601.00	0.00	7.50	76.40	9.40	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.
San Francisco (Airport)	6043.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	No.
San Francisco (Pier 41-43)	101.00	0.00	26.00	57.00	7.00	No.
San Francisco (Pier 41-43)	102.00	0.00	9.00	83.00	3.00	No.
San Francisco (Pier 41-43)	103.00	0.00	35.00	58.00	3.00	No.
San Leandro (Marina)	4324.00	0.00	20.40	37.00	29.60	No.
San Leandro (Marina)	4333.00	0.00	26.70	45.60	20.60	No.
San Leandro (Marina)	4334.00	0.00	46.00	32.90	9.10	No.
San Rafael	1101.00	0.00	1.50	87.30	6.30	No.
San Rafael	1102.00	0.00	4.10	91.90	3.50	No.
San Rafael	1122.00	0.00	8.30	16.40	70.10	Yes.
Sausalito	1290.00	45.90	0.00	36.40	8.20	No.
Sausalito (Bay Model)	1302.00	0.00	3.90	91.70	3.30	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.
<b>Total Average:</b>		<b>10.89</b>	<b>13.07</b>	<b>50.23</b>	<b>13.44</b>	

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).

**Table 5.7.3  
Low Income Analysis – Alternatives 1 Through 4**

<b>Facility</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Census Tract No.</b>	<b>Median Household Income (\$)¹</b>	<b>County Low Income Limit (\$)²</b>	<b>Potentially Low Income?</b>
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
Alcatraz Island	San Francisco	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data
Angel Island	San Francisco	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data
Antioch	Contra Costa	3050.00	47,798	52,200	Yes
Antioch	Contra Costa	3060.01	58,974	52,200	No
Antioch	Contra Costa	3060.02	88,818	52,200	No
Benicia	Solano	2520.00	90,245	41,200	No
Benicia	Solano	2521.02	63,255	41,200	No
Benicia	Solano	2521.07&	63,255	41,200	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
Candlestick	San Francisco	610.00	66,703	73,300	Yes
Coyote Point	San Mateo	6054.00	76,572	73,300	No
Coyote Point	San Mateo	6061.00	76,928	73,300	No
Crockett	Contra Costa	3570.00	69,675	52,200	No
East Palo Alto	San Mateo	6018.00	78,593	73,300	No
East Palo Alto	San Mateo	6019.00	73,718	73,300	No
East Palo Alto	San Mateo	6119.00	71,935	73,300	Yes
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
Fort Baker	San Francisco	1310.00	121,873	73,300	No
Fort Mason	San Francisco	126.00	108,199	73,300	No
Fort Mason	San Francisco	127.00	101,541	73,300	No
Fort Mason	San Francisco	129.00	82,873	73,300	No
Foster City	San Mateo	6081.00	103,681	73,300	No
Foster City	San Mateo	6082.00	129,720	73,300	No
Foster City	San Mateo	6083.00	120,446	73,300	No
Foster City	San Mateo	6103.03&	143,631	73,300	No

**Table 5.7.3 – Continued**  
**Low Income Analysis – Alternatives 1 Through 4**

Gross Field/Point Sonoma	Marin	1011.00	148,387	73,300	No
Gross Field/Point Sonoma	Marin	1330.00	92,029	73,300	No
Gross Field/Point Sonoma	Sonoma	1506.06 <sup>&amp;</sup>	83,706	73,300	No
Half Moon Bay	San Mateo	6135.01 <sup>&amp;</sup>	107,248	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
Hunters Point	San Francisco	231.01 <sup>*</sup>	41,258	73,300	Yes
Hunters Point	San Francisco	231.02 <sup>*</sup>	41,258	73,300	Yes
Hunters Point	San Francisco	232.00	58,618	73,300	Yes
Hunters Point	San Francisco	234.00	48,868	73,300	Yes
Hunters Point	San Francisco	606.00	62,660	73,300	Yes
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
Mare Island	Solano	2508.00	48,273	41,200	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
Moffett Field	Santa Clara	5046.01	59,688	66,800	Yes
Moffett Field	Santa Clara	5046.02	61,234	66,800	Yes
Moffett Field	Santa Clara	5047.00	84,776	66,800	No
Oakland (9 <sup>th</sup> Ave)	Alameda	4060.00	41,021	52,200	Yes
Oakland (Airport)	Alameda	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data
Oakland (Army Base)	Alameda	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data
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
PacBell/China Basin	San Francisco	180.00	36,621	73,300	Yes
Pittsburg	Contra Costa	3090.00	60,639	52,200	No
Pittsburg	Contra Costa	3100.00	48,155	52,200	Yes
Point Molate	Contra Costa	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data
Presidio	San Francisco	601.00	66,822	73,300	Yes
Redwood City	San Mateo	6102.00	57,191	73,300	Yes
Redwood City	San Mateo	6102.02 <sup>&amp;</sup>	57,191	73,300	Yes
Redwood City	San Mateo	6103.02	64,682	73,300	Yes

**Table 5.7.3 – Continued**  
**Low Income Analysis – Alternatives 1 Through 4**

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
San Francisco (Airport)	San Francisco	6043.00	No Data	No Data	No Data
San Francisco (Pier 41-43)	San Francisco	101.00	71,459	73,300	Yes
San Francisco (Pier 41-43)	San Francisco	102.00	147,079	73,300	No
San Francisco (Pier 41-43)	San Francisco	103.00	111,766	73,300	No
San Leandro (Marina)	Alameda	4324.00	63,374	52,200	No
San Leandro (Marina)	Alameda	4333.00	74,194	52,200	No
San Leandro (Marina)	Alameda	4334.00	80,139	52,200	No
San Rafael	Marin	1101.00	127,104	73,300	No
San Rafael	Marin	1102.00	171,097	73,300	No
San Rafael	Marin	1122.00	60,758	73,300	Yes
Sausalito	Marin	1290.00	60,758	73,300	Yes
Sausalito (Bay Model)	Marin	1302.00	148,625	73,300	No
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:

ABAG data. Median Income based on 1995 dollars. Projection to 2000 dollars was made using a 1.189 multiplier. Low Income Limit for a 3-person household published February 2002 by the California Department of Housing and Community Development. Since the average persons per household in every county potentially affected by the project was between 2 and 3 persons, a 3-person household low income limit was used. HUD bases their low income limits on a 4-person household, and uses a factor of 0.9 to determine low income limits for 3-person households.

\* 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 is from larger tract from the 1990 US Census.