CHAPTER V
Alternatives

A. Criteria for Selecting Alternatives

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that the EIR compare the effects of a “reasonable range of alternatives” to the effects of the project. The alternatives selected for comparison would attain most of the basic objectives of the project and avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant effects of the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6). The “range of alternatives” is governed by the “rule of reason” which requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit an informed and reasoned choice by the decision-making body and informed public participation (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f]). CEQA generally defines “feasible” to mean an alternative that is capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, technological, and legal factors.

The alternatives addressed in this EIR were selected based on the following factors:

1. The extent to which the alternative would accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project (identified in Chapter III)
2. The extent to which the alternative would avoid or lessen any of the identified significant environmental effects of the project (discussed throughout Chapter IV)
3. The feasibility of the alternative, taking into account site suitability, availability of infrastructure, property control (ownership), and consistency with applicable plans and regulatory limitations
4. The extent to which an alternative contributes to a “reasonable range” of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice
5. The requirement of the CEQA Guidelines to consider a no project alternative and to identify an environmentally superior alternative in addition to the no-project alternative (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e)).

Significant Project Impacts

To determine alternatives that would avoid or lessen any of the identified significant environmental effects of the project, the significant impact of the project must be considered and are listed below. Impacts that are not mitigated to less-than-significant levels are considered “significant and unavoidable” and are indicated in parentheses and by “SU”. This list is intended
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to provide context for the extent to which an alternative would avoid or lessen any of the identified significant environmental effects of the project.

- Transportation and Circulation (SU)
- Air Quality (SU)
- Noise
- Cultural Resources (Historic) (assumed SU)
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Geology, Seismicity and Soils
- Public Health and Safety
- Biological Resources

The significant environmental effects of the project and each alternative are summarized in Table V-3 at the end of this chapter.

State Law Compliance / No Project

A key consideration for the selection of project alternatives to the Kaiser Permanente OMC Project is the state law requirement (SB 1953) that requires the seismic retrofitting or replacement of the existing hospital by December 31, 2012. A consequence of not meeting this requirement is closure of the hospital. For this EIR, this state mandate significantly guides the formulation of the “no project” alternative (required by CEQA).

The purpose of the “no project” alternative is to allow a comparison of the environmental impacts that would result if the project were not approved with those that would occur if the project is approved. In some situations, the existing environment (the existing development and uses on the property) would not change if a project is rejected, and the “no project” alternative would be a continuation of existing uses. However, with the proposed project, rejection of the project would not preserve existing hospital uses in their current form. The no project alternative analyzed in this EIR consists of four different scenarios that could likely occur if the proposed project is not approved.

Non-CEQA Considerations

In response to community input received during the City-sponsored community urban design process for the project (a process separate from the environmental review process), the City has included a project alternative and a discussion of other possible project components that are not necessarily driven by an effort to reduce or avoid physical environmental impacts of the project, but are instead developed in response to urban design objectives or neighborhood/community values. These alternative components are identified as non-CEQA topics throughout this chapter, however they are fully discussed here for the benefit of the public, other public agencies, and City decision-makers who will ultimately consider the merits of the project, including matters of policy and project design.
B. Alternatives Selected for Consideration

With consideration given to the selection criteria identified above, the City selected the following reasonable range of project alternatives and a sub-alternative (which could be combined with any of the alternatives) to be fully addressed in this EIR: **Alternative 1A:** No Project / Closure of the Entire Kaiser Oakland Medical Center (OMC)

- **Alternative 1B:** No Project / Closure and Demolition of Existing Hospital Building (non-hospital services continue)
- **Alternative 1C:** No Project / Closure of Existing Hospital and Retrofit for Non-Hospital Medical Services
- **Alternative 1D:** No Project / Seismic Retrofit of the Existing Hospital for Hospital Services
- **Alternative 2:** Reduced Development
- **Alternative 3:** Reduced Phase 1 Parking Garage / Full Retail (Non-CEQA Alternative)
- **Alternative 4:** Consolidated Campus (Non-CEQA Alternative)
- **Alternative 5:** Historic Preservation
- **Sub-Alternative:** Underground Pedestrian Tunnels (Reduced Sky Bridges)

Each alternative is discussed in Section C below. A summary table of the No Project Alternatives (1A through 1D) is provided as **Table V-1**.

Several alternatives or alternative components were considered for inclusion of this EIR analysis. Those considered and discussed in this chapter, but that are not analyzed fully because they have been determined “infeasible,” include the following:

- Offsite Medical Center Locations
- Permanent Satellite Parking

Each is discussed below in Section E.

C. Description and Analysis of Alternatives

Throughout this section, a description of each alternative is followed by a discussion of impacts and how those impacts differ from those of the project. Given the factors necessary to ensure the many functional requirements of a large health care institution such as Kaiser Permanente, a discussion called *Ability to Meet Kaiser’s Objectives* is also provided for each project alternative or scenario, where appropriate, in order to provide the reader with as complete information as possible. However this discussion does not mean the City has ruled out from consideration the possible adoption of any of the alternatives analyzed in this EIR.
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As permitted by CEQA, the significant effects of the alternatives are discussed in less detail than the effects of the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[d]). However, the alternatives analysis is conducted at a sufficient level of detail to provide the public, other public agencies, and City decision-makers adequate information to fully evaluate the alternatives and for the City to approve any of the alternatives without further environmental review.

Unless indicated, the impacts associated with the project and each alternative are for year 2020 buildout conditions and are stated as levels of significance after implementation of mitigation measures and/or standard conditions identified in Chapter IV. Cumulative impacts for year 2025 are also identified.

TABLE V-1 SUMMARY OF NO-PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>Hospital Closes</th>
<th>Kaiser Leaves OMC Entirely</th>
<th>Hospital Bldg. Demolished</th>
<th>Smaller Non-Hospital Bldg. Constructed on Existing Hospital Site</th>
<th>Seismic Retrofit Occurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 1A - Closure of the Entire Kaiser OMC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 1B - Closure and Demolition of Existing Hospital (non-Hospital services continue)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 1C - Closure of Existing Hospital and Retrofit for Non-Hospital Medical Service</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 1D - No Project / Seismic Retrofit of the Existing Hospital for Hospital Services</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Another hospital would be subject to state law and be required to retrofit the building.

Source: Kaiser Permanente
Alternative 1A: No Project / Closure of the Entire Kaiser Oakland Medical Center

Description

In this scenario, the existing hospital\(^1\) closes by December 31, 2012 to comply with state law. All hospital services would move to other existing and/or proposed Kaiser hospitals. Kaiser would also relocate all other existing services at the Kaiser Oakland Medical Center (OMC) to other locations. All existing Kaiser OMC properties (including sites recently acquired by Kaiser) would be backfilled with other institutional, commercial, or office uses that are consistent with the existing zoning and General Plan land use classifications. Table V-2 summarizes the existing land uses for all the properties included in the project and sets forth the existing zoning and General Plan classifications.

Recently Acquired Sites

Because no change would have occurred to the existing General Plan or zoning designations on the project site under this alternative, the existing land uses could remain on sites recently acquired by Kaiser, otherwise intended for the project. The majority of these sites are within the Community Commercial General Plan land use classification, which allows a wide range of land uses. However, this alternative assumes that the replacement land uses that would develop after closure of the hospital and relocation of the other existing Kaiser medical services would be similar to existing conditions.

The existing M/B Center and adjacent parcels to the south that together make up Site 4 could also accept a wide range of commercial, retail, and service uses allowed by the Community Commercial classification. Given the latitude provided by this classification, it is reasonable to expect that future development on this site could be very different from existing conditions. For example, the Site 4 could potentially be redeveloped with high-density housing (pursuant to the R-70 Zone as well as the maximum 125 dwelling units per gross acres allowed by the Community Commercial classification), or a number of commercial uses that are vastly different than what currently exist. To be conservative for this analysis, and given the intent of the “no project” alternative requirement under CEQA, this No Project Alternative 1A does not assume future development that is substantially different or greater than what currently exists. For Site 7 (West Broadway MSB and parking garage), this would include the automotive-related uses (sales, service, and repair and cleaning) and office uses. Overall, future uses on Sites 7 and 9 and most of Site 4 (the existing non-medical use sites) would remain as set forth in Table V-2.

---

\(^1\) For purposes of the No Project Alternatives, the “hospital” includes all structures under OSHPD jurisdiction, which are not all structures on the Kaiser OMC.
### Table V-2

**EXISTING USES, ZONING AND GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION, BY SITE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Existing Uses</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>General Plan Land Use Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>C-40 Community Thoroughfare Commercial / S-18 Mediated Design Review Combining</td>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R-50 Medium Density / S-18 Mediated Design Review Combining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td>Medical (Existing Hospital)</td>
<td>S-1 Medical Center / S-18 Mediated Design Review Combining</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td>Medical, Office</td>
<td>C-40 Community Thoroughfare Commercial / S-18 Mediated Design Review Combining</td>
<td>Neighborhood Center Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Medical, Commercial, Parking, Residential</td>
<td>C-40 Community Thoroughfare Commercial</td>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 5</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>C-40 Community Thoroughfare Commercial</td>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 7</td>
<td>Auto Sales and Service, Pet Boarding (Animal Care), Applied Research (Office)</td>
<td>C-40 Community Thoroughfare Commercial / S-18 Mediated Design Review Combining</td>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R-70 High Density Residential/ S-18 Mediated Design Review Combining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 8</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>C-40 Community Thoroughfare Commercial / S-18 Mediated Design Review Combining</td>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 9</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>C-25 Office Commercial / S-18 Mediated Design Review Combining</td>
<td>Neighborhood Center Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 SOURCE: City of Oakland Zoning Regulations and General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element Map.

### Existing Medical Center

The *Institutional* General Plan land use classification on the existing hospital and Fabiola Medical Services Building (MSB) (Site 2) significantly limits the range of future uses that could occur on Site 2. Future uses would be limited to other medical and health service uses or other civic uses. This could include schools (excluding college campuses), public assembly and cultural facilities, public offices, and residential care/nursing home uses, for example. However, the *Institutional* classification would also allow high-density residential uses (maximum 125 dwelling units per acre), as does the S-1 Medical Center Zone (same as R-70 Zone density) on Site 2. For purposes of this alternative, it is assumed that Site 2 would remain medical service uses. This is a reasonable assumption given the specialized nature of the existing medical facilities.

Although the remaining existing Kaiser facilities (Howe, Piedmont, Fabiola, and Mosswood MSBs) (also not assumed to be demolished) would not be limited by the *Institutional*
classification, these sites would also be reused with medical-related administrative uses given the limits of the S-1 Medical Center Zone. The S-1 Zone allows only medical uses as a permitted commercial activity. Civic land uses, like those identified above, could also be permitted, however, the characteristics of these existing medical service buildings are most suitable for uses typical to professional and administrative office settings. The S-1 Medical Center Zone also generally restricts such uses that are unrelated to medical service or health care.

When considering the S-1 Zone in combination with the existing General Plan classifications on these sites (a process required and guided by Chapter 17.01 of the Oakland Planning Code\(^2\)), a wider range of uses could be permitted with approval of a conditional use permit by the City. However, this No Project Alternative 1A conservatively assumes future possible land uses limited to those permitted by the existing zoning and General Plan. This assumption is consistent with the intent of the CEQA “no project” alternative. Future uses on Sites 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, and the Kaiser medical uses portion of Site 4 would generally be replaced with similar existing uses identified for these sites in Table V-2.

**Impacts (Alternative 1A)**

**Land Use, Plans and Policies**

Existing buildings and land uses are assumed to remain under Alternative 1A. Therefore the alternative would not require an amendment to the Oakland Planning Code to create a new zoning district to accommodate new project development. No significant impacts would occur relative to land use compatibility or the applicable Zoning Regulations and General Plan.

**Transportation, Circulation, and Parking**

Anticipated changes to the project site under Alternative 1A would be consistent with uses and the level of development on the site today, although the medical uses would not be associated with Kaiser. Therefore, transportation conditions would be comparable to what exists today (and as they are forecast to be in the future without development of the site), and significant unavoidable traffic impacts associated with the project would be avoided. The site conditions would remain essentially as discussed in the setting sections of Chapter IV.

**Air Quality**

No construction or changes to the project site would occur with Alternative 1A, and replacement uses would be similar to existing conditions. Therefore, air quality conditions would be comparable to what exists today (and as they are forecast to be in the future without development of the site).

**Noise**

No construction or changes to the project site would occur with Alternative 1A, and replacement uses would be similar to existing conditions. Therefore, the noise environment would be

---

\(^2\) General Provisions of Zoning and General Plan Conformity, OPC Chapter 17.01.
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comparable to what exists today (and as forecast for future conditions), and less than significant
impacts (with standard conditions) related to construction noise would be avoided.

**Cultural Resources**

No construction or changes to the project site would occur with Alternative 1A. Therefore, the
less than significant (after standard conditions) impacts related to archaeological and
paleontological resources that would occur with the project would not occur with this alternative.
Also, the significant and unavoidable impact resulting from demolition of an historic resource
(3741-47 Broadway) would be avoided.

**Geology, Soils, and Seismicity**

No building development or changes to the project site or its uses would occur with Alternative
1A, however, new population would replace the existing medical center facilities. Therefore, the
project’s less than significant impacts (after conditions) related to geology, soils, and seismic
hazards would not occur with this alternative.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

No construction activities (excavation, grading, pier drilling) associated with the project would
occur with Alternative 1A. Although future new development would be required to adhere to all
agency standards, requirements, and specific project management measures to reduce or avoid
soil erosion, the amount and speed of storm runoff, and the release of hazardous materials into
watercourses or the storm drain system, such requirements may not occur with the reuse of
existing buildings. Thus, existing runoff volumes and velocities and amount of impervious site
coverage would not be expected to change (or be reduced) to the extent that would occur with the
project. Therefore, Alternative 1A is considered to have the same less-than-significant water
quality impacts (after standard conditions and mitigation) during construction.

**Public Health and Safety**

Although no building development or demolition would occur with Alternative 1A, contaminated
soils, groundwater, underground and above-ground storage tanks would likely continue to exist
on portions of the project site. Although new buildings are not expected to be constructed under
this alternative, interior alterations to existing buildings could result in the same less-than-
significant impact (after standard conditions) that would occur from demolishing structures that
could contain hazardous materials (e.g., lead-based paint, asbestos).

**Biological Resources**

Since no new construction would occur under Alternative 1A, the less than significant (with
standard conditions) impact resulting from the demolition of existing structures adjacent to Glen
Echo Creek would not occur. Work required for new replacement uses in existing buildings in
proximity to the creek would likely required Category 1 or Category 2 Creek Protection Permits
from the City of Oakland due to interior construction and alterations/remodeling or exterior work
that does not include earthwork, however, this work would not be expected to potentially affect
the actual creek or require significant agency permitting other than the City or Oakland’s Creek Permit. Also, the less-than-significant (after standard conditions) impacts to nesting/breeding habitats and special status species that would occur with the project would not occur with Alternative 1A.

**Population, Housing, and Employment**

Alternative 1A would not displace any existing housing units or residents as development would not occur on sites containing existing residential units. The alternative also would not result in new businesses or jobs or induce substantial population growth. A total of 33 existing dwelling units that have been acquired by Kaiser Permanente would be reoccupied. Also, the loss of existing Kaiser Permanente jobs from Oakland would occur under this alternative. Overall, the same less-than-significant impact would occur under Alternative 1A as would occur with the project.

**Visual Quality and Shadow**

With Alternative 1A, it is assumed that the existing appearance of the project site would not substantially change. Therefore existing views across the project site and the appearance of the project site, which is highly visible from adjacent major thoroughfares, including Interstate 580 (I-580), would not change or improve. Existing shadows also would not change, however reduced shadowing on certain adjacent residential areas that would occur with the project would not occur since the existing hospital building would not be demolished (and replaced with a lower, relocated building, as proposed). Thus, Alternative 1A would maintain some adverse existing conditions related to shadow, but would reduce the less-than-significant impact related to potential damage trees within the state-designated designated scenic route.

**Public Services and Facilities**

No new development or significantly different land uses would occur under Alternative 1A, however, population on the site (employees, visitors, residents) resulting from the replacement uses would likely be less than with the project, but would result in the same less-than-significant impact resulting from increased demand for police, fire, schools, parks, and libraries.

**Utilities and Service Systems**

There would not be an increased demand for water, wastewater, and storm drain service and facilities, solid waste, and gas and electricity services with Alternative 1A since no new development or significant changes in land use would occur.

**Ability to Achieve Kaiser’s Objectives (Alternative 1A)**

The Kaiser Foundation Health Plan (the project sponsor, referred to throughout as “Kaiser Permanente” or “Kaiser”) provides integrated inpatient and outpatient care to its members on a prepaid basis and is required per Section 1300.51(H) (ii) of Title 28 of the California Code of Regulations to provide hospital services as follows:
(ii) Hospitals. In the case of a full-service plan, all enrollees have a residence or workplace within 30 minutes or 15 miles of a contracting or plan-operated hospital which has a capacity to serve the entire dependent enrollee population based on normal utilization, and, if separate from such hospital, a contracting or plan-operated provider of all emergency health care services.

The Kaiser Oakland Medical Center (OMC) provides services to Oakland and Richmond Residence Area members. The Richmond Residence Area is comprised of the cities of Richmond, El Sobrante, San Pablo, and El Cerrito. The Oakland Residence Area provides services to members residing in Kensington, Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland, and Alameda. Kaiser has indicated that there is not sufficient inpatient nor outpatient capacity within the existing Kaiser facilities within the mandated 30 minutes or 15 miles (i.e. Kaiser Richmond, Kaiser Hayward and Kaiser Walnut Creek), and there is not reserve site capacity to plan new facilities. As well, there is not sufficient time to purchase suitable property, plan new hospital and outpatient facilities, or complete City required entitlements and build these facilities before December 31, 2012.

The No Project / Closure of the Kaiser Oakland Medical Center Alternative is not feasible because there is not sufficient reserve bed nor ancillary capacity to accommodate the forecasted demand generated by the almost 186,000 KFHP members residing within the Oakland and Richmond Residence Area. Also, Kaiser has explored and evaluated a number of sites for the Kaiser OMC and has not found any alternative sites that meet its objective of providing integrated inpatient and outpatient care services that are convenient and accessible to its members. (See Section E., Alternatives Considered but not Analyzed Further, below.)

___________________________

Alternative 1B: No Project / Closure and Demolition of Existing Hospital (Non-Hospital Services Continue)

Description

In this scenario, the existing hospital closes by December 31, 2012 to comply with state law. All hospital services would move to other existing and/or proposed Kaiser hospitals. The existing hospital would be demolished and the hospital site would be backfilled with development consistent with the existing zoning and General Plan. All existing non-hospital services would remain in their current locations. No new development would occur on these sites. The sites recently acquired by Kaiser, and not currently used by Kaiser, would be utilized by development consistent with the existing zoning and General Plan classifications. The existing structures on these sites would be retained.

Under this scenario, the existing hospital, on Site 2, would be demolished and that portion of Site 2 would be available for redevelopment in accordance with the existing General Plan and zoning classifications. As discussed above, these replacement uses on Site 2 would be narrowly defined by the combination of the S-1 Medical Center Zone designation and the Institutional General
Plan land use classification. Since the existing zoning and General Plan classification on Site 2 are specific to the medical uses on the hospital site, no General Plan Amendment or rezoning would occur. The replacement structure would be limited to medical uses and would be of similar floor area, height, and site configuration as the proposed project (new, lower Administrative Services Building). The remaining medical-related development on Site 2 (not located in the existing hospital) is retained. The existing structures and uses on Sites 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 remain as set forth in Table V-2. All are primarily medical service uses, except the general office use on Site 9 (AAA Building).

**Impacts (Alternative 1B)**

**Land Use, Plans and Policies**

Except for construction of a new building on the location of the existing hospital, existing buildings and land uses are assumed to remain under Alternative 1B. Therefore the alternative would not require an amendment to the Oakland Planning Code to create a new zoning district to accommodate new project development. No significant impacts would occur relative to land use compatibility or the applicable Zoning Regulations and General Plan.

**Transportation, Circulation, and Parking**

The existing hospital building would be replaced with a medical service building similar to that proposed by the project, and no changes would occur to the remainder of the project site. Conditions would be consistent with uses and the level of development on the site today. Therefore, transportation conditions would be comparable to what exists today (and as they are forecast to be in the future without development of the site), and significant unavoidable traffic impacts associated with the project would be avoided. The site conditions would remain essentially as discussed in the setting sections of Chapter IV.

**Air Quality**

The demolition and new construction under Alternative 1B would result in similar construction-related air quality effects (dust) as would occur with the proposed project, but to a lesser extent given the reduced amount of development that would occur. Also, without development of the proposed project, this alternative would generate fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed project (see Transportation). As a result, the significant and unavoidable impact associated with criteria air pollutant emissions (PM-10) associated with project traffic would be avoided under this alternative.

**Noise**

The demolition and new construction under Alternative 1B would result in similar construction-related noise effects as with the proposed project, but to a lesser extent given the reduced amount and area of development that would occur, and the resulting reduction in the number and duration of pier drilling activities. Also, without development of the proposed project, this alternative would result in less vehicular noise levels associated with the alternative’s operation compared to
the project’s operation. The less-than-significant impact (after standard conditions) that would result from exceeding the City’s noise standard for interior noise levels for hospital facilities would be avoided under this alternative.

**Cultural Resources**

Building development would occur with Alternative 1B. Therefore, the same less-than-significant impacts (after standard conditions) related to archaeological and paleontological resources that would occur with the project would occur with this alternative. New construction would occur only on the hospital portion of Site 2. The significant and unavoidable impact resulting from demolition of an historic resource (3741-47 Broadway) would be avoided.

**Geology, Soils, and Seismicity**

Building development would occur with Alternative 1B would result in the same less-than-significant impacts (after conditions) related to geology, soils, and seismic hazards that would occur with the project.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

Construction activities (excavation, grading, pier drilling) that would have occurred with the project would occur with Alternative 1B. Development would be required to adhere to all agency standards, requirements, and specific project management measures to reduce or avoid soil erosion, the amount and speed of storm runoff, and the release of hazardous materials into watercourses or the storm drain system. Specifically, redevelopment of the hospital site would allow for the implementation of measures to reduce these effects. Therefore, Alternative 1B is considered to have the same less-than-significant water quality impacts (after standard conditions and mitigation) during construction.

**Public Health and Safety**

Demolition of the existing hospital building would occur in Alternative 1B, therefore it would result in the same less-than-significant impact (after standard conditions) that would occur from demolishing a structure that could contain hazardous materials (e.g., lead-based paint, asbestos).

**Biological Resources**

Since no new construction would occur in proximity to Glen Echo Creek under Alternative 1B, the less-than-significant (after standard conditions) that would occur with the project would not occur in this alternative. Because the site adjacent to the creek was recently acquired by Kaiser, its uses under this alternative could have the same effects associated with interior work (requiring a City Creek Permit), such work would not be a significant impact. The less-than-significant impact (after standard conditions) to nesting/breeding habitats, particularly to breeding raptors and passerine birds, and to special status species habitat (pond turtle) associated with the creek waterway could occur under this alternative.
**Population, Housing, and Employment**

Alternative 1B would not displace any existing housing units or residents as development would not occur on sites containing existing residential units. The alternative also would not result in new businesses or jobs or induce substantial population growth. A total of 33 existing dwelling units that have been acquired by Kaiser Permanente would be reoccupied. Also, the loss of existing Kaiser Permanente jobs from Oakland would occur under this alternative. Overall, the same less-than-significant impact would occur under Alternative 1B as would occur with the project.

**Visual Quality and Shadow**

For Alternative 1B, the building that would replace the existing hospital building is assumed to be of similar floor area, height, and site configuration as the proposed project (new, lower Administrative Services Building). The large new building that would occur with the project on site other than the existing hospital location would not be constructed. Therefore the views across the site and the appearance of the project site, which is highly visible from adjacent major thoroughfares, including I-580, would remain as existing conditions and be less than significant, as with the project.

**Public Services and Facilities**

The building that would replace the existing hospital in Alternative 1B would contain medical services (versus hospital uses) is expected to have similar employment as the new Administrative Services Building proposed by the project. However, total change in onsite population (employees and visitors) would be substantially less than would occur with the project. As a result, Alternative 1B would result in less demand for police, fire, schools, parks, and libraries than would occur with project. The impacts would remain less than significant under this alternative.

**Utilities and Service Systems**

There would not be an increased demand for water, wastewater, and storm drain service and facilities, solid waste, and gas and electricity services with Alternative 1B since the characteristics of the replacement building would be similar to that proposed by the project, and since the recently acquired parcels that would not be developed by Kaiser as proposed would be similar to existing conditions. The impacts would remain less than significant under this alternative.

**Ability to Achieve Kaiser’s Objectives (Alternative 1B)**

The No Project / Closure and Demolition of Existing Hospital Alternative is not feasible in that it does not meet any of Kaiser’s objectives as discussed under Alternative 1A. In addition, it is infeasible to retain the balance of the uses without the hospital because Kaiser’s integrated model of health care delivery cannot be achieved with the hospital separate from the medical service functions. Kaiser’s model requires that it co-locate the hospital and specialty medical service uses.
Alternative 1C: No Project / Closure of Existing Hospital and Retrofit for Non-Hospital Medical Services

Description
In this scenario, the existing hospital closes by December 31, 2012 to comply with state law. All hospital services would move to other existing and/or proposed Kaiser hospitals. The existing hospital structure would be retrofitted and used for non-hospital medical services. All existing non-hospital services would remain in their current locations, and no new development would occur on these sites. The sites recently acquired by Kaiser, and not currently used by Kaiser, would be utilized by development consistent with the existing zoning and General Plan. The existing structures on these sites would be retained. Alternative 1C is different from Alternative 1B in that Alternative 1C would retrofit the existing hospital building for non-hospital medical services, and Alternative 1B would construct a new building of smaller size for non-hospital medical service (similar to the new Central Administration MSB proposed by the project).

Under this scenario, the existing hospital on Site 2 is retrofitted for non-hospital medical uses. The remaining development on Site 2 is retained. Sites 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 remain as set forth in Table V-2.

Impacts (Alternative 1C)

Land Use, Plans, and Policies
Except for retrofitting the existing hospital structure, existing buildings and land uses are assumed to remain under Alternative 1C. Therefore the alternative would not require an amendment to the Oakland Planning Code to create a new zoning district to accommodate new project development. No significant impacts would occur relative to land use compatibility or the applicable Zoning Regulations and General Plan.

Transportation, Circulation, and Parking
Under Alternative 1C, transportation conditions would be comparable to what exists today (and as they are forecast to be in the future without development of the site). The replacement uses in the retrofitted hospital structure would be non-hospital medical services, and the total building area would be more than that proposed with the project. In Alternative 1C, the total development on Site 2 would be 611,740 sq.ft. (existing conditions w/ retrofitted non-hospital area). (With the project, the net new development on Site 2 would be 215,545 sq.ft., substantially less than under Alternative 1C.) However, the total net new project development on the remainder of the project sites acquired by Kaiser would not occur (approximately 1.1 million square feet, excluding Site 2). Thus, peak-hour vehicle trips would be less than the proposed project (i.e., about 50 percent fewer under buildout conditions) with the hospital use being replaced with more floor area of non-hospital medical services than proposed by the project. This would reduce project effects on area roadways and intersections proportionately and eliminate significant unavoidable traffic.
impacts caused by the project. The site conditions would remain essentially as discussed in the setting sections of Chapter IV.

**Air Quality**
The retrofitting of the existing hospital building in Alternative 1C would result in similar construction-related air quality effects (dust) as would occur with the proposed project, but to a lesser extent given the reduced amount of development that would occur. Also, without development of the proposed project, this alternative would generate fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed project (see Transportation). As a result, the significant and unavoidable impact associated with criteria air pollutant emissions (PM-10) resulting from project traffic would be avoided.

**Noise**
The hospital building retrofit under Alternative 1C would result in similar construction-related noise effects as with the proposed project, but to a lesser extent given the reduced amount and area of development that would occur. Pier drilling activities may be required to retrofit the building, however the number and duration of these activities would be significantly less than with the project. Also, there would be fewer vehicle trips (see Transportation) under Alternative 1C compared to the project, thus there would be lower traffic noise levels compared to the project. As a result, this alternative would result in relatively lesser noise impact, but would have the same less-than-significant (with standard conditions) impacts that would occur with the project.

**Cultural Resources**
No new building development would occur with Alternative 1C, however, the seismic retrofitting could involve subsurface work. Therefore, the less-than-significant impacts (after standard conditions) related to archaeological and paleontological resources that would occur with the project would occur with this alternative. Also, the significant and unavoidable impact resulting from demolition of an historic resource (3741-47 Broadway) would be avoided.

**Geology, Soils, and Seismicity**
Building development would occur with Alternative 1C would result in the same less-than-significant impacts (after standard conditions) related to geology, soils, and seismic hazards that would occur with the project.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**
Some of the construction activities that would occur with the project would occur with the seismic retrofitting activities in Alternative 1C. Construction activities would be required to adhere to all agency standards, requirements, and specific project management measures to reduce or avoid soil erosion, the amount and speed of storm runoff, and the release of hazardous materials into watercourses or the storm drain system. However, opportunities to implement site design measures to reduce these effects would be limited. Therefore, Alternative 1C would likely
have the same less-than-significant water quality impacts (after standard conditions and mitigation) during construction.

**Public Health and Safety**
Seismic retrofit of the existing hospital building would occur in Alternative 1C, therefore it could result in the same less-than-significant impact (after standard conditions) that could occur from construction work on structures or sites that could contain hazardous materials (e.g., lead-based paint, asbestos, PCBs).

**Biological Resources**
Since no new construction would occur in proximity to Glen Echo Creek under Alternative 1C, the less-than-significant (after standard conditions) impact that would occur with the project would not occur in this alternative. As with Alternative 1B, interior work on buildings near the creek (as needed for replacement uses on sites recently acquired by Kaiser), may also required creek permitting. The less-than-significant impact (after standard condition) to nesting/breeding habitats, particularly to breeding raptors and passerine birds, and to special status species habitat (pond turtle) associated with the creek waterway could occur under this alternative.

**Population, Housing, and Employment**
Alternative 1C would not displace any existing housing units or residents as development would not occur on sites containing existing residential units. The alternative also would not result in new businesses or jobs or induce substantial population growth. A total of 33 existing dwelling units that have been acquired by Kaiser Permanente would be reoccupied. Also, the loss of existing Kaiser Permanente jobs from Oakland would occur under this alternative. Overall, the same less-than-significant impact would occur under Alternative 1C as would occur with the project.

**Visual Quality and Shadow**
For Alternative 1C, the existing hospital building would be seismically retrofitted and no new buildings would be constructed. Therefore the views across the site and the appearance of the project site, which is highly visible from adjacent major thoroughfares, including I-580, would remain as existing conditions and be less than significant, as with the project.

**Public Services and Facilities**
The building that would seismically retrofitted in Alternative 1C would contain medical service (vs. hospital uses) but is expected to have similar employment as the new Administrative Services Building proposed by the project. However, population on the site (employees, visitors, residents) resulting from the replacement uses would likely be less than with the project, but would result in the same less-than-significant increased demand for police, fire, schools, parks, and libraries.
Utilities and Service Systems

There would not be an increased demand for water, wastewater, and storm drain service and facilities, solid waste, and gas and electricity services with Alternative 1C since the characteristics of the retrofitted building would be similar to that proposed by the project, and since the recently acquired parcels that would not be developed by Kaiser be similar to existing conditions. The impacts would remain less than significant under this alternative.

Ability to Achieve Kaiser’s Objectives (Alternative 1C)

The No Project / Closure of Existing Hospital and Retrofit for Non-hospital Medical Services Alternative is not feasible in that it does not meet any of Kaiser’s objectives as previously discussed under Alternative 1A.

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) issued for this EIR in April 2005, described a project that considered the partial demolition and retrofit of the existing hospital for non-hospital medical services. Kaiser has indicated that it is infeasible to retain and expand the balance of the medical uses on the existing hospital site without a hospital because of Kaiser’s integrated service delivery model, as discussed above in Alternative 1A and 1B. (Also see Ability to Meet Kaiser’s Objectives under Alternative 1D.)

Alternative 1D: No Project / Seismic Retrofit of the Existing Hospital for Hospital Services

Description

In this scenario, the existing hospital would be retrofitted, by December 31, 2012, for continued use as hospital. All existing non-hospital services would remain in their current locations, and no new development would occur on these sites. The sites recently acquired by Kaiser, and not currently used by Kaiser, would be utilized by development consistent with the existing zoning and General Plan. The existing structures on these sites would be retained.

Under this scenario, the existing hospital on Site 2 is retrofitted for hospital medical uses. The remaining development on Site 2 is retained. The existing structures and uses on Sites 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 remain as set forth in Table V-2.

Impacts (Alternative 1D)

Alternative 1D is most representative of a “no project” alternative under CEQA: a scenario that reflects no change from existing conditions. The impacts that would occur would be related to the seismic retrofit work that would occur on the hospital building, which are similar to, but potentially more extensive than those described for Alternative 1C which also would retrofit the hospital building, but not to hospital standards.
V. Alternatives

Alternative 1D varies from Alternative 1C in that Alternative 1D would continue hospital uses instead of replacing them with non-hospital uses. An assessment of environmental effects associated with Alternative 1D that are not reflected in the assessment of Alternative 1C considers the difference in peak-hour vehicle trip generation from hospital uses compared to medical service uses. According to the transportation analysis prepared by Fehr & Peers consultants for this EIR, the Kaiser hospital use generates approximately 23 PM peak-hour trips per employee, and medical service building use generates 73 PM peak-hour trips per employee. However, hospital use has a much higher employee per floor area rate than medical service buildings, therefore there would be more employees in Alternative 1D (existing condition) than Alternative 1C (non-hospital use in the essentially the same floor area).

Overall, compared to the proposed project, Alternative 1D would not involve the new project development on the remaining sites acquired by Kaiser (approximately 1.1 million square feet, excluding Site 2). Peak-hour vehicle trips would be the same as existing conditions. The alternative would reduce project effects on area roadways and intersections proportionately and eliminate significant unavoidable traffic and air quality impacts caused by the project.

Ability to Achieve Kaiser’s Objectives (Alternative 1D)

A multidisciplinary team of architects, engineers and operational experts from the Kaiser OMC, Kaiser National Facilities Service Staff, and outside consultants, fully evaluated the seismic upgrade of the existing hospital through an extensive study. Based on that results of that study, Kaiser determined that seismic upgrade to meet the standards defined by Senate Bill 1953 by December 31, 2012 would not be feasible due to the following:

1. There would be total disruption of key hospital services (for example, Central Sterile Supply, Clinical Laboratory, Surgical Suite, Radiology, Inpatient Pharmacy and Emergency Room). Relocation of these departments into a new structure is not feasible due to lack of site capacity adjacent to the existing hospital, square footage requirements, key departmental adjacencies, and phasing/renovation issues. It is essential to Kaiser's operations to have medical services close to OMC because of Kaiser's integrated care delivery model. Relocating the hospital or medical services offsite (even temporarily) would significantly affect Kaiser’s operations and effective provision of health care. Kaiser has previously looked for buildings in which to temporarily locate certain medical services and has found no space feasible to meet the needs of services provided on the Kaiser OMC.

2. Due to the location of seismic upgrading with the addition of shear walls and other structural strengthening, departmental circulation would be severely compromised with a significant loss of square footage that would negatively impact the functional effectiveness of the facility.

3.
The NOP issued for this EIR in April 2005, described a project that considered the partial demolition and retrofit of the existing hospital. Since then, Kaiser has determined that it is infeasible to retrofit the existing hospital for medical services due to structural considerations of the existing hospital building, the amount of floor area expansion needed to meet Kaiser’s operational standards, and the logistics and risk of retrofitting a partially occupied structure. Operationally, it is infeasible to maintain the hospital and retrofit the structure at the same time. Therefore, Kaiser has determined that it is neither reasonable nor feasible for it to seismically upgrade the hospital to post-event functionality, particularly while continuing operations.

Alternative 2: Reduced Development

Description

The Reduced Development Alternative is included in the EIR to allow a comparison of the project to a scenario that will result in reducing or avoiding significant unavoidable impacts resulting from the project. Under this alternative, approximately 93,000 square feet of building area associated with medical services functions (versus number of hospital beds) on the new hospital site in Phase 2 would not be developed. As depicted in Figure V-1, a two-story portion of the four-story podium proposed at the corner of Broadway and MacArthur Boulevard would be eliminated. This alternative would also result in a reduction of approximately 236 employees. This alternative would not necessarily result in fewer parking spaces, but could result in a shorter structure on the new hospital site by elimination 240 spaces from the proposed hospital garage.

The remaining development on the new hospital site would remain as proposed by the project. Development proposed for the West Broadway MSB on Site 7 (Phase 1) and the Central Administration MSB on Site 2 (Phase 3) would remain as proposed by the project. Although the 93,000 square feet of medical services functions could be reduced anywhere within the project site, neither the West Broadway MSB (165,000 sq.ft.) or the Central Administration MSB (215,545 sq.ft.) is large enough to accommodate significant reductions in floor area and remain
Note 1:
93,000 sf reduction in Phase 2 MSB space corresponds to a reduction of 173 trips during peak hours to mitigate significant/unavoidable environmental impact.

Note 2:
Phase 1 & Phase 3 Program Development Unchanged

Figure V-1
Alternative 2:
Reduced Development
viable for Kaiser’s operations and services. Certain effects (CEQA and non-CEQA) specifically associated with these two sites are addressed in other alternatives discussed in this chapter.

Impacts (Alternative 2)

The difference between the Reduced Development Alternative and the proposed project is that approximately 93,000 square feet of medical service floor area on the podium level of the Replacement Hospital would not be built. All other aspects of the alternative are the same as for the proposed project, therefore, the environmental impacts associated with the Reduced Development Alternative would be the same as those identified for the project, except as discussed below:

Transportation, Circulation, and Parking

Development under the Reduced Development Alternative would result in fewer peak-hour vehicle trips than would occur with the proposed project (i.e., about 25 percent or 173 trips fewer under buildout conditions), which would eliminate the significant and unavoidable traffic-related impacts under 2010, 2020 buildout, and 2025 cumulative conditions and would reduce the overall traffic effects on area roadways and intersections proportionately.

Air Quality

As discussed above under Transportation, this alternative would generate fewer vehicle trips than the proposed project would generate. As a result, the significant and unavoidable impact related to criteria air pollutant emissions (PM-10) associated with project traffic would be reduced under buildout and 2025 cumulative conditions. Specifically, the number of daily vehicle trips to the project area would need to be reduced by approximately 350 daily trips at buildout and cumulative conditions to avoid the significant and unavoidable impact associated with criteria air pollutant emissions (PM-10). This reduction would occur under this alternative; therefore the significant and unavoidable impact would not occur. The less-than-significant (with standard conditions) impact related to construction-related impacts would remain.

Noise

Because this alternative would generate fewer vehicle trips than the proposed project (see Transportation, above), this alternative would result in lower vehicular noise levels compared to the project. As a result, this alternative would reduce the less-than-significant impact related to roadside noise. The less-than-significant impact (with standard conditions) regarding construction noise would continue to occur with this alternative, since construction activities would still occur, and the amount of building area reduced under the alternative would not substantially reduce or change the level or duration of construction noise.

Visual Quality and Shadow

For the Reduced Development Alternative, a portion of the Replacement Hospital building would be reduced in height at the corner of Broadway and MacArthur Boulevard. This change would
likely not affect views of or across the site from public vantage points, nor would it substantially reduce the new shadow cast on shade-sensitive areas. The four-story portion of the Replacement Hospital contributes to shading on the northeast portion of Mosswood Park during morning hours most times of year, however most of this shadow would be cast by the hospital tower containing hospital beds and that would not be reduced under this alternative (since it does not sit atop the portion of the low-rise podium that would be eliminated in this alternative; see Figure V-1). Eliminating two stories from the low-rise portion of the building would not substantially reduce shadow effects. Additionally, the reduction of two stories at this portion of the building is also not expected to substantially alter wind conditions in the vicinity. Therefore, this alternative would result in the same less-than-significant visual quality, shadow, and wind impacts identified for the project.

**Ability to Achieve Kaiser’s Objectives (Alternative 2)**

It is Kaiser’s objective to remain in Oakland at its existing medical center location. Kaiser indicates that it is not feasible to remove 93,000 square feet of medical service functions without impacting operational adjacencies, efficiencies, and member service and access. Therefore, under this Reduced Development Alternative, Kaiser would need to lease or construct another medical service building (MSB) offsite, which would incur additional expense and ongoing operational issues due to additional sites. These include staff having to divide work time between two MSB facilities (within the Replacement Hospital building and offsite) and the added complications of delivering and distributing materials between two MSB facilities. Additionally, Kaiser's integrated model of health care delivery requires that it maximize opportunities to co-locate the hospital and medical service uses. Kaiser's specialty services in particular are very closely linked with hospital services. Kaiser's doctors do not operate as separate independent doctors' offices. Instead, they operate in departments that require they be located in immediate proximity to each other. This also would impact members’ ability to access services if located at multiple sites, and would relocated existing health care services and jobs to locations likely outside of Oakland.

**Alternative 3: Reduced West Broadway Parking Garage /Full Retail (Non-CEQA)**

**Description**

The Reduced West Broadway Parking Garage Alternative is included in the EIR to allow a comparison of the project to a scenario that would limit the number of parking spaces provided on Site 7 in Phase 1 to only the number necessary to meet the parking demand of the adjacent West Broadway Medical Services Building. Currently, approximately 385\(^3\) additional parking spaces would occur in other Kaiser parking garages onsite to accommodate Phase 1 parking demand and interim shortfall: **872 spaces total**. Alternative 3 proposes the West Broadway garage with 431 garage spaces, 34 surface lot spaces, valet provisions for 60 spaces to occur elsewhere onsite, and would be reduced by 38 space to allow for

---

\(^3\) The proposed West Broadway garage provides 738 garage spaces, 34 surface lot spaces, and valet provisions for 100 spaces to occur in other Kaiser parking garages onsite to accommodate Phase 1 parking demand and interim shortfall: **872 spaces total**. Alternative 3 proposes the West Broadway garage with 431 garage spaces, 34 surface lot spaces, valet provisions for 60 spaces to occur elsewhere onsite, and would be reduced by 38 space to allow for
With Phase 3 Retail
No Surface Parking @ Manila Ave.
2 stories / 3 decks
433 stalls
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4 stories / 5 decks
738 stalls
spaces are proposed in the West Broadway Garage and a surface parking lot on Manila Avenue in order to accommodate a temporary parking shortfall that would occur for approximately three years, after demolition of the existing M/B Center parking structure in late Phase 1/early Phase 2 (in preparation for construction of the Replacement Hospital building and garage in Phase 2), until the completion of the hospital parking structure within Phase 2. As a result, the proposed West Broadway garage is larger than it would otherwise need to be.

Removing approximately 385 parking spaces from the West Broadway Garage would allow the parking structure to be lower in height, surface parking to be removed, and additional ground-floor retail to be developed in Phase 1 versus Phase 3. As depicted in Figure V-2, one option would be for the West Broadway Garage to be reduced from four stories (approx. 53 feet) to two stories (approx. 31 feet). The two below-grade parking levels proposed with the project would still occur. (The proposed project is shown in Figure V-3 for comparison.) Also, this alternative assumes that the total 7,700 square feet of ground-floor retail would be developed in the garage in Phase 1, instead of (as the project proposes) 1,700 square feet in Phase 1 and the remaining 6,000 square feet in Phase 3 (after the Phase 2 and Phase 3 parking garages are complete and can absorb the “surplus” parking constructed in the West Broadway Garage in Phase 1.) Another option would be to more configure the West Broadway MSB and its associated parking and retail components into a more fully-integrated building configuration.

Under this alternative, any one or combination of the following modifications to the proposed project would occur. These options are intended to reduce the number of parking spaces in the West Broadway garage and thus reduce the height or mass of that structure – considerations that do not address environmental impacts under CEQA:

- **Option 1 - Temporary Offsite Parking.** Relocate approximately 385 parking spaces from the proposed West Broadway Garage to one or more alternative parking facilities until completion of the new Replacement Hospital Garage in Phase 2. This option assumes that an appropriate offsite location(s) for temporary parking would be identified within two miles of the project site. It is assumed that employees would be shuttled between the medical center and the offsite parking locations during this period. A preliminarily survey of the area around the hospital has been conducted to assess existing and potential future parking facilities that could be available for Kaiser’s temporary use between the end of Phase 1 and completion of the Replacement Hospital Garage within Phase 2. A key consideration that limits this option is the uncertainty that adequate offsite facilities would be available to Kaiser when needed given possible existing or future commitments of parking facilities (public or private) for other future redevelopment and lease agreements that are not known at this time.

Under this option either the Phase 2 or Phase 3 parking garages would be increased in size to accommodate the approximately 385 parking spaces needed to satisfy total parking demand at buildout.
• **Option 2 - Allow Temporary Shortfall.** This option would eliminate the approximately 385 parking spaces proposed in the West Broadway Garage (those intended to meet the interim shortfall) and would not provide these spaces offsite or onsite. The resulting West Broadway Garage and retail development would be developed as described in Option 1.

• **Option 3 - Temporary Parking at Mosswood Park.** The City has explored the option of providing the approximately 385 parking spaces needed to satisfy the demand of the proposed West Broadway Medical Services Building (MSB) within Mosswood Park during period of parking shortfall (the end of Phase 1 in 2008 and completion of the Replacement Hospital Garage within Phase 2 by 2012). Figure V-4 approximates the extent of area that would be required to accommodate parking on the park with consideration given to avoiding and preserving existing mature vegetation, existing buildings (including historic resources), and existing high-use areas within the park. The option presumes that the parking would be removed and Kaiser would rehabilitate Mosswood Park upon completion of Phase 2. As with Option 1, either the Phase 2 or Phase 3 parking garages would be increased in size to accommodate the 385 parking spaces needed to satisfy total parking demand at buildout.

Primary considerations regarding the effects (CEQA and non-CEQA) of this alternative include 1) permitting requirements under the Oakland zoning regulations, 2) resulting impacts associated with new parking facilities at these potential satellite locations, 3) resulting impacts associated with resulting un-permitted parking in adjacent neighborhoods, 4) the availability of satellite parking locations, and 5) the resulting increase in other parking structures on the project site. These considerations pertain to each of the options described for the Reduced West Broadway Parking Garage Alternative.

As indicated in the introduction to this section, the impacts associated with the alternatives are primarily for year 2020 buildout conditions and, as appropriate, cumulative year 2025. Because this non-CEQA alternative addresses a temporary effect (parking shortfall) that would occur at the end of Phase 1 until subsequent parking garages are constructed on the project site, the following discussion also addresses potential effects that would occur during this interim period.
Figure V-4

Conceptual Parking on Mosswood Park

- Approximate Area Extents for Temporary Parking

Area A = 140 stalls
Area B = 260 stalls
Total = 400 stalls

Note: This estimate is not based on an accurate, measured Land or Tree Location survey. These parking schemes assume the use of 24 ft. (double lane) drives throughout.
Impacts (Alternative 3)

The difference between the Reduced West Broadway Garage Alternative (each of the three options) and the proposed project is that approximately 385 fewer parking spaces would be developed on project site in Phase 1 (and for Options 1 and 3, would not be provided until as late as Phase 3). The other significant differences under the alternative include the lower height of the West Broadway Garage and the temporary location of parking at offsite locations. All other aspects of the alternative are the same as for the proposed project. Therefore, the environmental impacts associated with this alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed project, except as discussed below.

Land Use, Plans, and Policies

Zoning Requirements and Limitations

As discussed in greater detail below under Permanent Satellite Parking, the Oakland Planning Code regulates where off-street parking spaces required by the zoning regulations can be located relative to the uses that such parking would serve (Oakland Planning Code Sec.17.116.170-180). Generally, off-street parking for uses proposed by the project may be located on another lot located within 300 feet (approximately one block) of the project site (under certain conditions and specific multi-owner agreements.) Based on Kaiser’s preliminary survey, other than Mosswood Park (Option 3), potential temporary parking locations within 300 feet of the project site (and that Kaiser owns in whole or in part) are limited. Therefore, Option 1 (temporary offsite parking) would require approval of a variance to the zoning regulations to allow temporary off-street parking.

Temporary Loss of Open Space and Trees

Option 3 (temporary parking on Mosswood Park) would temporarily remove several acres of parkland from the existing Mosswood Park. This would conflict with the following policy in the Open Space, Conservation, and Recreation (OSCAR) Element of the Oakland General Plan:

Policy REC-1.2 (No Net Loss of Open Space) - Unless overriding considerations exist, allow no net loss of open space within Oakland’s urban park system. In other words, the area covered by park buildings or other recreational facilities in the future should be offset in the long-run by acquisition or improvement of an equivalent or larger area of open space. Replacement open space would be of comparable value to the space lost and should generally serve an area identified on Figure 18 (Park Deficient Areas) as having un-met needs.4

The project area is designated on the OSCAR Park Deficiency Area Map as a “general area where new parks are needed.” This potential conflict would be temporary because Option 3 presumes

4 Policy REC-1-2 incorrectly references OSCAR Figure 18. Park Deficient Areas are shown on OSCAR Figure 17.
that when the temporary Kaiser-related parking constructed in Mosswood Park is removed upon completion of Phase 2, Kaiser Permanente would rehabilitate Mosswood Park facilities. The likely areas of the park to locate the temporary parking (based on the criteria stated above) are also the high-use area of the park (tennis courts, children’s park). No interim replacement open space or facilities would be provided.

The conceptual parking layout shown in Figure V-4 was developed with the objective of avoiding the removal or impact to existing mature trees. If this alternative is implemented, a final parking layout also would aim to avoid all existing mature trees and the potential effects of surface parking facilities near trees (soil compaction, new impervious surfaces, etc.) No trees would be removed for this alternative, and therefore it would not conflict with the following Land Use and Transportation Element (LUTE) of the General Plan, below:

Policy CO-7.4 (Tree Removal) Discourage the removal of large trees on already developed sites unless removal is required for biological, public safety, or public works reasons.

The City would be required to determine whether this policy conflict regarding the temporary reduction of urban parkland/open space would be acceptable and appropriate given potential overriding considerations that the City may consider as it evaluates the project and its environmental impacts. Considerations include to future improvements made by Kaiser Permanente that ultimately could occur to Mosswood Park. Thus, Option 3 would result in this policy conflict that would not occur with the project or any other alternatives or options discussed in this analysis.

Transportation, Circulation, and Parking

Traffic and Circulation

Compared to the proposed project, Option 1 (temporary offsite parking) could reduce peak-hour trip generation in the immediate vicinity of the project site since employee parking is being located offsite. However, any reduction would be temporary and the significant and unavoidable traffic-related impacts under 2010, 2020 buildout, and 2025 cumulative conditions would remain under this option. (See also Parking, below.) Under Option 1, no additional impacts are expected at the satellite parking locations because it is assumed that parking would occur within existing facilities or properties already used for parking. No new construction would occur, and traffic and circulation patterns would not be significantly altered.

Under Option 2 (allow temporary shortfall), the temporary reduction of traffic in the immediate vicinity of the project site that would likely occur in the other options would not occur. Although parking is not generally assumed to be a traffic generator, the temporary shortfall of approximately 385 parking spaces would likely result in increased neighborhood traffic impacts as vehicles circulate through the neighborhood attempting to find available on-street parking. The impact at buildout would be the same as for the project.
Under Option 3 (temporary parking on Mosswood Park), the potential for a temporary reduction in traffic in the immediate vicinity of the project is not anticipated to occur given the adjacency of Mosswood Park to the project site. For the same reason, no significant temporary changes in circulation are anticipated at the end of Phase 1.

While temporary reductions in peak-hour trips could occur in each option, at buildout, the potential effects on traffic and circulation would be similar to the proposed project since the same total number of parking spaces would occur, regardless of where or when they are located on the project site. The significant and unavoidable traffic-related impacts under 2010, 2020 buildout, and 2025 cumulative conditions would continue under this Reduce West Broadway Parking Garage Alternative and its options.

Parking

Option 1 (temporary offsite parking) and Option 3 (parking on Mosswood Park) would result in a temporary parking shortage of approximately 385 spaces at the end of Phase 1 (a non-CEQA impact). Both options propose offsite parking to address this temporary shortage. It may be possible that providing offsite parking facilities could reduce peak-hour employee trips (since employees would use the offsite facilities).

Under Option 2 (allow temporary shortfall), the temporary parking shortage would not be addressed, thus the resulting impact of unauthorized parking in adjacent neighborhoods would be likely since no alternative facilities would be provided.

While temporary parking shortfall would occur under each option, the total parking provided at buildout would be the same as proposed by the project.

Air Quality

As discussed above under Transportation, each of the options would result in the same significant and unavoidable traffic-related impacts under 2010, 2020 buildout, and 2025 cumulative conditions. It is possible, however, that peak-hour vehicle trips could be reduced temporarily at the end of Phase 1 until subsequent parking garages on the project site are completed, given the availability of offsite parking locations. As discussed under Alternative 2, approximately 350 daily vehicle trips to the project area would need to be avoided at buildout and cumulative conditions to eliminate the significant and unavoidable impact associated with criteria air pollutant emissions (PM-10). It is likely that this reduction could occur during the interim period when offsite parking would be provided, but this would not avoid the significant and unavoidable impact at buildout or cumulative conditions since the overall project development would not be reduced under this alternative. The impact would be the same as with the proposed project. However, under Option 2 (temporary shortfall), it is also likely that the lack of onsite employee parking (and lack of offsite Kaiser parking) would increase demand for parking near the project site and in adjacent neighborhoods. As a result, emission concentrations could potentially increase temporarily due to users driving and idling while looking for parking in these adjacent areas. This potential temporary effect would be worse under Option 2 (temporary shortfall).
Overall, at buildout, the Reduced West Broadway Garage Alternative would result in the same significant and unavoidable traffic-generated air quality impacts as identified for the project. The less-than-significant impact (with standard conditions) regarding construction-related air quality impacts would continue to occur with this alternative, since project construction activities would still occur.

**Noise**

As discussed above under Air Quality, Options 1 (temporary offsite parking) and Option 3 (Mosswood Park) for this alternative may temporarily generate fewer vehicle trips than the proposed project (see Transportation, above), and therefore reduce the less-than-significant impact related to vehicular noise levels. Under Option 2 (temporary shortfall) traffic noise may be worsened temporarily since no offsite parking would be provided and the likelihood that users would drive and idle while looking for parking in these nearby adjacent areas.

Overall, at buildout, the Reduced West Broadway Garage Alternative would result in the same less-than-significant impact traffic-related noise impact identified for the project. The less-than-significant impact (with standard conditions) regarding construction noise would continue to occur with this alternative, since project construction activities would still occur, particularly in proximity to noise-sensitive residential uses (including near Mosswood Park for Option 3).

**Cultural Resources**

As discussed in Section IV.E (Cultural Resources), the landscaping in Mosswood Park dates to the period of the historic J. Mora Moss House located in the park, especially those trees located closest to the building. As such, the landscaping is considered part of the historic setting of the property. Option 3 would introduce parking temporarily on Mosswood Park, however, as discussed above, a final parking layout would be designed to avoid existing landscaping, particularly any that may be considered an historic resources under CEQA.

**Visual Quality and Shadow**

As depicted in Figure V-3, the West Broadway Garage would be reduced from four stories (approx. 53 feet) to two stories (approx. 31 feet). As a result, the extent of new shadow cast during morning hours most times of year on Glen Echo Creek and residential structures located immediately west and adjacent to the garage would be less. The shadow impact identified for the project therefore would be reduced. The elimination of two stories (22 feet) along Broadway at 38th would likely not affect views of or across the site from public vantage points, nor would it substantially alter wind conditions in the vicinity.

The approximately 385 parking spaces that would be located offsite temporarily would be constructed as part of the Replacement Hospital Garage in Phase 2 or the potential Central Administration MSB parking in Phase 3. As a result, one or both of these garage structures would be increased in height and/or footprint. This could increase shadow cast by the Phase 2 garage on the southeastern section of Mosswood Park (during morning hours most times of year). Increase to the potential Phase 3 garage would not affect any shadow-sensitive uses given its distance from...
nearby residential uses, open space, or historic resources. Also, the amount of building area increase required to accommodate all or part of the approximately 385 parking spaces would not be substantial enough to affect the project’s less-than-significant impacts on view or wind effects.

**Ability to Achieve Kaiser’s Objectives (Alternative 3)**

Kaiser’s primary considerations regarding the Reduced West Broadway Garage Alternative include the potential lack of available and viable satellite parking locations (discussed above under Option 1 - Temporary Offsite Parking), and the inability to confirm that such facilities would be available to Kaiser on a lease-basis at the end of Phase 1. If adequate parking offsite facilities were not available or able to be secured by Kaiser before that time, the temporary shortfall would affect Kaiser’s goal to provide adequate parking for its members and employees and to reduce and/or avoid impacts on neighborhoods. Also, this lack of adequate parking, although temporary, could reduce the availability of parking for members and patients due to limited parking spaces onsite.

---

**Alternative 4: Consolidated Campus Alternative (Non-CEQA Alternative)**

**Description**

The Consolidated Campus Alternative is included in the EIR to allow a comparison of the project to a scenario that would eliminate development of Kaiser uses on Site 7, where the West Broadway Medical Services Building (MSB) and Garage would be developed in Phase 1. This alternative would shift these uses to Site 2 where the existing hospital is located. Assumptions for this alternative include:

1) Total buildout (hospital beds, medical office space, all other uses) would remain the same as proposed by the project;

2) Existing commercial buildings on Site 7 (including the historic resource) would be demolished and used for temporary surface parking during development of the Replacement Hospital on the M/B Center on Site 4;

3) Existing medical service uses on the M/B Center site would be temporarily relocated to offsite Kaiser facilities during construction of the Replacement Hospital on Site 4;

4) The Replacement Hospital (Site 4) would include approximately 54 percent (150,000 of 280,000 sq.ft.) of the medical service uses as proposed under the project. The remainder of medical service space would be shifted to the existing hospital site on Site 2;
5) Existing medical service uses on the existing hospital site would be temporarily relocated to offsite Kaiser facilities during construction of a new Central Administration MSB on Site 2;

6) A mixed-use development of approximately 280 dwelling units in a four- to five-story building with ground-floor retail and onsite parking would be constructed at the northwest corner of Broadway and West MacArthur Boulevard (Site 7) when it is no longer needed for interim parking.

As shown in Figures V-5 through V-8, the Consolidated Campus Alternative would reconfigure the nursing tower on the Replacement Hospital. It would also result in a substantially larger development and a landscaped court on the existing hospital site. (Scheme 1 in Figures V-5 and V-6, and Scheme 2 in Figures V-7 and V-8, differ in Site 2 site layout only.) Additionally, this alternative would not construct the overhead pedestrian bridges.

**Impacts (Alternative 4)**

The differences between the Consolidated Campus Alternative and the proposed project is that the alternative would not build a medical services building or parking on Site 7, and would build a smaller hospital building with a reconfigured tower on Site 4 (in Phase 2). Because the overall development program for the total project site would remain the same as for the proposed project, the resulting building on Site 2 (in Phase 3) would be larger than currently proposed. Non-Kaiser development is assumed on Site 7. All other aspects of the proposed project, are similar, and therefore the environmental impacts associated with the Reduced Development Alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed project, in addition to those discussed below.

**Transportation, Circulation, and Parking**

The overall Kaiser OMC project development program would not change under the Consolidated Campus Alternative, therefore the traffic-related effects related to trip generation would be the same as for the proposed project. The significant and unavoidable traffic-related impacts under 2010, 2020 buildout background, and 2025 cumulative conditions would continue. Mixed use development on Site 7 site would not occur as part of the proposed project, but would be assumed in 2020 buildout and 2025 cumulative conditions. Approximately 280 dwelling units with ground-floor retail would generate nearly 150 AM and 200 PM peak hour trips, thus worsening conditions at the already identified locations with significant and unavoidable impacts and potentially resulting in additional impacts at other intersections.
PHASE 1A
- Clear buildings on Honda Site to be used as interim valet surface parking (~450 to 500 cars) to accommodate parking deficiency generated during PHASE 1B.

PHASE 1B
- Demolish existing MB Center
- Relocate existing MOB to satellite sites, reduce immediate parking demand
- New Replacement Hospital
  3 winged Nursing Tower (4 bed floors + mechanical over a base of 3 floors)
- New 7 floors above grade + 2 floors below grade Hospital Garage (1216 stalls)

PHASE 2
- Demolish existing Hospital
- New 2 floors below grade Parking Garage over the entire site (~1100 stalls)
- New 2 floors + deck above grade Parking Garage (~330 stalls)
- Hospital Program on site to house:
  165,000 sf MOB (originally programmed on Honda Site) +
  150,000 sf MOB (transferred from MB Center Site) +
  45,000 sf Administrative/Education Center Use
- At grade Landscaped Court
- Pedestrian connection between Broadway and Howe Street

Note: Cafeteria and all other Public spaces of the Hospital should be located on the ground floor of the buildings.

Figure V-5
Alternative 4: Consolidated Medical Center
Scheme 1 – Site Plan
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Figure V-6
Alternative 4:
Consolidated Medical Center
Scheme 1 – Massing
PHASE 1A
- Clear buildings on Honda Site to be used as interim valet surface parking (~450 to 500 cars) to accommodate parking deficiency generated during PHASE 1B.

SITE FOR FUTURE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT (4-5 FLOORS)

PHASE 1B
- Demolish existing MB Center
- Relocate existing MOB to satellite sites, reduce immediate parking demand
- New Replacement Hospital
  - 3 winged Nursing Tower (4 bed floors, + mechanical over a base of 3 floors)
- New 7 floors above grade + 2 floors below grade Hospital Garage (1216 stalls)

PHASE 2
- Demolish existing Hospital
- New 2 floors below grade Parking Garage over the entire site (~1100 stalls)
- New 2 floors + deck above grade Parking Garage (~330 stalls)
- Hospital Program on site to house
  - 165,000 sf MOB (originally programmed on Honda Site) +
  - 150,000 sf MOB (transferred from MB Center Site) +
  - 45,000 sf Administration/Education Center Use
- At grade Landscaped Court
- Pedestrian connection between Broadway and Howe Street

Note: Cafeteria and all other Public spaces of the Hospital should be located on the ground floor of the buildings.

SOURCE: SMWM
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Figure V-7
Alternative 4:
Consolidated Medical Center
Scheme 2 – Site Plan
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Figure V-8
Alternative 4:
Consolidated Medical Center
Scheme 2 – Massing
Significantly more parking would be concentrated on Site 2, with access from Howe Street and Broadway as proposed with the project.

**Air Quality**

As discussed above under Transportation, this alternative would result in the same significant and unavoidable traffic-related impacts under 2010, and the introduction of the proposed mixed use development (not included as part of the Kaiser Project) in the background of 2020 buildout and 2025 cumulative conditions would worsen these impacts. As a result, the significant and unavoidable traffic-generated air quality impacts would remain and worsen. The less-than-significant (with standard conditions) construction-related air quality impacts would continue to occur with this alternative.

**Noise**

This alternative would result in the same significant and unavoidable traffic-related impacts under 2010, and the introduction of the proposed mixed use development (not included as part of the Kaiser Project) in the background of 2020 buildout and 2025 cumulative conditions would worsen these impacts. As a result, traffic-related noise impacts for this alternative would worsen, but would likely remain less-than-significant (with standard conditions) as identified for the project. The less-than-significant impact (with standard conditions) regarding construction noise would continue to occur with this alternative, since project construction activities would still occur.

**Visual Quality and Shadow**

**Replacement Hospital (Site 4)**

As indicated in Figures V-5 through V-8, the Replacement Hospital would be reduced in height: the podium by one story and the nursing tower by three hospital bed floors. Also, the nursing tower would be reconfigured from a rectangular tower on the building’s north-south axis to a three-winged tower. The reduction in height equivalent to five stories would reduce the shadow impacts identified for the project, specifically on the eastern portion of Mosswood Park during morning hours most times of year. The reduction in height of the Replacement Hospital site and the removal of pedestrian bridges could likely expand views of or across the site from public vantage points compared to the proposed project, the reconfiguration of the nursing tower along the building’s east-west axis would likely reduce views that would exist with the project, even with its taller height. Also, the reduced building heights would not occur in areas of the building that would substantially affect street-level wind conditions in the vicinity.

**Central Administration MSB (Site 2)**

Under this alternative, the garage on Site 2 would abut the length of the northern property line adjacent to residential uses. The garage would be two stories above grade. Given this relatively low building height, the alternative would not likely create substantial new shadow on shadow-sensitive uses (residences or historic resources) to the north, even in the morning hours in spring, winter, and autumn with shadows are longest.
**Summary**

In summary, the Consolidated Campus Alternative would likely reduce the less-than-significant shadow impacts identified for the project. It would reduce new shadow cast on the eastern portion of Mosswood Park (during morning hours most times of year. The alternative could worsen certain less-than-significant view impacts identified for the project due to the reconfiguration of the nursing tower, even with its reduced height.

**Ability to Achieve Kaiser’s Objectives (Alternative 4)**

It is Kaiser’s objective to remain in Oakland at its existing medical center location. Kaiser purchased the properties on Site 7 (west side of Broadway, between West MacArthur Boulevard to 38th Street) on which to develop the West Broadway Medical Services Building because of their proximity to the Kaiser OMC. It is essential to Kaiser's operations to have these medical services close to OMC because of Kaiser's integrated care delivery model. Kaiser has looked for other buildings close by in which to temporarily locate certain medical services and has found no space feasible to meet the needs of those services currently conducted in the M/B Center, or for those medical service functions currently provided on the existing hospital site. (See also Net Addition of Medical Center Activity and Employment in the discussion of Growth-Inducing Impacts in Chapter VI, Impact Overview and Growth Inducing Impacts.) Additionally, this alternative would require Kaiser to temporarily relocate existing medical service uses on the M/B Center site and the existing hospital site to offsite Kaiser facilities. This would require Kaiser to relocate services and employees twice (once to offsite locations, and then again, back to the Kaiser OMC), which is counter to its project objectives of providing uninterrupted operation of services, minimizing departmental moves, and maintaining the continuity of care at the Kaiser OMC during construction (as stated in Chapter III, Project Description).

---

**Alternative 5: Historic Preservation Alternative**

**Description**

As presented in the cultural resources impacts analysis in this EIR (Section IV.E), the City has conservatively assumed the Honda dealership at 3741-47 Broadway, the former 1919 Early Auto Co./Superior Tile Co. building, to be an historic resource under CEQA, pending the Oakland Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) confirmation. While this building was rated “Ec3” by OCHS which considered it to be of only minor historical importance if restored, OHP rated it “5S” (eligible for local listing). A subsequent, updated survey and evaluation of the structure by Architectural Resources Group (ARG), the historic preservation consultant for the building, supports, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the building is not a historic resource under CEQA criteria, however, since the LPAB has not reviewed the potential historical significance of this building in light of this recent reevaluation, in an abundance of caution, this building is assumed to be a historic resource for CEQA purposes, pending LPAB review. Its demolition is considered a significant impact under Section 15064.5.
The Historic Preservation Sub-Alternative is included in the EIR to allow a comparison of the project to a scenario that would avoid the demolition of the building and is considered a stand-alone scenario that could be combined with the proposed project and any other alternatives. This alternative would maintain the Honda building in its current location as shown in Figure V-9. The proposed programming of the West Broadway MSB would not change, so to preserve the Honda building, the West Broadway MSB would be reconfigured to shift approximately half of the building west, to the portion of the site proposed for a surface parking lot fronting on Manila Avenue. During final design review of the West Broadway MSB by the City, appropriate and feasible design treatments for the new building would be established to ensure adequate preservation of the Honda building and its historic setting. Considerations include the relationship of the new construction to the historic resource, particularly in terms of building setback and articulation along the street frontage, exterior materials, building massing, etc. Under this sub-alternative, the Honda building would be retained and rehabilitated for adaptive reuse (by uses consistent with Kaiser Permanente’s mission of health care) in accordance with the Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and City approvals.

Impacts (Alternative 5)

Since no change would occur to the development program proposed by the project (building floor area, uses, employees), the impacts resulting from this sub-alternative would be the same as those identified for the project, except as discussed below:

Land Use, Plans, and Policies

As discussed below under Visual Quality, the reconfiguration of the West Broadway MSB under the Preservation Sub-Alternative would result in substantial shadow effect on residences north and west of the portion of Sit 7 that fronts Manila Avenue. Although this increased shadow would not necessarily result in a significant impact under the CEQA significance criteria, it would raise the following General Plan policies related to neighborhoods and institutions into consideration for the City:

- LUTE Policy N2.1- As Institutional uses are among the most visible activities in the City and can be sources of community pride, high quality design and upkeep/maintenance should be encouraged. The facilities should be designed and operated in a manner that is sensitive to surrounding residential and other use.

- LUTE Policy N2.4 – New large-scale community, governmental, and institutional uses should be located outside of areas that are predominantly residential. Preferably, they should be located among major thoroughfares with easy access to freeways and public transit or in the Downtown.

- LUTE Policy N2.5 – When reviewing land use permit applications for the establishment or expansion of institutional uses, the decision-making body should take into account the institution’s overall benefit to the entire Oakland community, as well as its effects upon the immediate surrounding area.
**Cultural Resources**

Coupling this Sub-Alternative with any of the alternatives analyzed in this EIR, or with the project, would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts (project and cumulative) that would occur with demolition of the Honda building, pursuant to CEQA and the Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan. It would, however, create new, long shadows on the historic resource during early to mid afternoon hours (3:00) since the building is located directly north of the West Broadway MSB. (See Figures IV.K-16 through IV.K-27, shadow diagrams, provided in Section IV.K, Visual Quality and Wind)

**Hydrology**

The reconfigured West Broadway MSB onto the portion of Site 7 fronting Manila Avenue would require the project sponsor to reroute the existing underground Glen Echo Creek culvert. Existing buildings are built over the culverted segment of the creek. The West Broadway MSB proposed by the project would be set back approximately 17 feet from the culverted segment. Because the City has determined that new construction would not be permitted over the existing culverted segment, the culvert would have to be rerouted.

As discussed under *Expanded Campus Project Variant* in Section IV.G, Hydrology and Water Quality, although the culvert rerouting would alter the existing directional flow along a segment of Glen Echo Creek, it would not result in a “substantial alteration” constituting a significant adverse environmental effect. Compared to the project, similar permitting, shoring work would be required, and additional hydro-engineering would be required to ensure appropriate stormwater capacity flows through the rerouted system. The same less-than-significant impact (with standard conditions and mitigation) related to water quality would occur under the sub-alternative.

**Visual Quality**

A portion of the West Broadway MSB would be developed on an approximately 16,000 square-foot area on which a 34-space employee-only parking is proposed by the project. As depicted in Figure V-9, a new six-story building would be developed adjacent to existing one- to two-story residences. As a result, new, substantial shadow would be cast on the residential buildings located north and west of this site, consistent with the orientation of shadows throughout the year (as depicted in Figures IV.K-16 through IV.K-27 in the shadow analysis provided in Section IV.K, Visual Quality and Wind). Based on projections of the shadow diagrams in Section IV.K, residences to the west (across Manila) would be affected by new shadow cast from development on the currently undeveloped site in morning hours (9:00 a.m.) all year, with shadow continuing on these residences through midday (noon) in December and on to afternoons (3:00 p.m.) in September. New shadow that would occur on the residences immediately north of new development would occur all hours of the day in September and December, and generally not until midday (noon) and afternoons (3:00 p.m.) in March.

This increase in the duration of shadow that would occur on these nearby residential uses as a result of the reconfigured West Broadway MSB under the sub-alternative would not necessarily result in a significant impact pursuant to the significance criteria set forth by CEQA. The effect would, however, be more severe than under the project scenario. This substantial shadow effect
would, however, potentially conflict with General Plan policies discussed above under *Land Use, Plans, and Policies*.

There would be no change in shadows cast on historic resources since none are located close to this portion of the West Broadway MSB parcel. Changes would not occur to shadow cast on Glen Echo Creek, although, as discussed in the shadow analysis for the project, the creek is not necessarily considered a shade-sensitive area. The development under this sub-alternative also would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista from a public vantage point, primarily since the building would infill an existing vacant parcel that is surrounded by existing development and across which any notable views would be limited from the public street. Also, the development under this sub-alternative would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the area.

**Ability to Achieve Kaiser’s Objectives (Alternative 5)**

Kaiser has indicated that reconfiguring the West Broadway MSB in order to retain the existing Honda Building (historical resource, conservatively) in place would have an adverse impact on the internal planning for the life of the building. The current design is rectangular and lends itself to efficient planning, while this alternative would create essentially two separate buildings connected by a link. The irregular building shape would create severe constraints and Kaiser would require re-planning.

Additionally, the existing Honda Building is an aged unreinforced masonry building that does no comply with seismic standards and therefore Kaiser could not place any clinical use in it. Nor would it be advisable for administrative use. In order to be safe, it would require seismic retrofitting. It would be a costly and inefficient burden for Kaiser, in terms of facilities management, energy use and planning adjacencies.

This scheme would separate the Parking Structure from the MSB, impacting the accessibility for members. Many members have disabilities or mobility impairments. The members would have to exit the Parking Structure and walk down the street to get into the MSB, rather than accessing it directly through the interior.
Assumption:
Honda Building to Remain

MSB:
EIR Project: 165,000 sf (5 stories + Basement)
Exhibit: 165,000 sf (5 stories + Basement)
   No surface parking lot
   note: 5 story building on Manila Ave.

MSB Parking Garage:
EIR Project: 738 stalls (4 story / 5 deck + 2 below)
Exhibit: No Change

(6) floors @ 13,000 sf MSB Beyond

View from Broadway

Figure V-9
Alternative 5:
Historic Preservation

SOURCE: SMWM
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Sub-Alternative: Underground Pedestrian Tunnels (Reduced Sky Bridges) (Non-CEQA Alternative)

Description

The Underground Pedestrian Tunnels (Reduced Sky Bridges) Sub-Alternative is included in the EIR to allow consideration of a scenario that would construct underground pedestrian tunnels instead of the overhead pedestrian bridges proposed by the project. As a sub-alternative, this scenario could be combined with any of the project alternatives discussed in this chapter, or the project. The sub-alternative assumes that tunnels would be located in approximately the same location as the three proposed bridges: 1) between the new hospital and the Mosswood MSB, 2) between the new hospital and the new Central Administration MSB, and 3) between the new Central Administration MSB and the new West Broadway MSB. Figure V-10 illustrates a conceptual tunnel design cross-section (discussed in more detail below). Excavation would have to occur to depths of more than 40 feet.

Impacts (Tunnel Sub-alternative)

Since no change would occur to the development program proposed by the project or buildings as they occur above grade (floor area, heights, uses, employees, by phase or overall), the impacts resulting from this sub-alternative would be the same as those identified for the project, except as discussed below:

Land Use, Plans, and Policies

The City’s Pedestrian Master Plan, an Element of the Oakland General Plan, includes policy-supporting Action 2.1.4 that states “Avoid the use of pedestrian overpasses and underpasses for pedestrian crossings on surface streets.” Action 2.1.4 directs that avoidance of underpasses (tunnels) as well as overpasses (bridges) in an effort to encourage the use of pedestrian activity on public streets (rather than above or below street-level). Overall, underground tunnels would pose the same effect on street-level pedestrian activity as would a pedestrian bridge, notwithstanding user behavior that might attract or deter the use of either one over the other (e.g., perceived safety and security). The entrances to the Kaiser buildings would continue to be on the street level. Underground tunnels would only be accessed from within Kaiser buildings, which would generally be inconvenient to the general public to access. Therefore, it is unlikely that a pedestrian walking on the street would opt to enter a Kaiser building and go down to the tunnel to cross the street. Thus, any general pedestrian activity on the street would not be significantly reduced by the existence of a tunnel. However, to the extent that tunnels create more convenient access from parking structures to medical buildings, the tunnels would likely reduce Kaiser-related pedestrian travel on the surface streets.
Transportation, Circulation, and Parking

Broadway and MacArthur / West MacArthur Boulevard are heavily traveled arterial streets that provide direct access to I-580 and connecting freeways and Downtown Oakland. The phasing of construction required for tunnels under these roadways would require partial or complete street closure at the construction site. This would last through the full period of construction of the tunnels. Full or partial street closure would also be required for the construction of the overhead bridges proposed by the project. However, since it is anticipated that most of the skybridge structure would be fabricated off-site, lane or street closures would be required for erection of the bridge components only. The construction period for the tunnels would be approximately 12 months, compared to the erection of skybridges, which would be approximately 6 months. For both cases, traffic interruption could be scheduled to occur at off-peak hours, nights or weekends to minimize impact on traffic.

The duration of street closure and traffic rerouting anticipated for construction of tunnels would increase the potential for traffic circulation conflicts. Prior to its issuance of an encroachment permit for construction within the right-of-way, the City of Oakland Public Works Agency would identify required conditions to appropriately re-route traffic and ensure public safety.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Construction of the proposed project would involve subsurface construction activities (excavation, soil stockpiling, grading, and dredging, etc.), and these activities would have to be expanded to construct underground tunnels. As identified for the project, these activities generate loose, erodable soils that, if not properly managed, could affect water quality. The same standard conditions that would apply to the project would also apply to construction of the tunnels. The impact could be more severe due to the increased earthwork required to construct the tunnels.

Public Health and Safety

Construction of underground tunnels would involve a greater amount of subsurface construction activity that would occur within soil and groundwater impacted by historic hazardous material use. This could increase the less-than-significant impact of exposing workers, the public, or the environment to hazardous conditions. The same standard conditions that would apply to the project would also apply to construction of the tunnels.
Figure V-10
Sub-Alternative:
Conceptual Underground Tunnel Diagram

SOURCE: BKF Engineers
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Ability to Achieve Kaiser’s Objectives (Tunnel Sub-Alternative)

Kaiser proposes to create a campus pathway system to ensure the safe and efficient transfer of in-patients between the new hospital with diagnostic services and other medical services located in other MSBs within the medical campus. Kaiser requests consideration of alternatives to street level transport of staff, members, supplies and equipment. Pedestrian overhead bridges and tunnels would provide protection against inclement weather and would improve the traffic flow for automobiles and shuttles on congested thoroughfares. Overhead bridges and tunnels would provide a safe environment for physically disabled, elderly and parents with children to negotiate busy intersections and to decrease the incidence of falls. Overhead bridges would also provide a safe route to transport patients to the hospital for specialized treatment that is urgent, but not emergent (for example, woman in labor from Obstetrics, child with need for acute care from Pediatric Clinics, elderly patient who requires X-Rays from Podiatry). Patients cannot be transported between buildings on the street via wheelchairs or gurneys. Also, Kaiser prefers overhead pedestrian bridges over tunnels due to the actual and perceived improved security for staff and members who would be visible to the public on an elevated walkway.

...movement of materials in all weather, as well as link parking to the buildings it serves.

During its formulation of the proposed project, Kaiser Permanente considered implementing underground pedestrian tunnels or overhead pedestrian bridges. During its consideration of tunnels versus overhead bridges, Kaiser also reviewed a number of preliminary engineering considerations outlined by BKF Engineers (BKF), the professional civil engineer for the project, for connecting site utilities and creating internal circulation among buildings. In addition to the CEQA-related environmental effects discussed above. BKF identified the following physical, functional, and economic constraints to installing pedestrian tunnels under and perpendicular to Broadway and MacArthur Boulevard:

- **Conflicts with Existing Utilities** - Existing storm drainage and sanitary sewer pipes cross the identified tunnel alignment across Broadway and West MacArthur Boulevard. It is unlikely that these crossings could be avoided by rerouting the existing lines. The tunnel would have to be deep enough below grade to run below the existing utilities. **Figure V-1** illustrates a conceptual tunnel design prepared by BKF during early project development. Tunneling below existing utilities would require supporting those utilities that could not be rerouted during the construction process (i.e., ensure no interruption of stormwater and sewer flows), which would increase the potential for damage to these existing utilities.

- **Economic Constraints** – Kaiser estimates that the cost to construct underground tunnels at the project site is approximately three times the cost to construct the proposed overhead bridges. For comparative purposes, the cost for the underground tunnels is estimated at $10 million versus approximately $3 million for overhead bridges. Additionally, give the significant amount of underground work required for the
V. Alternatives

construction of tunnels (versus the proposed bridges), there is a much higher likelihood of encountering unforeseen hazardous conditions or (other conditions associated with extensive subsurface work) that would impact the duration and cost of construction.

For these reasons, and the CEQA-related environmental considerations discussed above, Kaiser did not proceed with the pedestrian tunnels scenario, determining them to be infeasible and contrary to its project objectives discussed above.

D. Environmentally Superior Alternative

Each of the No Project Alternatives would avoid all significant unavoidable and significant impacts associated with the project and each of the other alternatives. This includes impacts related increased traffic, air quality (PM-10 emissions), and demolition of an historic resource. Conditions related to hazardous materials (soils contamination) and stormwater runoff (impervious surfaces and lack of onsite reduction measures) that currently exist on the Kaiser Permanente OMC would remain instead of being improved by the project as proposed (and with implementation of identified mitigation measures and/or standard conditions). However, the limited new development and project site area under the No Project Alternatives would maintain that any one of the No Project Alternatives would be environmentally superior to the project.

Environmentally Superior: Alternative 2 (Reduced Development) Combined with Alternative 5 (Historic Preservation)

CEQA requires that that a second alternative be identified when the “no project” alternative emerges as the Environmentally Superior Alternative (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e)). In this case, Alternative 2 (Reduced Development) combined with Alternative 5 (Historic Preservation) would therefore be considered environmentally superior.

Alternative 2 would avoid the significant and unavoidable traffic and air quality impacts that would occur with the project. Alternative 5 would avoid the significant and unavoidable cultural resources impact of demolishing the historic resource at 3741-47 Broadway (Honda Building). The overall development program would not change under Alternative 5, therefore the impacts on traffic and air quality would not be reduced or avoided. Also, the duration of shadow cast on adjacent residences (on Manila Avenue) during certain times of year would increase with Alternative 5.

Alternative 3 (Reduced West Broadway Garage) would nominally reduce visual quality impacts (shadow) by being lower in height, but the overall development program would remain as proposed by the project (resulting in no overall change in traffic, air quality, or noise impacts). Also, Alternative 3 may result in temporary residual effects from reducing the amount of parking onsite until the completion of Phase 2 or 3 (increased traffic congestion and associated air quality and noise due to increased demand for parking on or near the medical center).
V. Alternatives

Alternative 4 (Consolidated Campus) would result in increased traffic, air quality, and traffic noise impacts compared to the project and the other alternatives. Overall traffic would increase since the overall development program would not be reduced, but additional development (mixed use residential and ground-floor retail) is assumed on Site 7. The mixed-use development on Site 7 would also maintain the significant and unavoidable impact on the historic resource at 3741-47 Broadway that would occur with the project.

The Underground Tunnels Sub-Alternative would not reduce any significant impact associated with the project, although it would remove bridge structures that would otherwise obstruct public views along Broadway and MacArthur Boulevard. It would increase less-than-significant impacts (with standard conditions and mitigation measures) related to water quality (soil erosion), hazardous materials (exposure of workers and public), and temporary traffic conflicts during extended construction periods.

Conclusion

Each, Alternative 2 and Alternative 5 would avoid significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the project; therefore both would be environmentally superior to the proposed project. While Alternative 2 would avoid two impacts (traffic and air quality), and Alternative 5 would avoid one impact (cultural resources), the City would consider the merits of each alternative in light of the competing policies of historic preservation, traffic and air quality conditions, and residential neighborhood impacts (shadow, encroachment of institutional buildings) that they raise.

For purposes of this EIR, the combined Alternative 2 and Alternative 5 is considered the environmentally superior alternative. This would result in a scenario where the West Broadway MSB would be reconfigured to avoid demolition of the Honda Building in Phase 1, and medical services for the Replacement Hospital would be reduced by approximately 93,000 square feet in Phase 2.

E. Alternatives Considered but not Analyzed in Detail Because they are Infeasible

Offsite Medical Center Location

An offsite alternative would evaluate whether significant and unavoidable impacts related to traffic, air quality emissions (PM-10), and historic resources that would occur with the project could be avoided or substantially reduced by developing the project on another site within the City of Oakland or nearby.

Kaiser Service-Area Objectives

As indicated throughout the discussion of Kaiser objectives relative to each alternative, one of Kaiser Permanente’s primary objectives is to remain in Oakland to provide health care services at
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Kaiser indicates that, since it purchased the MacArthur/Broadway (M/B) Center in 1996, it has not found any alternative sites for the Kaiser Oakland Medical Center (OMC) that meet its objectives and operational needs. Kaiser Permanente’s objective is to provide integrated inpatient and outpatient care services that are convenient and accessible to its members, as well as being cost effective. Kaiser OMC is part of the East Bay Service Area, which has facilities in Richmond and Alameda, as well as Oakland. Kaiser OMC is jointly licensed with Richmond Medical Center. (See Figure V-11). This means that Oakland, in addition to its function of providing primary care services to Oakland area members, also provides specialized Surgical; Women and Infants, Pediatrics; and other services to both Oakland and Richmond members. These services are not available at the Richmond Medical Center, therefore maintaining this joint license is critical to providing these specialized services to its members.

Over the past 12 years, Kaiser Permanente has explored and evaluated a number of sites for the Kaiser OMC. None of these sites met Kaiser’s project objectives or operational needs mentioned above. The conclusions concerning suitability and the major barriers to successful acquisition and entitlements of each of these sites are summarized below.

San Leandro

Kaiser Permanente has acquired a project site in the City of San Leandro to provide a replacement for the Hayward Medical Center. Kaiser does plan to locate a portion (approximately 10 percent) of Kaiser OMC’s current demand to the future San Leandro campus (and the development program analyzed in this EIR for the proposed project reflects this reduction). However, the Kaiser OMC provides needed services for Richmond Medical Center residence area members as well. Richmond Medical Center residence area members live in Richmond, El Cerrito, San Pablo, and El Sobrante. As initially discussed under Alternative 1A (No Project / Closure of the Entire Kaiser OMC), Section 1300.51(H) (ii) of Title 28 of the California Code of Regulations requires for following:

(ii) Hospitals. In the case of a full-service plan, all enrollees have a residence or workplace within 30 minutes or 15 miles of a contracting or plan-operated hospital which has a capacity to serve the entire dependent enrollee population based on normal utilization, and, if separate from such hospital, a contracting or plan-operated provider of all emergency health care services.5

If Kaiser OMC services were shifted to San Leandro, this requirement would no longer be met for Richmond area members using the specialized services at Kaiser OMC. Figure V-11 shows the area where a Kaiser hospital could be located to continue to service its existing members needing special medicals services. To relocate Kaiser OMC to San Leandro would not be convenient nor accessible for its Oakland, Berkeley, Emeryville, Alameda, Richmond, El Cerrito, San Pablo, and El Sobrante members. Also, consideration of a non-Oakland location would be counter to the City’s policies that encourage retaining local employment opportunities and that support

5 This requirement applies to the provision of the following services: primary care, Ob-gyn, and medical.
institutional facilities that serve the Oakland community, and specifically the continued provision of quality health care in Oakland in support of its policies for public safety.

If Kaiser Permanente relocated its hospital to San Leandro, the supporting medical services that exist at Kaiser OMC would also be relocated to be in proximity to the hospital. Located close to Interstate 880 (I-880) developing Kaiser’s hospital and related service on the San Leandro site would likely result in the similar significant and unavoidable traffic and air quality impacts identified for the project. Significant and unavoidable impact to cultural resources (historic resources) would likely be avoided.

**Emeryville**

In the 1990s, Kaiser assembled a site from multiple parcels in the warehouse and commercial district of Emeryville. However, with the purchase of the M/B Center in Oakland in 1996, it was decided to build the replacement hospital the OMC location because of its accessibility to the current membership, adjacency to outpatient services and cost. The Emeryville site has since been sold, and there is no available site in Emeryville that meets Kaiser Permanente’s project objectives. Also, Kaiser Permanente’s desire has been to remain in the City of Oakland in a location convenient to its membership. Additionally, as stated above, consideration of a non-Oakland location would be counter to the City’s policies that encourage local employment opportunities and that support institutional facilities that serve the Oakland community.

**Laney College**

The Athletic Fields at Laney College were evaluated. This parcel would have provided an opportunity for partnering between the College and Kaiser to provide on-the-job training for health professionals and increase the access to jobs for the community at large. Kaiser and the President of the College forged a proposal for this partnership. This purchase was not completed because of opposition from students and faculty, and was ultimately rejected by the Laney College Board of Trustees. Assuming that Laney reconsidered development of a new Kaiser hospital and related medical service at this location, significant and unavoidable impacts related to traffic and air quality could likely occur, and the impact on cultural resources may likely be avoided.
Figure V-11
2005 East Bay Area Population

SOURCE: Kaiser Permanente, 2005
Downtown Oakland Assemblage

The feasibility of an assemblage of redevelopment properties in Downtown Oakland between Telegraph, Broadway, 16th and 20th Streets was explored and did not meet Kaiser’s project objectives of developing a cost-effective project. The major challenges were difficulty of assemblage, size (needed at least 20 acres), cost, traffic impacts to adjacent streets (including the need to reroute one way traffic on 17th and 19th Streets), and the presence of the historic Fox Theater building which would be an impediment to timely redevelopment. The site is currently being developed as part of the Uptown Project, part of the City’s 10K Initiative for downtown residential development.

Oak Knoll

The former Navy Hospital site was evaluated for feasibility and did not meet Kaiser Permanente’s project objectives. Although the site is large and access was acceptable, the location was greater than 15 miles from the Richmond Medical Center and it was not centrally located to the Oakland and Richmond membership. Because the Oakland and Richmond Medical Centers share a Hospital license (as discussed above under Kaiser Service-Area Objectives), there is a requirement that travel distance between them be 15 miles or less. In addition, there is a mandate that members should not have to travel more than 15 miles or 30 minutes for care. This project site was acquired from the U.S. Navy for private development in late 2005.

Hegenberger Road / Coliseum Site

A site with proximity to the Oakland Airport and the Oakland Coliseum was evaluated. This site did not meet the criteria for location due to the greater than 15 mile distance from Richmond Medical Center and the travel time and distance for Oakland and Richmond members. Additionally, the project site has recently been fully developed as a retail commercial center at Hegenberger and I-880.

In conclusion, Kaiser Permanente has not been able to find a suitable alternative site, in Oakland or nearby, that meets its primary objective of remaining in Oakland at its current medical center location, as well as the project objectives identified in Chapter III of this EIR. Kaiser’s priorities for selecting an alternative site also include its health care operational needs and the needs of its members. Therefore, an offsite alternative is not considered in greater detail in this EIR.

Permanent Satellite Parking (non-CEQA)

The project proposes a total of 3,584 onsite parking spaces to meet the parking demands of the project. This reflects an increase of approximately 928 parking spaces to what currently exists. All of the project’s required parking would be located in new or existing parking structures on the
V. Alternatives

The provision of permanent satellite parking would allow a portion of the project’s employee parking supply to be located offsite.\(^6\) As a result, parking facilities within the Kaiser OMC could be reduced, and theoretically, the number of peak-hour employee vehicle trips (and related air quality and noise impacts) could be reduced. Each of these considerations (CEQA and non-CEQA) are addressed to some extent by Alternative 2 (Reduced Development) and Alternative 3 (Reduced West Broadway Parking Garage). However, unlike Alternative 3, this alternative assumes offsite parking on a permanent basis. Unlike Alternative 2, this alternative does not propose a reduced development program as means to reduce parking demand (by way of reducing employment).

Key Considerations

Primary considerations for this alternative include 1) permitting requirements under the Oakland zoning regulations, 2) impacts resulting from new parking facilities at satellite locations, 3) impacts resulting from associated with resulting non-permitted parking in adjacent neighborhoods, 4) the availability of permanent satellite parking locations. These considerations encompass CEQA as well as non-CEQA considerations.

Zoning Requirements and Limitations

The Oakland Planning Code regulates where off-street parking spaces required by the zoning regulations can be located relative to the uses that such parking would serve (Oakland Planning Code Sec.17.116.170-180). For off-street parking serving Health Care Civic Activities or Medical Service Activities, off-street parking must be located on the same lot as the activity, or it may be located on another lot that is within 300 feet (approximately one block). If another lot is used, it must have at least one owner in common with the lot where the activity is located (subject to specific agreements that assure that the parking would be maintained and reserved for the agreed-upon use and duration). A number of feasible, permanent satellite parking locations are described below, within 300 feet of the project site. However, Kaiser does not own these properties (in whole or in part). Therefore, the project would require approval of a variance to the zoning regulations to allow off-street parking required for the project to be located offsite, inconsistent with the requirements described above. Additionally, if the satellite parking location already contains existing uses, the required number of off-street parking spaces to serve those existing uses would have to be confirmed and maintained and a conditional use permit or variance may be required to allow parking for offsite activities.

Resulting Impacts at Satellite Locations

A permanent satellite employee parking alternative is not required to reduce significant environment impacts associate with the project, which are otherwise addressed by the alternatives

\(^6\) It is not feasible to effectively implement the use of satellite parking facilities by visitors/members due to the infrequency of these trips to the medical center, compared to employee trips.
V. Alternatives

analyzed herein. However, it is reasonable to presume that locating substantial numbers of parking spaces at satellite locations would substantially reduce the traffic impacts of the project in the immediate vicinity. Depending on the number of offsite parking spaces provided, and the efficiency of the necessary shuttle system between the satellite locations and the Kaiser OMC, there could be enough of a reduction in local traffic at the Broadway/MacArthur Boulevard intersection to reduce this project impact to less than significant. However, it is also reasonable to presume that new and permanent satellite parking facilities would result in potential environmental impacts to traffic and circulation, air quality, and noise. Unlike the assumption for made for the temporary offsite parking locations in Alternative 3, it is assumed that future permanent satellite parking facilities may be created by constructing new parking structures, in which case potential construction-related and project impacts could also result. Until specific satellite parking locations are identified, the extent of resulting impacts relative to those occurring with the proposed project (or any of the alternatives) can not be definitively known.

Feasible Satellite Locations

A number of possible permanent satellite parking locations have been considered near the Kaiser OMC. To date, a suitable location that meets Kaiser’s operational needs and that is available for acquisition on a permanent basis has not been identified. Below is a summary of locations considered.

1. **3401 Broadway** - This site is an approximately 27,000-sq.ft. paved parcel that is immediately south of the Mosswood MSB and I-580. This site could support a substantially sized parking structure. Kaiser was unsuccessful in obtaining this property, which the owner has leased in 2005 to a Honda dealership on a long term basis. The Honda dealership has indicated that this property is an important part of their business plan and was necessary for their ongoing operations.

2. **Caltrans Parking Lots** – Kaiser explored all of the surface parking lots located under I-580 in proximity to the Kaiser OMC. It currently leases the lot directly east of the Mosswood MSB under I-580. Caltrans leases these lots on a three-year basis, and Kaiser indicates that Caltrans will not commit to longer lease terms. The other Caltrans lots in the area are currently leased to non-Kaiser entities.

3. **I-580 near Moss Avenue** – Kaiser explored a site near the eastbound onramp to I-580 at Moss Avenue, east of the Kaiser OMC. A motel is currently located on the site. Although the site is located close to the medical center, high-volume, peak-hour vehicular access to and from the site would be difficult given the motel site’s immediate proximity to MacArthur Boulevard and the eastbound I-580 onramp.

4. **3851 Broadway (Masonic Center)** – Kaiser is currently exploring lease of the parking lot behind the Masonic Center at 3851 Broadway. Consideration of this location at this time may be speculative, as would its long-term (permanent) availability to Kaiser given the existing Masonic Center use that remains onsite.
In summary, this scenario is not considered in detail in this EIR because no feasible, permanent site has been identified. Feasible satellite parking locations could become available to Kaiser during the 14-year development period of the project. If such a location were to be identified, the City would require (as a condition of approval for the project) that Kaiser consider such locations, conducting additional detailed analysis for the City to consider and evaluate at that time.
### TABLE V-3
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

**NOTE:** Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A. Land Use, Plans, and Policies**

A.1: The project would develop new and different uses and buildings in adjacent to existing neighborhoods east and west of the project, but would not result in the physical division of an existing community.

|                  | LS | N  | N  | N  | N                      | LS                           | LS                      | LS            | LS                     |

A.2: The project generally would be consistent with the General Plan land use classifications and existing zoning district regulations that apply to the project site, but may require variances authorized by the Oakland Planning Code.

|                  | LS | N  | N  | N  | N                      | LS                           | LS                      | LS            | LS                     |

**B. Transportation, Circulation, and Parking**

B.1: Traffic generated by the project would affect traffic levels of service at local intersections in the project vicinity in 2010.

|                  | SU | LSM | LSM | LSM | LSM | LSM | SU | SU | SU |

**Legend**

- **LS**: Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
- **LSM**: Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- **LSC**: Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
- **SU**: Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- **N**: No impact
- **B**: Beneficial
- **-**: Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation
TABLE V-2 (continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>No Project 1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.2: Traffic generated by the project would affect traffic levels of service at local intersections in the project vicinity in 2025.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU*</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3: Traffic generated by the project would contribute to cumulatively significant impacts at local intersections in the project vicinity in 2025.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU*</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend
LS Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
LSM Less than significant impact, after mitigation
LSC Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation) (LSc – Less than significant impact prior to standard conditions)
SU Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
N No impact
B Beneficial
* Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation
### TABLE V-2 (continued)

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

Note: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>No Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.4: The project would generate demand for alternative transportation service for the area.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5: The project would create demand for bicycle parking.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6: The project would increase the potential for pedestrian safety conflicts</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7: The project would increase the potential for conflicts among different traffic streams.</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- **LS**: Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
- **LSM**: Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- **LSC**: Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
- **SU**: Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- **N**: No impact
- **B**: Beneficial
- **∅**: Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation
### TABLE V-2 (continued)

#### SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**B.8:** The project would contribute to 2010 changes to traffic conditions on the regional and local roadways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>LSM</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>LS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**B.9:** The project would contribute to 2025 changes to traffic conditions on the regional and local roadways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>LSM</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>LS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**B.10:** Project construction would temporarily affect traffic flow and circulation, parking, and pedestrian safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### C. Air Quality

**C.1:** Activities associated with demolition, site preparation and construction would generate short-term emissions of criteria pollutants, including suspended and inhalable particulate matter and equipment exhaust emissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>LSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Legend**

- **LS**: Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
- **LSM**: Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- **LSC**: Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation) (LSc – Less than significant impact prior to standard conditions)
- **SU**: Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- **N**: No impact
- **B**: Beneficial
- **Ø**: Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation
V. Alternatives

### TABLE V-2 (continued)
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

**NOTE:** Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.2: The project would result in increased long-term emissions of criteria pollutants from vehicular traffic to and from the project site and from the operation of the Central Utility Plant. The increase in emissions would exceed Bay Area Air Quality Management District significance criteria for daily emissions of PM-10.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3: Mobile emissions generated by project traffic would increase carbon monoxide concentrations at intersections in the project vicinity.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.4: The proposed project could result in exposure of persons to substantial levels of Toxic Air Contaminants such that the probability of contracting cancer for the Maximally Exposed Individual exceeds 10 in one million.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.5: The proposed project together with anticipated future development in the area, could result in long-term traffic increases and could cumulatively increase regional air pollutant emissions and conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Bay Area Clean Air Plan.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- **LS**: Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
- **LSM**: Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- **LSC**: Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
- **SU**: Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- **N**: No impact
- **B**: Beneficial
- **Ø**: Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation
### TABLE V-2 (continued)

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1: Construction activities would intermittently and temporarily generate noise levels above existing ambient levels in the project vicinity.</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2: Noise from project-generated traffic would not significantly increase roadside ambient noise levels.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.3: Operational noise sources generated by HVAC equipment, the Central Utility Plant, emergency generators, ambulance sirens, proposed parking structures, truck loading/unloading, etc., would not exceed the Oakland Noise Ordinance standards regarding operational noise and would not substantially impact nearby noise-sensitive receptors.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- LS: Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
- LSM: Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- LSC: Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation) (LSc – Less than significant impact prior to standard conditions)
- SU: Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- N: No impact
- B: Beneficial
- 0: Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation

---
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### TABLE V-2 (continued)

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D.4:** Given the measured exterior noise levels in the vicinity of the project site, the interior noise levels within hospital buildings, especially in rooms used for overnight use such as patient wards, could exceed DNL 45 dBA, the interior noise standard for hospitals according to the City of Oakland General Plan Noise Element.

**D.5:** The proposed project, together with anticipated future development in the area as well as Oakland in general, could result in long-term traffic increases that could cumulatively increase noise levels.

### E. Cultural Resources

**E.1:** Construction of the project could cause substantial adverse changes to the significance of currently unknown cultural resources at the site, potentially including an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 or CEQA Section 21083.2(g), or the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

|                  | LSC | LSC | LSC | LSC | LSC | LSC | LSC | LSC | LSC |

Legend:
- **LS**: Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
- **LSM**: Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- **LSC**: Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
- **SU**: Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- **N**: No impact
- **B**: Beneficial
- ×: Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation

---
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TABLE V-2 (continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Development</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced West Broadway Garage</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Campus</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.2: The project may adversely affect unidentified paleontological resources at the site.

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>Less than significant impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation) (LSc – Less than significant impact prior to standard conditions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE V-2 (continued)

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>No Project</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1C</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.3: The proposed project would result in the demolition of the building at 3741-47 Broadway which is conservatively assumed to be an historic resource under Section 15065.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, pending Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board review.

| E.3 | SU | N | N | N | N | SU | SU | SU | B | SU |

E.4: The project would construct new and substantially larger medical facilities adjacent to historic resources, but would not affect their historic setting.

| E.4 | LS | N | N | N | N | LS | LS | LS | Ø | LS |

E.5: The proposed project, in combination with cumulative development that would involve demolition of other automobile-related historic resources in Oakland, would result in cumulative impacts to automobile-related historic resources.

| E.5 | SU | N | N | N | N | SU | SU | SU | N | SU |

---

**Legend**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>Less than significant impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE V-2 (continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A Reduced</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B Development</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C No Project</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **E.6:** Construction of the proposed project in combination with construction from other known projects in the vicinity could cause a significant cumulative impact to currently unknown cultural resources at the site, potentially including an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 or CEQA Section 21083.2(g), or the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

- **F. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity**

  - **F.1:** In the event of a major earthquake in the region, seismic ground shaking could potentially injure people and cause collapse or structural damage to existing and proposed hospital structures.

Legend:

- **LS**: Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
- **LSM**: Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- **LSC**: Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation) (LSc – Less than significant impact prior to standard conditions)
- **SU**: Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- **N**: No impact
- **B**: Beneficial
- **Ø**: Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation
NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

F.2: Project construction, specifically in proximity to daylighted segments of Glen Echo Creek, would comply with all City and RWQCB requirements related to erosion control and water quality during construction, including compliance with the ACCQP NPDES permit; the City of Oakland Creek Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance and Grading Ordinance; and compliance with requirements for preparation of a construction SWPPP. The project therefore would not result in substantial, long-term erosion or siltation that would increase the sediment load to Glen Echo Creek and Lake Merritt.

E.5: The proposed project, in combination with cumulative development that would involve demolition of other automobile-related historic resources in Oakland, would result in cumulative impacts to automobile-related historic resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>No Project</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>LSM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend
- **LS**: Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
- **LSM**: Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- **LSC**: Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
- **SU**: Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- **N**: No impact
- **B**: Beneficial
- **Ø**: Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation
### TABLE V-2 (continued)

#### SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**G. Hydrology and Water Quality**

G.1: Project construction would involve activities (excavation, soil stockpiling, pier drilling, grading, and dredging, etc.) that would generate loose, erodable soils that, if not properly managed, could violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; result in substantial erosion or siltation; create or constitute substantial polluted runoff; or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

G.2: Project excavation activities would not deplete groundwater supplies nor substantially interfere with groundwater recharge or cause contaminated groundwater discharge to contaminate surface water.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

G.3: The project would result in new development that could substantially alter existing drainage pattern of the project site, the surrounding area, or the drainage course of Glen Echo Creek.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Legend**

- **LS**: Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
- **LSM**: Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- **LSC**: Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation) (LSc – Less than significant impact prior to standard conditions)
- **SU**: Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- **N**: No impact
- **B**: Beneficial
- **Ø**: Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation
TABLE V-2 (continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>3 Reduced Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.4: The project would not result in a net increase in impervious surfaces and would not cause an increase in the volume of project-related stormwater runoff. The project would not violate any waste discharge requirements that would create substantial runoff and that would result in substantial flooding onsite or offsite. Nor would the project exceed the capacity of the stormwater drainage system.</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.5: The project would not result in flooding due to its proximity to a 100-year flood hazard area, or expose people or structures to other substantial risk related to flooding, seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.6: The increased construction activity and new development resulting from the project, in conjunction with other foreseeable development in the city, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts on hydrology and water quality conditions.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

- **LS**: Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
- **LSM**: Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- **LSC**: Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
- **SU**: Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- **N**: No impact
- **B**: Beneficial
- ****: Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.
H. Public Health and Safety

H.1: Demolition or renovation of existing structures that contain hazardous building materials, such as lead-based paint, asbestos, and PCBs could expose workers, the public, or the environment to these hazardous materials and would generate hazardous waste.

H.2: Implementation of the project would disturb soil and groundwater impacted by historic hazardous material use, which could expose construction workers, the public, or the environment to adverse conditions related to hazardous materials handling.

H.3: The project would involve the transportation, use, and storage of hazardous chemicals, which could present increased public health and/or safety risks to Kaiser workers, patients and visitors, and the surrounding area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>Less than significant impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSMC</td>
<td>Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation) (LSc – Less than significant impact prior to standard conditions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE V-2 (continued)

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

**NOTE:** Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous materials used onsite during construction activities (i.e. solvents) could be spilled through improper handling or storage, potentially increasing public health and/or safety risks to Kaiser workers, patients and visitors, and the surrounding area.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed project could increase the volume of hazardous materials and hazardous waste at Kaiser, subsequently increasing the risk of spillage and/or accidental release of hazardous substances.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards at the project site could contribute to cumulative hazards in the vicinity of the project site.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LSØ</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- **LS** Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
- **LSM** Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- **LSC** Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
- **SU** Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- **N** No impact
- **B** Beneficial
- **Ø Ø** Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation
### I. Biological Resources / Wetlands

I.1: Within the vicinity of Glen Echo Creek, demolition of existing structures and construction on Site 7 in Phase 1 (West Broadway MSB and parking structure) could result in impacts to potentially jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the U.S. under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and waters of the state under the jurisdiction of the State Regional Water Quality Control Board (SWRCB) or Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act and Porter-Cologne Act. This disturbance would affect both areas classified as wetland and channels that are considered “other waters of the U.S.” No formal wetland delineation was conducted, however, Glen Echo Creek would be considered a Water of U.S. and fall under regulatory jurisdiction of the agencies identified above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>LSC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legend

- **LS**: Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
- **LSM**: Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- **LSC**: Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation) (LSc – Less than significant impact prior to standard conditions)
- **SU**: Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- **N**: No impact
- **B**: Beneficial
- **-** Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.
### TABLE V-2 (continued)
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.2: Installation of the temporary bypass culvert within Glen Echo Creek waterway (Standard Condition G.1a) during Phase 1 (West Broadway MSB and parking structure) would result in temporary disturbance to pond turtle habitat.</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>No Project</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LSC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| I.3: Construction activities on Site 7 adjacent to Glen Echo Creek during Phase 1 (West Broadway MSB and parking structure) would result in disturbance to nesting habitat for breeding raptors and passerine birds including nesting Cooper’s hawk. | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | LSC | N | N | N | N | LSC | LSC | LSC | LSC |

| I.4: The project would conduct construction activities near several protected trees and would potentially remove approximately 34 protected trees located within or adjacent to the project site and would conducted these activities in compliance with the City of Oakland’s Tree Preservation and Removal Ordinance | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | LSC | LSC | LSC | LSC | LSC | LSC | LSC | LSC | LSC |

---

**Legend**
- **LS**: Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
- **LSM**: Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- **LSC**: Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
- **SU**: Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- **N**: No impact
- **B**: Beneficial
- **Ø**: Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation
TABLE V-2 (continued)

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.5: Construction of project facilities could result in impacts to common plant and animal species.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.6: The project would not make a contribution that is “cumulatively considerable” to any cumulative impact on biological resources.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Population, Housing, and Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.1: The project would displace existing housing and residents, but not in substantial numbers necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, in excess of that anticipated in the City’s Housing Element.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>Less than significant impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>Less than significant impact, after mitigation (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation) (LSc – Less than significant impact prior to standard conditions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE V-2 (continued)
### SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.2: The project would displace existing businesses and jobs, but not in substantial numbers necessitating construction of replacement facilities elsewhere, in excess of that anticipated in the City’s General Plan.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.3: The project would not induce substantial population growth in a manner not anticipated by the General Plan, either directly by proposing new housing or businesses, or indirectly through infrastructure improvements.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K. Visual Quality and Shadow

K.1: The project would demolish existing buildings along major pedestrian and vehicular corridors and construct new buildings of varying height and bulk compared to existing buildings in the area. This would substantially but not adversely alter the existing visual character and quality of the project area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K.1: The project would demolish existing buildings along major pedestrian and vehicular corridors and construct new buildings of varying height and bulk compared to existing buildings in the area. This would substantially but not adversely alter the existing visual character and quality of the project area.</td>
<td>LS/B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS/B</td>
<td>LS/B</td>
<td>LS/B</td>
<td>LS/B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>Less than significant impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE V-2 (continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K.2: Construction activities associated with the project may result in accidental damage to one or more trees within a state-designated scenic highway.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.3: The project would construct new buildings, some of which would be taller and have more bulk than some existing buildings on the project site or nearby. This new construction would result in changes to views from public viewpoints but would not adversely affect scenic vistas.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.4: The project would increase the amount of light and glare emitted from the project site but would not result in substantial adverse effects to day or nighttime views or adjacent residential uses.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend
LS  Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
LSM Less than significant impact, after mitigation
LSC Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation) (LSc – Less than significant impact prior to standard conditions)
SU  Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
N   No impact
B   Beneficial
Ø   Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation
TABLE V-2 (continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K.5: The project would create additional shadow on adjacent areas, however, the project would not cast shadow on historic resources, would not introduce landscaping conflicting with the California Public Resource Code; would not cast shadow on buildings using passive solar heat, solar collectors for hot water heating, or photovoltaic solar collectors; and would not cast shadow that impairs the use of any public or quasi-public park, lawn, garden, or open space.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.6: The proposed project would not increase the duration of hazardous wind conditions.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.7: Development proposed as part of the project, when combined with other foreseeable development in the vicinity, could result in cumulative impacts related to visual character views, aesthetics, shadow, light and glare.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L. Public Services and Recreation Facilities

Legend
- **LS**: Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
- **LSM**: Less than significant impact, after mitigation
- **LSC**: Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
- **SU**: Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
- **N**: No impact
- **B**: Beneficial
- **Ø Ø**: Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation
Table V-2 (continued)

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L.1: The project could result in an increase in calls for police protection services, but would not require new or physically altered police facilities in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.2: The proposed project would increase the number of calls for fire protection services and emergency medical assistance, but would not require new or physically altered fire facilities in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.3: The proposed project could result in new students for local schools, but would not require new or physically altered school facilities to maintain acceptable performance objectives.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

LS  Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
LSM Less than significant impact, after mitigation
LSC Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation) (LSc – Less than significant impact prior to standard conditions)
SU Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
N  No impact
B  Beneficial
Ø  Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation
TABLE V-2 (continued)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Development</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced West Broadway Garage</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Campus</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L.4: The project could increase the demand for parks and recreational facilities, and library facilities, but would not result in substantial physical deterioration of such facilities or require new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives.

M. Utilities and Service Systems

M.1: The project would not exceed water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, nor require or result in construction of water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

M.2: The project’s projected wastewater demand would not result in the City of Oakland exceeding its citywide projected base flow allocation for Subbasins 52-09 and 50-05; nor would the project require or result in construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Legend
LS  Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
LSM Less than significant impact, after mitigation
LSC Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)
SU  Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
N   No impact
B   Beneficial
Ø   Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation
TABLE V-2 (continued)

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.3: The project would not require or result in construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.4: The project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs, and would not require or result in construction of landfill facilities or expansion of existing facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Additionally, the project would not impede the ability of the City to meet the waste diversion requirements of the California Integrated Waste Management Act or the Alameda County Waste Reduction and Recycling Initiative or cause the City to violate other applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.</td>
<td>LSc</td>
<td>LSc</td>
<td>LSc</td>
<td>LSc</td>
<td>LSc</td>
<td>LSc</td>
<td>LSc</td>
<td>LSc</td>
<td>LSc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>Less than significant impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation) (LSc – Less than significant impact prior to standard conditions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE V-2 (continued)

**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

Note: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation or standard conditions of approval and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>1C</th>
<th>1D</th>
<th>2 Reduced Development</th>
<th>3 Reduced West Broadway Garage</th>
<th>4 Consolidated Campus</th>
<th>5 Preservation</th>
<th>Tunnel Sub-Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS Ø</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M.5: The project would not violate applicable federal, state and local statutes and regulations relating to energy standards; nor would the proposed project result in a determination by the energy provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the providers' existing commitments and require or result in construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

M.6: The increased development resulting from the proposed project, in conjunction with population and density of other foreseeable development in the city, would not result in cumulative impacts on utilities and service systems.

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>Less than significant impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>Less than significant impact, after standard conditions (LSCM – after standard conditions and mitigation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø Ø</td>
<td>Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>