

## 6 IMPACT OVERVIEW

As required by CEQA, this chapter provides an overview of the impacts of the proposed project based on the technical topical analyses. The topics covered in this chapter include growth inducement; cumulative impacts; unavoidable significant effects; significant irreversible changes; short-term uses versus long-term productivity; and impacts not found to be significant. A more detailed analysis of the effects the project would have on the environment is provided in Chapter 4: Environmental Evaluation.

### *A. Growth Inducement*

A project is considered to be growth-inducing if it fosters economic or population growth beyond the boundaries of the project site. Typical growth inducements might be the extension of urban services or transportation infrastructure to a previously unserved or under-served area, or the removal of major boundaries to development.

Overall, the proposed project would not be expected to induce growth beyond the limits of the project site. The proposed project site is an undeveloped parcel of land within the City of Oakland. The site is surrounded by residential and some commercial development, so it is already served by public infrastructure and utilities, and no extension of services into unserved areas would be necessary. In addition, the City has designated the project site for residential development in the Oakland General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element at a density above that of the proposed project. Therefore the proposed project would not result in growth or development which would not be otherwise anticipated, and no significant growth impacts would occur.

### *B. Cumulative Impacts*

CEQA Guidelines require consideration of the potential cumulative impacts that could result from a proposed project in conjunction with other projects

in the vicinity. Such impacts can occur when two or more individual effects either together create a considerable environmental impact or compound other environmental consequences. The cumulative impact analysis in this section is based on the impacts of the proposed project in combination with all other projects assumed under the buildout of the City of Oakland General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element. The projections of buildout contained in the General Plan have been analyzed in the General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element EIR, certified by the Oakland City Council on March 13, 1998.

The traffic analysis in this EIR considered cumulative traffic impacts by combining projected traffic volumes from other approved projects in the area with the project-generated traffic, as described in Section 4.8. The list of approved projects, as determined by City staff, included residential development at Leona Quarry, residential and commercial development at the former Oak Knoll Naval Hospital site, residential development in the Eastmont Area, residential development at MacArthur Boulevard and 73<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, and residential development on Golf Links Road. The traffic analysis concluded that the project, combined with these approved projects, would have a significant cumulative traffic impact on the Mountain Boulevard/Keller Avenue intersection. However, this impact would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure TRAF-1.

Although biological, geological, noise and utility impacts would potentially occur as a result of the proposed project, these impacts would not be significant enough to contribute to a cumulative impact over a larger area, and would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels by the relevant mitigation measures included in this EIR. The potential air quality, hydrology and traffic impacts that would occur as a result of the proposed project may have the potential to contribute to a cumulative impact. However, these impacts have already been analyzed in the General Plan Land Use and Transportation Element EIR, which included an assumption of development on the project site at a density higher than that of the proposed project.

No other cumulative impacts are anticipated as a result of the combination of the proposed project and the other approved projects in the vicinity.

### *C. Unavoidable Significant Impacts*

Unavoidable significant impacts are those significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. As described in Chapter 4, all of the potential impacts from the proposed project are either less than significant or could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels by the implementation of mitigation measures.

### *D. Significant Irreversible Changes*

CEQA requires that an EIR assess whether a project will result in significant irreversible changes to the environment. The CEQA Guidelines describe three distinct categories of irreversible changes that should be considered:

#### **1. Changes in Land Use which Commit Future Generations**

The proposed project would commit future generations to development on the proposed project site. Once the proposed project is developed it is unlikely to be economically feasible or desirable to change to a significantly different land use for several decades or to return the site to its current vacant state. However, this is not considered to be an adverse impact, since the site is designated for residential development in the Oakland General Plan.

#### **2. Irreversible Damage from Environmental Accidents**

Since the project does not involve the use or transport of hazardous materials, no significant environmental damage, such as the accidental spill or explosion of hazardous material, is anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

### 3. Consumption of Natural Resources

The assessment of a proposed project's consumption of nonrenewable resources includes increased energy consumption, conservation of agricultural lands, and loss of access to mining reserves. The proposed project will require additional utility service, and it will require resources for construction. However, it is anticipated that these additional services will be provided with no impact to the service providers and without the need for additional staff or facilities. Additionally, the property is not agricultural land, nor does it provide access to a mining reserve due to the proximity of existing residential development. Moreover, the project is located on a site surrounded by existing development and would not require the extension of utilities or other services to areas that are not currently served by existing infrastructure. Overall, the proposed project would not have significant impacts on the consumption of natural resources.

#### *E. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*

CEQA allows environmental issues for which there is no likelihood of an impact to be "scoped out" during the EIR scoping process and not covered in an EIR. This section summarizes previous findings from the Initial Study completed for the project regarding areas of concern which were "scoped out" and are not considered further in this EIR:

- ◆ **Agricultural Resources.** The project site is located on urbanized lands. There is no farmland located on or adjacent to the project site and the site is not under Williamson Act Contract. Furthermore, the site is designated for residential development in both the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore there would be no impact to agricultural resources.
- ◆ **Hazardous Materials.** The Initial Study conducted for the project concluded that there was no evidence that the site has ever been developed and no reason to anticipate impacts from hazardous materials contamination on the site as a result of previous uses. A further analysis of hazardous materials impacts was therefore scoped out of this EIR. However, in

response to a comment letter submitted by the California Department of Toxic Substances on the Initial Study, a more thorough records search was conducted by the Hazardous Materials Division of the City of Oakland Fire Services Agency. The Hazardous Materials Division maintains both City and Alameda County records for all past and current commercial properties handling hazardous materials. The Division has no records that any properties on Keller Avenue have handled hazardous materials now or in the past.<sup>1</sup> In addition, surface reconnaissance of the site conducted for the cultural resource and geotechnical investigations of the site revealed no evidence of past site disturbance that would indicate possible contamination. Furthermore, the proposed project would not involve the use or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, there is no risk of hazardous materials impacts from the proposed project.

- ◆ **Mineral Resources.** The project site is located in an area classified by the California Geological Survey (CGS) as Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) 2a, a zone in which geologic data indicates that significant mineral deposits are present. However, the existing residential development surrounding the site does not permit mineral extraction, since there would be significant land use conflicts between aggregate mining and the surrounding residential uses. Thus, development of the site would have a less-than-significant impact on the availability of mineral resources, since extraction of these resources is essentially impossible with or without the project.
- ◆ **Population and Housing.** The project would create an additional 32 housing units. These housing units would result in an additional 88 persons, according to the Association of Bay Area Governments' household size projections. This project would increase the population in Oakland by 0.02 percent, which is too small to be considered significant. Since there is no existing development on the site, no housing or people will be displaced. No impacts to population or housing are anticipated.

---

<sup>1</sup> Personal communication, Celestina Pacheco, City of Oakland Fire Services Agency, Hazardous Materials Division. March 16, 2004.

- ◆ **Public Services.** The proposed project would add 32 housing units and 88 residents within an area already served by City of Oakland services and facilities. This increase would not create significant impacts on the City's ability to provide fire, police, school, or other public services. Oakland Police Department and Oakland Fire Department staff reviewed the proposed project and determined that it would not affect their ability to maintain acceptable service ratios and response times.<sup>2</sup> In addition, final project plans must be approved by the Fire Services Agency to ensure that adequate fire and life safety measures are designed into the project in compliance with all applicable State and City fire safety requirements. According to Oakland Unified School District's student generation rate, the project would generate about 17 total students for the OUSD. The existing elementary, middle and high schools in the project area have enough capacity to serve 17 additional students. In addition, the project area is already served by existing parks, which would not be significantly impacted by 88 potential new users.
- ◆ **Recreation.** The proposed project area is adequately served by existing parks nearby, including the Leona Canyon Regional Open Space Preserve, managed by the East Bay Regional Park District, and King Estates Park, managed by the City of Oakland. Since this project only involves the addition of a small increment of population, 32 households, there would be no substantial increase in the use of existing recreational facilities or the need for new recreational facilities.

---

<sup>2</sup> Meeting Communication, Ernest Robinson, Fire Marshal, Oakland Fire Department, April 2, 2003.