

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

To: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Office of Planning and Research 1400 Tenth Street, Room 222 Sacramento, CA 95814 <input type="checkbox"/> Office of the County Clerk-Recorder County of Alameda 1106 Madison Street Oakland, CA 94607	From: Oakland Unified School District 1000 Broadway, Suite 680 Oakland, CA 94607
--	---

Subject: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.

Project Title: Central Kitchen, Instructional Farm and Education Center Project

State Clearinghouse Number	Lead Agency	Area Code/Telephone/Ext.
SCH# 2015092070	Oakland Unified School District	510-879-8535 Contact: Jacqueline Minor, General Counsel

Project Location – Address: 2850 West Street (APN:9-691-38-1 and 9-695-15)

Project Location - City: Oakland

Project Location - County: Alameda

Project Description: The project would construct a 43,245 square-foot building containing a central kitchen, education center and administrative offices at the site of the former Marcus Foster School. An instructional farm comprising 1.5 acres would showcase a wide variety of hand-scale agricultural techniques, growing methods and crops.

This is to advise that Oakland Unified School District, the Lead Agency, has approved the above-described project on **November 4, 2015** and has made the following determinations regarding the above-described project:

1. The project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
2. A Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study (MND/IS) was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures were made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program was adopted for this project.
5. Findings were made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

This is to certify that the MND/IS with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the general public at: Oakland Unified School District, General Counsel Office, 1000 Broadway, Suite 680, Oakland, CA 94607.

Signature: 
James Harris, Board President

Date: 11/4/15

Signature: 
Antwan Wilson, Board Secretary and Superintendent

Date: 11/4/15

- ☒ Signed by Lead Agency
☐ Signed by Applicant

Date received for filing at OPR: _____



Central Kitchen, Urban Farm and Education Center Project

FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION/ INITIAL STUDY

Oakland Unified School District

In association with Center for Ecoliteracy



November 2015

Prepared by:

PLACEMAKERS

CHS Consulting Group

Geoffrey H. Hornek

Terraphase Engineering, Inc.

CENTRAL KITCHEN, INSTRUCTIONAL FARM AND EDUCATION CENTER PROJECT FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION/INITIAL STUDY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Final MND/IS	1
No New Significant Information	1
Organization of this Final MND/IS	1
PROJECT SUMMARY	3
Summary of the Project	3
Site Location	3
Project Description	3
CEQA Process and Schedule	3
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4
LIST OF COMMENTERS ON DRAFT MND/IS	10
Public Agencies Commenting in Writing	10
Individuals Commenting in Writing	10
WRITTEN COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT MND/IS AND RESPONSES TO THESE COMMENTS	11
Comment Letter #1: Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	12
Letter #1 Response: Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	14
Comment Letter #2: Shaunna Vella	15
Letter #2 Response: Shaunna Vella	17
Comment Letter #3: Alternier Baker Cook	19
Letter #3 Response: Alternier Baker Cook	20
Comment Letter #4: Lynne Horiuchi, Ph.D.	21
Letter #4 Response: Lynne Horiuchi, Ph.D.	25
REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT MND/IS	28
Introduction: Table S-1	28
Initial Study: Project Description	28
Initial Study: Section 5 Cultural Resources	29
Appendix I: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Checklist	29
Erratta	29

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Final MND/IS

The Final Mitigated Declaration/Initial Study (MND/IS) is an informational document prepared by the Oakland Unified School District (District), the Lead Agency. This Response to Comments document includes written public comment letters on the Draft MND/IS and presents responses to the written public comments; and as necessary makes corrections and clarifications to the Draft MND/IS. This Response to Comments document, together with the Draft MND/IS constitute the Final MND/IS for the Project. Due to its length, the text of the Draft MND/IS is not included with this Response to Comments document but is included by reference as part of the Final MND/IS. The District has prepared this document pursuant to Sections 15070 – 15074 of the CEQA Guidelines which address the preparation of Negative and Mitigated Negative Declarations.

No New Significant Information

If significant new information is added to a Draft MND/IS after notice of public review has been given, but before adoption of the Final MND/IS, the lead agency must issue a new notice and re-circulate the Draft MND/IS for further comment and consultation.

Although this Response to Comments document contains additions and clarifications to information presented in the Draft MND/IS, none of these additions and clarifications constitute a “substantial revision” as defined under Section 15073.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, defined as:

- A new avoidable significant effect is identified and mitigation measures or project revisions must be added in order to reduce the effect to insignificance.
- The lead agency determines that the proposed mitigation measures or project revisions will not reduce potential effects to less than significance and new measures or revisions must be required.

Information presented in this document support the District’s determination that recirculation of the Draft MND/IS is not required because:

- Revisions to mitigation measures are more effective as revised pursuant to Section 15074.1 of the CEQA Guidelines.
- Revisions to the project do not represent new avoidable significant effects.
- New information is added to clarify the project based on community input.

Organization of this Final MND/IS

This Final MND/IS contains information about the proposed Project, supplemental environmental information and responses to comments raised during the public review and comment period on the Draft MND/IS. Following this Introduction, the document is organized as described below.

Project Summary: summarizes the proposed Project, potential environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures.

List of Commenters on Draft MND/IS: lists public agencies and individuals that submitted written comments on the Draft MND/IS during the public review and comment period.

Written Comments on the Draft MND/IS and Responses to these Comments: contains the comment letters received on the Draft MND/IS and presents individual responses to the specific CEQA-related comments raised.

Revisions to the Draft MND/IS: contains text changes and corrections to the Draft MND/IS initiated by the District (as the Lead Agency) or resulting from comments received on the Draft MND/IS.

PROJECT SUMMARY

Summary of the Project

Site Location

The Project site is in the Hoover-Foster neighborhood in West Oakland and contains the former Marcus Foster School located at 2850 West Street. The site is located about 525 feet west of Interstate 980 and about 530 feet east of San Pablo Avenue. Access to the site is available from West Street and 29th Street.

Project Description

The proposed Project would consist of the construction of a central kitchen, instructional farm and education center at the Marcus Foster School site. The new building would contain 43,245 gross square feet and would include a central kitchen wing and an administrative office and education center wing. The central kitchen wing would range in height from 16 feet to 36 feet and the administrative office and education center wing would be 16 feet in height. An outdoor dining area would be located adjacent to the eastern edge of the education center. A staff and visitor parking area containing 40 parking spaces and two handicap spaces would be located east of the new building and would be accessed from 29th Street. A truck loading apron would provide three bays for delivery purposes that would accommodate up to two semi-trucks and one or two box trucks; and six bays to accommodate six box trucks for food delivery to District schools; and eight parking spaces and one handicap space for staff. The instructional farm would comprise about 1.5 acres and is designed to showcase a wide variety of hand-scale agricultural techniques, growing methods and crops. The instructional farm would include an outdoor gathering area, outdoor classrooms, orchard, raised and perennial beds, children's garden, farm stand, stormwater treatment planting area, beehive, composting area and community garden.

The central kitchen and administration office would house between 52 and 74 staff. The education center would have the capacity for 60 students. Visitors to the facility are estimated at 30 to 70 persons; and District K-12 students touring the instructional farm are estimated at 30 to 70 students. Outdoor dining events would be planned for up to 50 persons. Special events for up to 120 persons would take place two to three times a year.

Construction would take about 16 months, starting in December 15, 2015 and ending in May 15, 2017. Construction hours would be 7:00 am to 4:00 pm. Monday through Friday.

CEQA Process and Schedule

Prior to the release of the Draft MND/IS, the District undertook a comprehensive community engagement effort which is presented below in chronological order:

- Canvassing the neighborhood immediately surrounding the Project site with fact sheets and flyers about the Project, launching an informational website, returning resident calls with requests for more information, reaching out to and meeting with West Oakland key leaders (including community-

based organizations, local political leaders and nearby schools) both on a one-on-one basis and through three group meetings to collect input about the programming and design and canvassing the neighborhood to distribute flyers inviting residents to community meetings.

- A community meeting on January 26, 2015 where the architects presented the Project design to residents and community leaders. The community asked questions and provided their input.
- A community meeting on January 31, 2015 where the CEQA consultant presented information on the CEQA review process for the Project and residents and community leaders asked questions about CEQA and shared their concerns about potential environmental impacts.
- In February and March 2015, the District sent representatives to three community meetings to discuss the Project with local residents.
- A second CEQA-related community meeting on May 2, 2015 where the CEQA consultant presented preliminary conclusions pertaining to Project impacts and mitigation measures.
- Establishment of a Community Engagement Advisory Committee made up of local residents, neighbors and key District personnel. The District convened seven Committee meetings to gather community input on topics of concern for local residents and share additional information about the Project.
- Conducted a neighborhood survey to assess community concerns and perspectives about the Project. The survey was released in July 2015.
- A community town hall meeting on August 29, 2015 to discuss the Project and receive input from the community.

The purpose of the District's community engagement effort was to inform the public about the Project and its environmental review process and to receive comments from the community regarding their concerns about the environmental effects of the Project.

On September 25, 2015 the Oakland Unified School District issued a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Kitchen, Instructional Farm and Education Center Project. The 30-day public review and comment period on that Draft MND/IS ended on October 28, 2015. A public hearing on the Final MND/IS is scheduled for November 4, 2015.

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The summary table included in the Draft MND/IS and presented on the following pages of this document identify the potentially significant impacts and recommended mitigation measures that would reduce the potentially significant impacts to less than significant. The District agreed to incorporate the recommended mitigation measures identified in the Draft Initial Study. Thus, a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the proposed Project in conformance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE CENTRAL KITCHEN, INSTRUCTIONAL FARM AND EDUCATION CENTER PROJECT

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<i>Initial Study Section 3 Air Quality</i>			
During Project construction the maximum annual PM _{2.5} concentration would exceed the Project-level BAAQMD CEQA threshold.	Potentially Significant	<p>AIR-1 Although the Project construction fleet emissions would be limited by the requirements of the California Air Resources Board's (CARB) <i>In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation</i>, the Project health risk assessment found that additional controls are required to assure that the BAAQMD's diesel particulate matter (DPM) concentration threshold is met at all local residences. Accordingly, the construction contractor shall implement the following BAAQMD <i>Enhanced Exhaust Emissions Reduction Measures for Project Construction Equipment</i> measures to further reduce construction-related exhaust emissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All off-road equipment greater than 25 horsepower (hp) and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All such engines shall meet or exceed USEPA/CARB Tier 3 off-road emission standards; or 2. All such engines shall be retrofitted with a CARB-level 2 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS) device. 	Less Than Significant
<i>Initial Study Section 5 Cultural Resources</i>			
During Project construction it is possible unknown prehistoric, historic or paleontological resources and human remains could be disturbed.	Potentially Significant	<p>CUL-1 In the event that any prehistoric, historic or paleontological materials are discovered during ground disturbing activities, all work within 50 feet of the resources shall be halted and the District shall consult with a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant, the District and qualified archaeologist shall meet to determine the appropriate avoidance or other measures. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis and/or professional museum curation and a report shall be prepared by the qualified archaeologist according to current professional standards.</p>	Less Than Significant

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE CENTRAL KITCHEN,
INSTRUCTIONAL FARM & EDUCATION CENTER PROJECT (Continued)**

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<i>Initial Study Section 5 Cultural Resources - continued</i>			
		<p>CUL-2 In the event that human skeletal remains are uncovered at the Project site during construction or ground-breaking activities, all work shall immediately halt and the Alameda County Coroner shall be contacted to evaluate the remains and following the procedures and protocols pursuant to Section 15064.5(e)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, if the County Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the District shall contact the California Native American Heritage Commission, pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and all excavation and site preparation activities shall cease within a 50-foot radius of the find until appropriate arrangements are made. If the agencies determine that avoidance is not feasible, then an alternative plan shall be prepared with specific steps and timeframe required to resume construction activities. Monitoring, data recovery, determination of significance and avoidance measure (if applicable) shall be completed expeditiously.</p>	
<i>Initial Study Section 12 Noise</i>			
During Project construction, daily average outdoor noise levels from the Project site could rise to disruptive and annoying levels.	Potentially Significant	<p>NOISE-1 The following Best Management Practices shall be incorporated into the construction documents to be implemented by the construction contractor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide enclosures and noise mufflers for stationary equipment, shrouding or shielding for impact tools, and barriers around particularly noisy activity areas on the site. • Use quietest type of construction equipment whenever possible, particularly air compressors. • Provide sound-control devices on equipment no less effective than those provided by the manufacturer. • Locate stationary equipment, material stockpiles, and vehicle staging areas as far as practicable from sensitive receptors. • Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines. 	Less Than Significant

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE CENTRAL KITCHEN,
INSTRUCTIONAL FARM & EDUCATION CENTER PROJECT (Continued)**

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<i>Initial Study Section 12 Noise - continued</i>			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require applicable construction-related vehicles and equipment to use designated truck routes when entering/leaving the site. Designate a noise disturbance coordinator who shall be responsible for responding to complaints about noise (and vibration) during construction. The telephone number of the noise disturbance coordinator shall be conspicuously posted at the construction site. Copies of the project purpose, description and construction schedule shall also be distributed to the surrounding residences. Limit project construction activity to the hours of 7 am to 9 pm on weekdays as required under the <i>City of Oakland Municipal Code Chapter 8.18.020</i>. 	
<i>Initial Study Section 16 Transportation and Circulation</i>			
During Project construction, it may be necessary to temporarily close traffic lanes adjacent to the Project site.	Potentially Significant	<p>TRAFFIC-1 During Project construction, in the event of traffic lane closures, the District shall provide advance notice to the neighbors to inform them about the location, dates and times of lane closures. To reduce potential temporary construction impacts to the surrounding streets during construction activities, the District shall comply with the City of Oakland's Standard Conditions of Approval for Construction Traffic and Parking, which requires that a construction traffic management plan be developed and approved by the City. Project compliance with Standard Conditions of Approval for Construction Traffic and Parking shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A set of comprehensive traffic control measures, including scheduling of major truck trips and deliveries to avoid peak traffic hours, detour signs if required, lane closure procedures, signs, cones for drivers, and designated construction access routes; Notification procedures for adjacent properties and public safety personnel regarding when major deliveries, detours, and lane closures will occur. 	Less Than Significant

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE CENTRAL KITCHEN,
INSTRUCTIONAL FARM & EDUCATION CENTER PROJECT (Continued)**

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<i>Initial Study Section 16 Transportation and Circulation – continued</i>			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location of construction staging areas for materials, equipment, and vehicles at an approved location. • A process for responding to, and tracking, complaints pertaining to construction activity, including identification of an onsite complaint manager. The manager shall determine the cause of the complaints and shall take prompt action to correct the problem. Planning and Zoning shall be informed who the Manager is prior to the issuance of the first permit issued by Building Services. • Provision for accommodation of pedestrian flow. • Provision for parking management and spaces for all construction workers to ensure that construction workers do not park in on-street spaces • Any damage to the street caused by heavy equipment, or as a result of this construction, shall be repaired, at the applicant's expense, within one week of the occurrence of the damage (or excessive wear), unless further damage/excessive wear may continue; in such case, repair shall occur prior to issuance of a final inspection of the building permit. All damage that is a threat to public health or safety shall be repaired immediately. The street shall be restored to its condition prior to the new construction as established by the City Building Inspector and/or photo documentation, at the applicant's expense, before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. • Any heavy equipment brought to the construction site shall be transported by truck, where feasible. • No materials or equipment shall be stored on the traveled roadway at any time. • Prior to construction, a portable toilet facility and a debris box shall be installed on the site, and properly maintained through project completion. 	

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE CENTRAL KITCHEN,
INSTRUCTIONAL FARM & EDUCATION CENTER PROJECT (Continued)**

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
<i>Initial Study Section 16 Transportation and Circulation – continued</i>			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All equipment shall be equipped with mufflers. • Prior to the end of each work day during construction, the contractor or contractors shall pick up and properly dispose of all litter resulting from or related to the project, whether located on the property, within the public rights-of-way, or properties of adjacent or nearby neighbors. 	

LIST OF COMMENTERS ON DRAFT MND/IS

Public Agencies Commenting in Writing

Presented below is a list of written correspondence received by Oakland Unified School District from public agencies providing comments on the Central Kitchen, Instructional Farm and Education Center Project Draft MND/IS:

- Letter #1: Department of Transportation (Caltrans) – Letter from Patricia Maurice, District Branch Chief; dated October 26, 2015.

Individuals Commenting in Writing

In addition to the comments received from public agencies, a number of private individuals have submitted written comments on the Draft MND/IS. These individuals include the following:

- Letter #2: Shaunna Vella – Email dated October 27, 2015.
- Letter #3: Alternier Baker Cook – Email dated October 28, 2015.
- Letter #4: Lynne Horiuchi, Ph.D. – Letter dated October 28, 2015.

WRITTEN COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT MND/IS AND RESPONSES TO THESE COMMENTS

This section includes copies of the written comments received by U.S. mail and electronic mail during the public review and comment period on the Draft MND/IS. Specific responses to the individual comments in each correspondence follow each letter.

Each correspondence is identified by a numeric designator (e.g., “1”). Specific comments within each correspondence also are identified by a numeric designator reflecting the numeric sequence of the specific comment within the correspondence (e.g., “1-2” for the second comment in Comment Letter 1).

Responses focus on comments that pertain to the adequacy of the analysis in the MND/IS or to other aspects pertinent to the potential effects of the Project on the environment, pursuant to CEQA. Comments that address topics beyond the purview of the MND/IS or CEQA are noted as such for the public record. Where comments have triggered changes to the Draft MND/IS, these changes appear as part of the specific response and are consolidated in Revisions to the Draft MND/IS section of this document where they are generally listed in the order the revision would appear in the Draft MND/IS document.

Comment Letter #1: Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

EDMUND G. BROWN Jr., Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 4
P.O. BOX 23660
OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660
PHONE (510) 286-6053
FAX (510) 286-5559
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov



Serious Drought.
Help save water!

October 26, 2015

ALA980035
ALA-980-PM 1.5
SCH# 2015092070

Ms. Jacqueline Minor
Oakland Unified School District
955 High Street
Oakland, CA 94601

Central Kitchen Instruction Farm and Education Center Project – Mitigated Negative Declaration

Dear Ms. Minor:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the project referenced above. The proposed project would demolish the two existing on-site buildings and construct a central kitchen, instructional farm, and education center that is approximately 43,245 gross square feet. Nearby regional access is provided via the State Route 24 on-ramp and off-ramps on 17th Street approximately 0.5 miles from the project site. Our comments seek to promote the State's smart mobility goals that support a vibrant economy and build active communities rather than sprawl. We have reviewed the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and have the following comments to offer.

Mitigation Responsibility

As the lead agency, the Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) is responsible for all project mitigation including any needed improvements to State highways, if any. The project's fair share contribution, financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures.

1-1

Vehicle Trip Reduction

We encourage the OUSD to consider project-specific Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and parking management strategies including dedicated car-sharing parking, dedicated bicycle parking and facilities, and providing transit passes or incentives to employees and visitors. This would promote mass transit use thereby reducing regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Additionally, considering Complete Street improvements, such as street furniture for pedestrians and transit riders may reduce vehicle trips and further alleviate the project's parking demand. This smart growth approach is consistent with MTC's Regional Transportation

1-2

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"

Comment Letter #1 (continued)

Ms. Jacqueline Minor, Oakland Unified School District
October 26, 2015
Page 2

Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy goals of both increasing non-auto mode transportation, and reducing per capita VMT by 10 percent each.

↑ 1-2
con't.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter or seek additional information, please contact Sherie George at (510) 286-5535 or sherie.george@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



for PATRICIA MAURICE
District Branch Chief
Local Development - Intergovernmental Review

c: State Clearinghouse

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"

Letter #1 Response: Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

- 1-1 As discussed in Section 16 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION of the Draft Initial Study, the proposed Project would result in less than significant traffic and circulation impacts. As discussed on pages 138 -149 of the Draft Initial Study, the Project would operate at acceptable LOS C or better during both AM and PM peak hours at all study intersections. Thus, no mitigation measures are required and were not identified in the Draft Initial Study.

The Draft Initial Study identified potential temporary construction impacts to the surrounding streets during construction activities and identified Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1, on pages 152-153, to reduce potentially significant temporary construction traffic and circulation impacts to less than significant. Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1 would not require any improvements to State highways.

- 1-2 This comment suggests the District consider including Transportation Demand Management and parking management strategies. The Project includes the following features to reduce vehicle trips:

- Parking facilities for 12 bicycles.
- K-12 students visiting the Instructional Farm will be transported by bus or carpool.
- Special events visitors will be encouraged to arrive in vans.

OUSD Mail - Concerns for the Central Kitchen



Concerns for the Central Kitchen

Shaunna Vella <shaunna.vella@gmail.com>
To: jacqueline.minor@ousd.org

Tue, Oct 27, 2015 at 10:01 AM

My name is Shaunna Vella, I live directly across from the potential loading dock of the proposed Central Kitchen Project at Marcus Foster. This is my formal concerns for the Marcus Foster Central Kitchen.

2-1

2-2

2-3

2-4

<https://mail.google.com/mail/ca/u/0/?ui=2&ik=47db1fd534&view=pt&q=shaunna.vella%40gmail.com&qs=true&search=query&th=150aa3eea1b27c4e&siml=15...> 1/2

Comment Letter #2 (continued)

10/27/2015

OUSD Mail - Concerns for the Central Kitchen

I understand this is a great project for Oakland, for the school children on Oakland. I understand that there has been abundant work on behalf of the local residents, and OUSD to find compromise for this construction and specifically concerns regarding the site-selection process and communication with community. I appreciate all that OUSD has done since January in regards to reaching out to us but it still does not change that I am deeply concerned with the health risks regarding air quality, toxins with demolishing the existing building, and environmental risks like increase traffic, increased sounds, smells that could be aggravating live within 100 feet distance from. These are my formal concerns, so that OUSD has it on record that we are residents of 2805 West Street, CA 94608 Shaunna Vella, and Summer Cox are against the use of this property to be turned into the Central Kitchen.

2-5

<https://mail.google.com/mail/ca/u/0/?ui=2&ik=47db1fd534&view=pt&q=shaunna.vella%40gmail.com&qs=true&search=query&th=150aa3eea1b27c4e&siml=15...> 2/2

Letter #2 Response: Shaunna Vella

- 2-1 This comment suggests the Project would present significant adverse health risks to the Hoover-Foster neighborhood. The Draft Initial Study addresses potential health risks to neighborhood residents in Section 3 AIR QUALITY (pages 44 – 62). The Project air quality analysis concluded that nearby residents would not be exposed to significant health risks from toxic air contaminants (TACs) due to Project construction or operation. It also estimated the cumulative health risks due to Project TAC emissions combined with emissions from all existing substantial TAC sources (as identified by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)) within 1,000 feet of the Project site (i.e., the “zone of influence” prescribed by the BAAQMD for cumulative TAC analysis, not the zone within which significant Project TAC impacts are expected). No significant cumulative TAC health risks were found.
- 2-2 This comment presents concerns about increased traffic, truck deliveries on weekends, truck safety, increase in noise and toxins due to trucks, aesthetics and property values. The concerns are addressed below:

Increased Traffic. During weekdays, there would be up to two semi-trucks and eight box trucks, for a total of ten trucks, entering and exiting the Project site on West Street between the hours of 7:00 am and 2:00 pm Monday through Friday. The Project is estimated to result in an increase in approximately 33 to 60 vehicle trips in the vicinity of the Project site during the AM (7:00 am to 8:00 am) and PM (5:00 pm to 6:00 pm) peak hours respectively. The traffic analysis concluded this increase is less than significant.

During Project construction, it is estimated there would be a peak of 150 truck trips per day over a two to three-day period during the demolition of the existing two buildings. As discussed in Section 16 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION of the Draft Initial Study, with implementation of Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1 (pages 152-153) traffic impacts during Project construction activities would be less than significant.

Truck Deliveries on Weekends. There would be up to three delivery trucks accessing the Project site during one weekend day per week. The District has added text to identify the number of truck deliveries on weekends under the Revisions to the Draft MND/IS section on page 28.

Truck Safety. Trucks would access the Project site from West Street and drive directly onto the truck apron and then back up to the loading dock. The truck apron would be fenced and gated along its West Street frontage. Pedestrians will not have access to the truck apron. During Project construction, the entire Project site will be fenced and gated, preventing pedestrian access to the construction site. Truck drivers must obey all traffic safety requirements (e.g., speed limits, signaling) when entering and exiting the Project site. During construction activities there will be public safety personnel on-site to monitor truck activity. The potential for truck accidents with pedestrians, bicycles and autos, while a possibility, is not considered to represent a significant safety hazard.

Increase in Noise and Toxins Due to Trucks. Noise and TAC emissions will be limited by the relatively small number of truck operations associated with food delivery (i.e., two semi-trucks and eight box trucks, each making one trip in and one trip out of the site per day) and by adherence to procedures/regulations that reduce noise: 1) there will be no outdoor loading activities in the yard outside the loading dock; 2) trucks will back into the dock and all loading activities will take place within the building; 3) TAC emissions (i.e., truck idling will be limited to five minutes per loading operation by California law; and 4) trucks will comply with California emission regulations for diesel engines, which will get progressively more stringent over time. Thus, there will be no significant noise impacts to adjacent residents as defined by the Oakland Noise Ordinance, nor significant health impacts to adjacent residents or to their gardens under BAAQMD criteria.

Aesthetics. As discussed in Section 1 AESTHETICS, Subsection 1c of the Draft Initial Study (pages 36 – 41), the new building would be similar in height and massing as with the existing two buildings located on the Project site; and the new building would be located at the site of the existing two buildings - the corner of West Street and 29th Street. The physical size of the building will be similar to the existing two buildings and the new building would be compatible with the heights and massing of nearby development. The site use will change to include a central kitchen, but there will continue to be a school use including culinary and hospitality classes and outdoor classrooms for K-12 students touring the Instructional Farm.

Property Values. Property values are not a CEQA-related issue and therefore is not addressed in the Draft MND/IS.

- 2-3 This comment presents concerns about odors from the facility trash bins located on the loading dock and from on-site composting. The trash bins would be sealed and would be located about 150 feet away from the nearest residential property line; they will be emptied frequently so that odor does not increase from food spoilage. Regarding the compost yard, it would be located at the center of the property, about 160 feet away from the nearest residential property line. This yard will be used to compost only green waste (dead plants) from the instructional farm, a process which is essentially odorless. Food waste produced by the central kitchen will not be composted on site, but will be hauled offsite regularly for disposal.
- 2-4 This comment presents concerns about TAC impacts because of the resident's location within the "zone of influence" of the Project's air quality analysis. This zone is not the area within which significant Project TAC impacts are expected. It is the area prescribed by the BAAQMD for the inclusion of Project and other existing local TAC sources within the scope of the air quality analysis. Both project-level and cumulative analyses were conducted under BAAQMD guidelines and no significant TAC health risks were found to the nearest residents nor to any other residents within the 1,000-foot zone of influence.
- 2-5 The commenter's opinions are noted and are hereby made part of the public record. The commenter's concerns about health and environmental risks are discussed in Responses 2-1 through 2-4 above.

Comment Letter #3: Alternier Baker Cook

From: Alternier Baker Cook <alternierbcook@hotmail.com>
 Date: Wed, Oct 28, 2015 at 1:24 PM
 Subject: Opposition to the Central Kitchen, Instructional Farm & Educational Center
 To: "jacqueline.minor@ousd.org" <jacqueline.minor@ousd.org>

October 28, 2015

Jacqueline Minor
 General Counsel
 Oakland Unified School District
 1000 Broadway, # 680
 Oakland, CA 94607
 Jacqueline. Minor@ousd.org

Dear Ms. Minor

I am writing in opposition to the Central Kitchen, Instructional Farm and Educational Center sponsored by OUSD. The project is located at 2850 West Street, Oakland, Ca.

Questions about CEQA issues were not addressed to my satisfaction, in that I had specifics issues with the air quality, noise, hydrology, traffic, and hazardous materials. Yes, I attended the Community Engagement Advisory Committee meeting on October 2 that allowed Committee members to ask OUSD questions about the Mitigated Negative Declaration. Responses are due on the four hundred plus page document on October 28, 2015, are due on October 2, 2015 for the purpose of since the May 2, 2015 meeting. A review of the environmental issues were heard at the January 31, 2015 meeting and the OUSD Central Kitchen, Instructional Farm & Educational Center Project CEQA Meeting on May 2, 2015. The Engagement should have happened during the design phase. No apology can alter that.

3-1

The community did not become aware of this project until earlier in 2015. However, it was planned in 2011 and the community was not informed at that time about the site selection. The three-block radius for outreach is not big enough. I live within the three-block radius. I am a senior citizen with severe respiratory challenges including Asthma and allergies to multiple environmental pollutants. I was not contacted. Many of my neighbors also reported that they too were not contacted through the outreach methods. The only times we hear from the OUSD was through our Property Tax Assessment and when our School Board Representative is "hustling" votes. Neighbors beyond the designated outreach area area are impacted as well. I recommend including, at least, all of Beat 6X.

3-2

I contacted Alan Gibbs, PG, and CHD in June of this year. Mr. Gibbs is the project manager for the CEQA portion of the project. I asked him to have Consultants, contact me to provide clarity on Air, Noise, Traffic, Geotech, Hydrology and Hazardous Materials. At the May 2, 2015 meeting, these items had potentially significant impacts and that mitigations were in question. I also asked that the responses be specific and use nontechnical language. I asked to further information regarding these issues.

3-3

This project will gut the heart and soul out of the community.
 Sincerely,

Alternier B. Cook
 665-31st Street
 Oakland, CA 94609
 510-653-9368
alternierbcook@hotmail.com

Letter #3 Response: Alternier Baker Cook

- 3-1 The commenter opinions are noted and hereby made part of the public record.
- 3-2 The commenter opinions are noted and hereby made part of the public record. The community engagement process for preparation of the Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study began prior to the first CEQA community meeting on January 31, 2015 with neighborhood canvassing, distribution of fact sheets and flyers and launching of an informational website for the Project.
- Ms. Cook notes she is within the public outreach three-block radius of the Project site. Ms. Cook's property is located approximately 875 feet northeast of the Project site. Air pollutant emissions from Project construction would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1 which requires that equipment have EPA-certified "clean" diesel engines. Air pollutant emissions from the two semi-trucks and eight box trucks, each making one trip in and one trip out of the site per day, would be limited because of the low number of truck trips per day and truck engine idling would be restricted to five minutes. The health risks of Project truck emissions during both construction and operation were estimated at the closest residences (where health risks would be greatest) and found to be acceptable according to the standards of BAAQMD. Project health risks at a residence 875 feet northeast of the Project site would be substantially less than those at the closest residences and well below BAAQMD standards.
- 3-3 The commenter opinions are noted and hereby made part of the public record. Ms. Cook contacted Mr. Gibbs by telephone on August 5, 2015, at which time Mrs. Cook discussed with Mr. Gibbs project-related traffic, noise, air quality, hazard materials, water quality, cultural resources and land use impacts. Mr. Gibbs referred Mrs. Cook to discuss her concerns with the District.

Comment Letter #4: Lynne Horiuchi, Ph.D.

Lynne Horiuchi, Ph.D.

701 39th Street Oakland, CA 94609
Tel: 510 919 6932 Email: clhoriuchi@gmail.com

October 31, 15

Jacqueline Minor
General Counsel
Oakland Unified School District
1000 Broadway, Room 680
Oakland, CA 94607
Jacqueline, minor@ousd.org

Dear Jacqueline Minor,

I am writing regarding the following project:

PROJECT TITLE: Central Kitchen, Instructional Farm and Education Center

PROJECT SPONSOR: Oakland Unified School District

PROJECT LOCATION: 2850 West Street (APN: 9-691-38-1 and 9-695-15)

DATE OF PUBLIC NOTICE: September 24, 2015

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: September 24, 2015 through 4:30 PM on October 28, 2015

DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING: Wednesday, November 4, 2015 at 6 PM at The Great Room, LaEscuelita Education Center, 1050 2nd Avenue, Oakland, CA 94606

As you know, many of us in the neighborhood oppose this project because as planned it will take out the heart and soul of this historically black neighborhood. The major reasons it should not take place is because of the lack of community engagement from the time it was planned in 2011 or earlier and the community was not informed about the site selection process.

The Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) has proposed the development of their Central Kitchen at the Marcus Foster School site at 29th Street between West and Martin Luther King Jr. Way very near the rapidly developing uptown area. OUSD has repeatedly stated that they “can do whatever they want on the site,” because they do not need to abide by local planning requirements. The historically black community surrounding the school site was only notified of the project on January 26, 2015 as the project was being readied for construction in June 2015, even though OUSD with Board Director Jumoke Hodge had been planning to build on the Marcus Foster site since 2011 and possibly earlier.

The imposition of the Central Kitchen development on this historically black community is an environmental injustice. The process and model of development of the Central Kitchen is comparable to other government actions arbitrarily undertaken that have decimated the Hoover/Foster area in the last half a century. In the 1960s and early 1970s, freeway development tore through the adjacent neighborhoods using eminent domain to claim property. Our Hoover/Foster area has not yet recovered from this legacy. We struggle with both the perception and reality that government entities allow illegal dumping, homeless encampments, blighted properties, drug dealing, violence and prostitution in the area. Your development strategy for the

4-1

4-2

Comment Letter #4 (continued)

Lynne Horiuchi

Page 2

Central Kitchen parallels the eminent domain projects of the past - where private property is seized for governmental development without regard to or input from residents or property owners. The greatest impacts of these types of government actions have fallen on communities of color--strategies thought to be completely outmoded.

4-2
con't.

The residents of the Hoover/Foster neighborhood have repeatedly raised questions about the serious flaws in the community outreach and site selection process. The residents have drawn attention to the Central Kitchen's potentially significant impacts on the health of children and people with respiratory ailments because of the neighborhood's proximity to the major thoroughfares in the San Francisco Bay area and the Port of Oakland. The Kitchen site is also within three blocks of the location of the Uber Headquarters and a 161-unit development that will be increasing traffic congestion in the burgeoning uptown area and near the freeway off ramps at 27th Street and Route 24/IS980. The Central Kitchen is an inappropriate land use for this site. OUSD would not have been able to place such a project in Claremont, Temescal, North Oakland or Lake Merritt, so West Oakland is the logical place in their mind.

4-3

As one resident has commented:

...the powers that be see the people in this neighborhood as a bunch of ignorant blacks and Latinos who are too lazy to take care of themselves. Asians who will sell out to the highest bidder own the property and the few businesses are owned and operated by Middle Easterners who do not care. This is far from the truth....

We are not seen as people who add to the sustainability to the community and therefore Downtown must make decisions without consulting us. We have routinely experienced governmental and private entities attempting to place services and activities that do not directly add community benefits as well as a sustainable tax base. Further, in most of these attempts, the residents have not been notified. We have had numerous non-profit services, from group homes low rent for ex-offenders to drug treatment services and public housing and more. Many of these services are focused for people who are not former residents of the area. However, it is almost impossible for an owner-occupied property owner to secure financing through normal channels as well as permits to renovate and maintain their properties. However, developers do not appear to have this challenge.....

4-4

This project will clearly have an adverse significant impact on the housing and economics of the neighborhood and it is part of patterns and practices that have discriminated against poor people of color in low-income neighborhoods like ours.

4-5

The project has been repeatedly misrepresented as benefitting all of Oakland's school children for whom we must sacrifice our neighborhood for the urgent need for new food production facilities. Per the promoters of this project, its great benefit will be another urban farm, like the one that will be built by City Slickers at 37th Street and Peralta as well as the numerous gardens that are programmed all over the area in addition to existing one. The rendering showing the monolith character of the building is rarely shown, and the NIAM public relations group has misrepresented the project, meetings and documents, i.e. the survey, the townhall meeting, and the

4-6

Comment Letter #4 (continued)

Lynne Horiuchi

Page 3

renderings. Public has rarely been informed about the demolition of school which is valued at approximately \$40 million.

↑ 4-6
con't.

The traffic study is entirely inadequate. The traffic area is miniscule and does not take into account any of the increases in traffic from development that will be taking place in the next two years such as the 161 unit apartment at 29th and Telegraph and the Uber Headquarters planned for 27th and Route 24/IS980. These are just three blocks from the proposed project and any additional traffic with these projects is likely to create level f congestion, especially around the freeway ramp intersections which is just two blocks away. The traffic study area needs to be redrawn to realistically include and model traffic *in the immediate future as well as long-term projections account for growth in Oakland's Uptown area* for a reasonably calibrated analysis of traffic impacts. Moreover, the number of vehicles that will be used and their stated maximum of 5 minutes of idling per vehicle is unrealistic and understates the significant potential impacts.

4-7

The air quality impact study seems at odds with the real suffering of people in the area from respiratory diseases. Our neighborhood is contained by freeways built during the 1960s and 70s. The congestion at the MacArthur maze spills toxins on us daily--all of us wipe this off our window sills, furniture and anything that remains outdoors. We are also close the Port of Oakland that brings numerous trucks into our area. Perhaps because the air quality is based on an inadequate traffic study, it cannot realistically reflect the impact of poor air quality in our area.

4-8

The cultural resources study also seems inadequate. Robert Kennard, an illustrious African American architect, was part of the design team responsible for Marcus Foster School. He was well-known enough to have garnered an obituary in the New York Times in 1995. Most importantly, he was the founder of the organization that became the National Organization of Minority Architects, the most nationally and internationally prominent organization for the representation of minority architects. Mr. Kennard was one of only 31 blacks among the 2,648 architects in the American Institute of architects at his passing. Thus, the Marcus Foster School is associated with the life of a person significant in our past and should be nominated for the National Register of Historic Places. The building remains in good shape, retaining the integrity of its original design. It is a site we should be honoring and memorializing, not only for its association with Robert Kennard but also for its association with Marcus Foster whose philosophies the school building embodies. Although the Marcus Foster School building is less than 50 years old, it should be considered significant and eligible for the National Register of Historic Places based on the importance of the individuals with whom it is associated, and this regardless of individual opinions of its value. The demolition of the building will be an adverse and significant effect on the Marcus Foster School.

4-9

The site selection process was entirely inaccessible to the residents of the surrounding community. Per his testimony at the townhall meeting on 29 August 2015, it appears it was the architect's determination of the requirements for the building were based on the total square feet the project required including the garden. Besides the fact that the garden seems entirely unnecessary with the funding of the City Slicker garden,

4-10
↓

Comment Letter #4 (continued)

Lynne Horiuchi

Page 4

there is thorough documentation of the site selection process at this late date. This should be covered thoroughly in an environmental document with alternatives, especially given the nearly complete lack of community involvement until OUSD had the project shovel ready for construction in 2015. Clearly the Initial Study level of this document is not adequate.



4-10
con't.

Finally, thank you very much for your recent efforts at community engagement. We hope to work with you productively in the future. However, the Initial Study is inadequate in many respects. I hope there will be an Environmental Impact Report prepared for this project so the community may understand the full impact of the project and possible alternatives.



4-11

Best regards,

Lynne Horiuchi

Letter #4 Response: Lynne Horiuchi, Ph.D.

- 4-1 The District opted to include in the Draft MND/IS a detailed section on community engagement. The District realizes that for opponents, this seems to be the most significant issue. The District believes throughout the Measure J bond campaign there was significant information about the central kitchen project and this information was available to all residents of Oakland before the community-specific engagement commenced in November 2014. The following link is to an article that appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle on October 11, 2012 about the central kitchen: <http://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/Oakland-Measure-J-to-upgrade-school-kitchens-3941438.php?cmpid=email-desktop>.
- 4-2 The commenter opinions are noted and hereby made part of the public record.
- 4-3 The commenter opinions are noted and hereby made part of the public record.
- 4-4 The commenter opinions are noted and hereby made part of the public record.
- 4-5 The commenter opinions are noted and hereby made part of the public record. It is noted the Project staff would be existing District employees that will be relocated from other District facilities to the Project facility, are housed in Oakland and other areas in the East Bay and would not place a significant demand on housing units in the community. Additionally, the District would hire neighborhood residents for temporary jobs as construction compliance coordinators which represents an economic benefit for the community.
- 4-6 The commenter opinions are noted and hereby made part of the public record.
- 4-7 This comment suggests the traffic study area be redrawn. Presented below are responses to issues raised by the commenter.

Traffic Study Area. In conducting a traffic study, it is assumed there are multiple ways for people to travel from Point A to Point B, thus the Project trips will likely spread onto multiple streets at greater distances from the Project site. Therefore, the traffic analysis focuses on the immediate vicinity of the Project site and along major roadways where the greatest Project impacts would occur.

Planned Development in Area. Traffic volumes for the Future Cumulative condition are developed primarily based on 2035 travel demand forecasts produced by the Alameda CTC's Countywide Travel Demand Model, which is periodically updated to be consistent with the most recent land use and socio-economic database of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and assumptions of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's regional travel demand model. As such, the Cumulative Conditions (Year 2035) account for general cumulative background growth due to major transportation projects and land use developments that are in various stages of planning/design or construction. While it's unclear whether the specific project at 2935 Telegraph Avenue was included in the Alameda CTC model, according to the Draft EIR

for 2935 Telegraph Ave, this mixed-use development would add up to 18 vehicle trips during the AM and PM peak hour to the critical movement at the intersection of 27th Street and I-980 On-ramp. With the limited addition of these trips, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS E, same as the Cumulative Baseline condition. Moreover, even with the addition of trips from 2935 Telegraph Avenue, the Project contribution to the intersection delay would continue to be less than six seconds at critical movement, thus the proposed Project would have a less-than significant impact. The Uber Headquarter is planned for the old Sears Building located at 20th Street and Broadway, not for 27th and I-980. The planned location for Uber Headquarter is approximately a mile south of the Project site. Trips to and from this location would likely occur along 18th for direct access to I-980. Therefore, it's very unlikely the Uber Headquarter would increase traffic volumes in the vicinity of the Project site.

Model Scenarios. Traffic impacts are assessed for the Existing and Cumulative Conditions. The Existing Conditions scenario is assumed to represent what is on the ground at the commencement of this study and also with added trips from the proposed Project. As explained above, the Cumulative Conditions scenario is primarily based on the travel demand forecasts produced by the Alameda CTC 2035 travel demand model. Therefore, traffic analyses account for both immediate future as well as long-term projections.

- 4-8 This comment presents correct observations concerning the major local air pollutant sources (i.e., freeways, Port of Oakland) that adversely affect air quality in West Oakland. The Draft Initial Study's air quality analysis was conducted with knowledge of this regional air quality context, as noted on page 31 of the Initial Study:

"West Oakland, where the Project site is located, is adjacent to the Port of Oakland and major freeways, both major sources of air pollutants, to the west and south. Regional wind patterns favor the transport of pollutants to West Oakland, and the confining terrain of the East Bay hills and frequent episodes of atmospheric stability favor their local buildup."

The Project air quality analysis, which was fully in compliance with BAAQMD Guidelines, concluded that nearby residents would not be exposed to significant health risks from toxic air contaminants (TACs) due to Project construction or operation. It also estimated the cumulative health risks due to Project TAC emissions combined with emissions from all existing substantial TAC sources (as identified by the BAAQMD) within 1,000 feet of the Project site. No significant cumulative TAC health risks were found.

The main component of Project operational TAC emissions would come from the delivery trucks. These TAC emissions will be limited by the relatively small number of trucks (i.e., two semi-trucks and eight box trucks, each making one trip in and one trip out of the site per day) and by adherence to procedures/regulations that reduce TAC emissions (i.e., truck idling will be limited to five minutes per loading operation by California law; and trucks will comply with California emission regulations for diesel engines, which will get progressively more stringent over time).

- 4-9 As stated in Section 3 CULTURAL RESOURCES, Subsection 3a (page 65), the two existing buildings located on the Project site are not included on the City of Oakland's Local Register of Historical Resources, the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places. The buildings were constructed in 1997 and are 38 years old. Both the State and federal Registers generally consider a property potentially historic if it is at least 50 years old.

The District has added text describing the distinguished career of Robert Kennard and the commitment to undertake photographic documentation of the interior and exterior of the two existing buildings. Please refer to page 29 of the Revisions to the Draft MND/IS section.

- 4-10 The District has repeatedly said that the alternative site selection analysis discussed by the commenter is not required for the preparation of the Project MND/IS.
- 4-11 The commenter opinions are noted and hereby made part of the public record.

REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT MND/IS

The changes to the Draft MND/IS presented in this section of the Final MND/IS are either initiated by the District (Lead Agency) staff or made in response to public comments received on the Draft MND/IS. Changes consisted of additions, revisions or clarifications to descriptive information presented in the Draft MND/IS. None of the changes affected the original findings or determinations of the Draft MND/IS. Throughout this section, newly added text is shown in single underline format and deleted text is shown in ~~striketrough~~ format. For changes specifically initiated by comments received on the Draft MND/IS, the numeric designator for the comment is indicated in [brackets] prior to its description.

Changes are listed generally in the order in which they would appear in the Draft MND/IS document. As indicated in the Introduction section, the entirety of the Final MND/IS consists of the Draft MND/IS and this Response to Comments document. Thus, the changes to the Draft MND/IS presented in this section incorporate and supersede the text of the Draft MND/IS.

INTRODUCTION: Table S-1

The District has added a mitigation measure to address community concerns regarding temporary construction air quality, noise and traffic impacts as found on pages 2, 4 and 6 (and elsewhere) in the Draft MND/IS:

AIR-2 The District shall hire a Neighborhood Construction Compliance Coordinator.

NOISE-2 The District shall hire a Neighborhood Construction Compliance Coordinator.

TRAFFIC-2 The District shall hire a Neighborhood Construction Compliance Coordinator.

INITIAL STUDY: Project Description

The District has eliminated the small barn and barnyard which are deleted under *Instructional Farm* on page 22:

Phase 2 of the instructional Farm comprises about 44,350 square feet and would include the following: lath house, ~~small barn and barnyard~~, row crops, orchards and service area.

and on page 32:

Phase 2 would complete the instructional farm facilities including the lath house, ~~small barn~~, row crops, orchards, service area and community garden.

[2-2] The following text is revised to clarify the number of truck deliveries on weekends on page 26, first paragraph, seventh sentence:

There may be up to three ~~limited~~ truck deliveries on one ~~the~~ weekend day.

INITIAL STUDY: Section 5 Cultural Resources

The District has added information on the history of the two existing school buildings located on the Project site under Subsection 5a, following the second paragraph on page 65:

In 1973 Robert Kennard, a pioneering African-American architect, co-designed the Marcus Foster Middle School with the MacKinlay Winnaker McNeil & Associates firm. Mr. Kennard's architectural firm is the oldest African-American-owned architectural practice in the western United States. Mr. Kennard received numerous awards, including being inducted into the College of Fellows of the American Institute of Architects in 1987; he also received the Institute of Architects prestigious Whitney Young Citation in 1991 for encouraging young people of color to enter the architectural profession. The Marcus Foster Middle School designed by Mr. Kennard in 1973 represented a departure from then contemporary design in many ways, including the open floor plan that gave teachers use of large spaces, unencumbered by classroom walls.

The Marcus Foster Middle School is not a historic resource under CEQA. However, in recognition of Mr. Kennard's important work, community contributions and the open floor plan concept he developed for the Marcus Foster School, the District agrees to photographic documentation of the interior and exterior of the two existing buildings prior to their demolition. The photographs shall be on display in the Education Center wing of the new building.

APPENDIX I: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Checklist

The District has added contact information on page 1 under the two bullets:

- District is responsible for coordination of the monitoring and reporting program including the monitoring checklist. All documentation associated with the record of proceedings for Project monitoring and reporting will be available to the public. ~~at fDistrict to identify contact and location of where documents are availablef.~~ Contact: Lance Jackson, Interim Deputy Chief of Facilities Planning and Management.
- District has overall responsibility for confirming compliance with all mitigation measures contained within the checklist. Once all mitigation measures have been complied with, the individuals and agencies assigned responsibility for implementing the mitigation measures and providing specified documentation shall submit a completed check list to ~~fDistrict to identify contactf~~ Lance Jackson, Interim Deputy Chief of Facilities Planning and Management.

ERRATTA

Page 89: a) LAND USE AND PLANNING

Page 97: The

Page 112: San Pablo Avenue