

Adapting to Rising Tides project www.adaptingtorisingtides.org





The Plan step is where we develop possible actions in adaptation responses, and evaluate & select the most relevant responses to move forward. Today we are focused on developing adaptation responses – we drafted responses based on what we learned during the assessment & what the ART program has learned overall – today is a chance for you to see them and give feedback to make them more relevant.

## Key Planning Issues Access on and off Bay Farm Island and to and from Oakland International Airport (OAK) is already limited due to the island's geography, is vulnerable to future flooding and seismic events, and will affect the economy, public health and safety, and community function if disrupted. Oakland International Airport (OAK) is vulnerable to future flooding and seismic events both within its facilities and through its dependence on other assets. The Oakland/Alameda study area contains shoreline habitat, including habitat for the endangered California Ridgeway's Rail. However, much of this habitat exists in the form of fringing marshes, which are not predicted to persist given sea level rise, sediment projections and surrounding land uses.



Note that South Field is protected-



Note that South Field is protected under current and near term flood levels. Planning is underway for upcoming seismic work. Planned improvments-construction starts next year

-Raise the APD to provide shoreline and flood protection against anticipated mid -century sea-level rise, tidal and storm surges.

• Improve stability and reduce water seepage of the dike by installation of new embankments, and deep cement-soil mix walls.

• Strengthen the dike against liquefaction by the installation of underground rock columns.

• Strengthen the dike against wave action by the installation of additional rock armor.





Table	e 3: Modified	Low-Lying Ar	eas in the DEM	Contributin	g to Inundat	ion	*
Site	Average DEM Elevation (feet NAVD88)	SLR Scenario of First Overtopping (inches SLR)	Approximate Wall Height from Ground (feet)	Average LiDAR Elevation (feet NAVD88)	Modified Elevation (feet NAVD88)	Revised SLR Scenario of First Overtopping (inches SLR)	
A. Tide Gate Stru	cture	· ·					
West Segment	10.0	36	2.0	10.0	NA	36	
East Segment	9.0	36	2.0	9.5	9.5	36	
B. Veterans Cour: Seawall							
North Segment	7.2	24	3.0	10.0	10.0	48	
Middle Segment	5.9	12	3.0	10.0	10.0	48	
South Segment	7.5	12	3.0	10.0	10.0	48	
C. Doolittle Drive/Harbor Bay Parkway Intersection	8.5	24	NA	9.0	9.0	36	
D. Doolittle Drive	8.5	24	NA	9.0	9.0	36	
E. East Doolittle Drive	8.5	24	NA	9.0	9.0	36	

This areas aren't QUITE as low as we thought-remember Kris walking through the revised inundation? They are still very low. 36" is a 50 year water level here-48" isnt necessarily impossible in present day (although it is >100-yr coastal event).







\$3800-6800/linear foot (21-38 Million total). Could provide flood protection improvements



\$2800/linear foot, \$15M total, could provide flood mitigation benefits



\$2900/linear foot, \$16M total, no flood mitigation benefits.



\$5100/linear foot, \$29M total, could provide flood mitigation benefits.



How do we coordinate EBRPD and the Port/Caltrans/City of Alameda around these low points?

Segment C1 will use the existing sea wall Segment C2 proposes elevated structure (D) which doesn't provide flood protection



Michigan example, trail replacing cement flood wall. Normal river conditions are contained and the trail functions. The berm landside of the trail is the extreme flood protection.



- How to address near term risk along Doolittle?
- Multiple property owners
- Port of Oakland and ACFCWCD mapping



What is the long term plan?

