CHAPTER 6
Impact Overview and Growth-Inducing Impacts

6.1 Significant Unavoidable and Cumulative Environmental Impacts

A significant and unavoidable impact would result if a project reaches or exceeds the defined threshold of significance and no feasible mitigation measure is available to reduce the significant impact to a less-than-significant level. The proposed project would result in the following significant and unavoidable (SU) environmental effects and/or cumulative impacts, as identified in Chapter 4 of this EIR:

**SU Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases Emissions (GHG) Impacts**

- **Impact AIR-1:** Activities associated with demolition, site preparation, and construction would generate short-term emissions of criteria pollutants (NOx), including suspended inhalable particulate matter and equipment exhaust emissions. (Phase 1 year 2010 only, if proposed BAAQMD Thresholds are adopted1) (Project)

- **Impact AIR-6:** The proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulative air quality impact from criteria pollutant emissions. (Less than Significant under existing BAAQMD Thresholds. (Phase 1 year 2010 only, if proposed BAAQMD Thresholds are adopted1)

- **Impact AIR-8:** Construction and operation of the project would result in a cumulatively considerable increase in GHG emissions. (Phase I, Future Phases and Buildout if proposed BAAQMD Thresholds are adopted1) (Cumulative)

- **Impact AIR-9:** The project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation of an appropriate regulatory agency adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. (Phase I, Future Phases and Buildout if proposed BAAQMD Thresholds are adopted1) (Cumulative)

---

1 In November 2009, BAAQMD issued its most recent draft update to its CEQA Air Quality Thresholds and Guidelines, as part of a planned update of BAAQMD’s CEQA Guidelines, which were last updated in December 1999, as discussed above. Preliminary drafts were issued in September, October 2009, and November 2009 and BAAQMD held numerous public hearings to obtain public review and comment on the draft. Adoption of the November 2009 draft is anticipated to occur in early 2010.
**SU Cultural Resources Impacts**

- **Impact CUL-4**: Future Phases of the proposed project would demolish the potentially historical resource at 418 30th Street. (*Conservatively assumed to be Significant and Unavoidable; Project*)

**SU Transportation, Circulation and Parking**

All SU intersection operations impacts identified for the proposed project occur only under the 2035 Buildout scenario, with the exception of Intersection #44. SU Intersection #44 impacts under Existing and 2015 scenarios (Impacts TRANS-2, 4, 6 and 8) are conservatively deemed significant and unavoidable because further study is required to determine the feasibility of the mitigation measures. If, after submission of final design plans, the improvements are determined to be feasible, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. The Intersection #44 impact under the 2035 Buildout scenario (Impact TRANS-20) is significant and unavoidable because the impact would not be reduced to less than significant even after implementation of the identified mitigation measure, if the improvements are determined to be feasible. SU Intersection #44 impacts for all scenarios are identified together under Impact TRANS-20.

Although several of these impacts also occur in the Existing or 2015 scenarios, mitigation measures are identified that reduced the significant impacts in those analysis scenarios to less than significant; no feasible mitigation measures are available that reduce the significant 2035 Buildout impacts to less than significant (except for Impact TRANS-9 and TRANS-18, discussed below).

- **Impact TRANS-10**: Buildout of the proposed project would degrade the vehicle level of service from an acceptable LOS E to an unacceptable LOS F during the PM peak hour at Intersection #7-Telegraph Avenue / Grand Avenue (2035). (*SU and Cumulative*)

- **Impact TRANS-11**: Buildout of the proposed project would increase the average intersection vehicle delay by more than two seconds during the PM peak hour at Intersection #8-Telegraph Avenue / 27th Street (2035), which would operate at LOS F during both peak hours under 2035 Without Project conditions. (*SU and Cumulative*)

- **Impact TRANS-13**: Buildout of the proposed project would degrade PM peak-hour operations from LOS E to LOS F (and increase the average intersection delay by more than two seconds) during the PM peak hour at Intersection #13-Telegraph Avenue / MacArthur Boulevard (2035). In addition, buildout of the proposed project would increase the average intersection vehicle delay by more than four seconds (under prevailing LOS E conditions) during the AM peak hour. (*SU and Cumulative*)

- **Impact TRANS-15**: Buildout of the proposed project would increase the average intersection vehicle delay by more than six seconds during the AM peak hour at Intersection #34-Broadway / West MacArthur Boulevard (2035), which would operate at LOS E during the AM peak hour under 2035 Without Project conditions. (*SU and Cumulative*)

- **Impact TRANS-17**: Buildout of the proposed project would add more than 10 trips to Intersection #39-Harrison Street / 29th Street (2035), which would meet peak-hour signal warrants under 2035 Without Project conditions. (*SU and Cumulative*)
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- **Impact TRANS-19**: Buildout of the proposed project would increase the average intersection vehicle delay by more than six seconds during the AM peak hour at Intersection #43-Piedmont Avenue / West MacArthur Boulevard (2035), which would operate at LOS E during the AM peak hour under 2035 Without Project conditions. (SU and Cumulative)

- **Impact TRANS-20**: Buildout of the proposed project would add more than 10 trips to Intersection #44-West Grand Avenue / Brush Street (2035), which would meet signal warrants under 2035 Without Project conditions. (SU and Cumulative)  
  (Also SU under Existing Plus Phase 1 [Impact TRANS-2]; under Existing Plus Buildout [Impact TRANS-4]; under 2015 Plus Phase 1 [Impact TRANS-6]; and under 2015 Plus Buildout [Impact TRANS-8])

- **Impact TRANS-21**: Buildout of the proposed project would increase the v/c ratio at Intersection #45-West Grand Avenue / San Pablo Avenue (2035), which would operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour under 2035 Without Project conditions. (SU and Cumulative)

The following cumulative traffic impacts are significant and unavoidable because it is not certain that the measure could be implemented because the City of Oakland, as lead agency, could not implement feasible mitigation measures identified in this EIR without the approval of Caltrans. However, in the event that the mitigation measure could be implemented, the impact would be less than significant

- **Impact TRANS-9**: Buildout of the proposed project would increase the vehicle delay to a critical movement by more than four seconds during the AM and PM peak hour at Intersection #6-27th Street / Northgate Avenue / I-980 On-Ramps (2035), which would operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour under 2035 Without Project conditions. (SU and Cumulative)

- **Impact TRANS-18**: Buildout of the proposed project would increase the average intersection vehicle delay by more than two seconds during the PM peak hour at Intersection #41-Oakland Avenue / Perry Place / I-580 Off-Ramp (2035), which would operate at LOS F during both peak hours under 2035 Without Project conditions.) (SU and Cumulative)

### 6.2 Growth-Inducing Impacts

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR should discuss “…the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.” Growth can be induced in a number of ways, including through the elimination of obstacles to growth, through the stimulation of economic activity within the region, or through precedent-setting action.

Examples of projects likely to have significant growth-inducing impacts include extensions or expansions of infrastructure systems beyond what is needed to serve project-specific demand, and development of new residential subdivisions or industrial parks in areas that are currently only sparsely developed or are undeveloped. Typically, projects on infill sites that are surrounded by existing urban uses are not considered growth-inducing because it usually does not facilitate development intensification on adjacent sites.
Because the proposed project would be redeveloping an existing medical center and adding related uses, it is not expected to have growth-inducing effects. The project site is in a developed area fully served by public utilities. There are no significant areas that are undeveloped adjacent to the project site. Additionally, the proposed project would not remove any obstacles that would help facilitate growth that could significantly affect the physical environment.

Indirect population growth associated with the proposed project could occur in association with job creation. The economic stimulus generated by construction of the proposed project could result in the creation of new construction-related jobs. In addition, the increase in medical office space, classroom space and retail square footage that would be built as part of the project could generate more employees and students. It is estimated that the future operations at the completed ABSMC Summit Campus Master Plan Project would employ approximately 429 people. However, the jobs created during both the construction and operation phases of the project would not be substantial in the context of job growth in Oakland and the region over the next 10 to 20 years. The proposed project’s employment would represent about 0.2 percent of the total 2005 employment in Oakland and only 0.16 percent of the City’s future total employment as projected by ABAG’s projections for Oakland in 2030. Consequently, the proposed project would not result in a substantial population increase or induce unanticipated new growth.

The proposed project does not include housing; therefore, it would not directly induce an increase in residential population. Indirectly, as described above, it could bring some new residents into the downtown area, fulfilling Oakland’s 10k in Downtown plan.

The proposed project would occur on an infill site in an existing urbanized neighborhood in Oakland. It would not result in the extension of utilities or roads into exurban areas, and would not directly or indirectly lead to the development of greenfield sites in the East Bay. Because the project site is located within an existing urbanized area, and is near a major transit station (19th Street BART Station) as well as high-density urban residential units, anticipated growth would benefit the existing transit system and could reduce adverse impacts associated with automobile use, such as traffic, air pollution and noise. Therefore, the population growth that would occur as a result of proposed project implementation would be largely beneficial and not considered substantial and adverse.

### 6.3 Significant Irreversible Environmental Effects

An EIR must identify any significant irreversible environmental changes that could result from implementation of a proposed project. These may include current or future uses of non-renewable resources, and secondary or growth-inducing impacts that commit future generations to similar uses. CEQA dictates that irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified (CEQA Guidelines §15126.2(c)). The CEQA Guidelines identify three distinct categories of significant irreversible changes: (1) changes in land use that would commit future generations; (2) irreversible changes from environmental actions; and (3) consumption of non-renewable resources.
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Changes in Land Use Which Would Commit Future Generations

The proposed project would allow for the improvement of approximately 20.40 acres of land in the “pill hill” area of Oakland. The proposed project is consistent with the land use designated by the City of Oakland’s General Plan. Because the proposed project would occur on an infill site on land within an urban area surrounded by similar or compatible uses, it would not commit future generations to a significant change in land use.

Irreversible Changes from Environmental Accidents

No significant irreversible environmental damage, such as what could occur as a result of an accidental spill or explosion of hazardous materials, is anticipated due to implementation of the proposed project. Furthermore, compliance with federal, State, and local regulations, the City of Oakland’s Standard Conditions of Approval, and the implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.9, Hazardous Materials and Hazards, would reduce to a less-than-significant level the possibility that hazardous substances within the project site would cause significant environmental damage.

Consumption of Non-Renewable Resources

Consumption of non-renewable resources includes conversion of agricultural lands, loss of access to mining reserves, and use of non-renewable energy sources. The project site is located within an urban area of Oakland; no agricultural land would be converted to non-agricultural uses. The project site does not contain known mineral resources and does not serve as a mining reserve.

Construction of proposed project would require the use of energy, including energy produced from non-renewable resources. Energy consumption would also occur during the operational period of the proposed project due to the use of automobiles, lighting, and appliances. However, the proposed project would incorporate energy-conserving features, as required by the uniform Building Code and California Energy Code Title 24. The proposed project would also incorporate sustainable construction features where feasible or as otherwise required by law that would strive to meet the energy objectives of the Green Guide for Health Care, resulting in a more energy efficient development and reduced consumption using local materials and labor.

6.4 Effects Found Not To Be Significant

Meetings with representatives of the City of Oakland departments involved in the planning and review of development projects, and consultants for the City were held to determine the preliminary scope of the proposed project. In addition to those meetings, a Notice of Preparation was circulated on January 23, 2009 and again on March 13, 2009, and a public scoping meeting was held on February 18, 2009, at the Planning Commission, to solicit comments from the public and city officials about the scope of this EIR. Written comments received on the NOP were
considered in the preparation of the final scope for this document and in the evaluation of the proposed project. An Initial Study was not prepared for the proposed project.

The NOP prepared for the proposed project indicated there would likely be no environmental effects on or to geology and soils; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use, plans, and policies; noise levels; population and housing; public services; recreation; utilities and service systems; and cumulative growth. However, since the proposed project did not include the preparation of an Initial Study, these environmental factors have been fully analyzed in this document (Chapter 4).

The following two topics from the CEQA Environmental Checklist were excluded from discussion in the EIR because it was determined during the scoping phase that there would be no impacts to these issues:

**Agricultural Resources**

As discussed in Section 4.1 (Land Use, Plans, and Policies), the Oakland General Plan Land Use Map designates various residential, institutional, and commercial land use classifications on and surrounding with project site. The project area, as with the majority of developed land in the City of Oakland, is designated by the California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program as Urban and Built-Up Land (Department of Conservation, 1998). Therefore, specifically, the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use; would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; and would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. The project would have no impact on agricultural resources.

**Mineral Resources**

According to the City’s OSCAR Element of the General Plan, the project is located in a developed urban area that has no known existing mineral resources. The CGS has classified lands within the San Francisco Bay Region into Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs) based on guidelines adopted by the California State Mining and Geology Board, as mandated by the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) of 1974 (Stinson et al., 1982). The project area is mapped by the CDMG as MRZ-1, an area where adequate information indicates a low likelihood of significant mineral resources (Stinson, et al., 1982). The intent of designating significant deposits is to identify areas where mineral extraction could occur prior to development. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; and would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. The project would have no impact on mineral resources.
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