CHAPTER 6
Impact Overview and Growth Inducement

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines, this section summarizes the significant and unavoidable and cumulative effects identified in the EIR, the potential for growth inducement from the project, potential economic and social effects, significant irreversible environmental effects, as well as effects found not be significant.

6.1 Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b), this EIR has identified significant environmental effects which cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented (see “Significant and Unavoidable (SU)” in Section 4.4, Impact Classifications, in Chapter 4 of this Draft EIR). The following significant and unavoidable impacts are identified for the project:

- **Impact CUL-1**: The Project will have an impact on a historical resource as defined by PRC Section 5024.1.

- **Impact NOI-2**: Construction of the Project would substantially and temporarily increase noise levels in areas of sensitive receptors and exceed the ambient noise environment.

- **Impact TRA-1**: The Project would increase traffic volumes on area roadways and affect levels of service at the local and CMP study intersections and freeways under Existing plus Project Conditions. (SU for intersection LOS and queuing on Bon Air Road/Sir Francis Drake Blvd.)

- **Impact TRA-5**: The Near-Term Project would increase traffic volumes on area roadways and affect levels of service at the local and CMP study intersections and freeways under Near-Term (Year 2018) plus Near-Term Project Conditions.

- **Impact TRA-7**: The Project, in conjunction with past, present and other reasonably foreseeable future development in the area, would increase traffic volumes on area roadways and affect levels of service at the local and CMP study intersections and freeways under Cumulative plus Project conditions. (SU for intersection LOS and freeway segment LOS)

All significant and avoidable impacts for the project are identified in the respective environmental topic sections throughout Chapter 4 and are included in Table 2-1, Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts, in Chapter 2, Summary.
6.2 Cumulative Impact

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15130, this EIR has identified significant cumulative impacts of a project when the project’s incremental effects are cumulatively considerable (as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15026[a][3]). The approach to the cumulative analysis, and the list of cumulative development considered throughout this Draft EIR for the cumulative analyses, are discussed under Cumulative Analysis, in Chapter 4 of this Draft EIR.

The following cumulative impact is identified for the project (e.g., the project’s contribution is cumulatively considerable) (and is also identified above as a significant and unavoidable).

- **Impact TRA-7**: The Project, in conjunction with past, present and other reasonably foreseeable future development in the area, would increase traffic volumes on area roadways and affect levels of service at the local and CMP study intersections and freeways under Cumulative plus Project conditions. (SU for intersection LOS and freeway segment LOS)

6.3 Growth Inducement

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires that an EIR evaluate the growth inducing impacts of a proposed project. Specifically, the 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. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a waste water treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

This section addresses the implications of the project for growth in Marin County, including unincorporated county areas, cities, and the Bay Area region. The discussion is organized into the following three topics:

1. Net addition of employment: the extent to which project improvements and expansion would result in growth of medical services employment that would not otherwise occur in Marin County or the Bay Area region.

2. The growth-inducing relationship between increases in medical services employment and associated increases in population and the demand for housing.

3. The multiplier effects whereby project increases in medical services employment would support growth in other economic sectors.

The section summarizes topics and impacts addressed in Section 4.K Population, Housing, and Employment, in Chapter 4, which provides the context for evaluating growth-inducing impacts.
6.3.1 Net Addition of Project Employment

Local Area Perspective

To summarize from Chapter 3, Project Description (see Table 3-1), the project would replace the existing hospital with the proposed Hospital Replacement Building; renovate and convert about 74,986 square feet of the existing hospital wings from acute care hospital uses to non-acute-care outpatient services; and add outpatient care and associated services at the new 100,000 square-foot Ambulatory Services Building. There would be no change in the number of licensed patient beds currently on the project site.\(^1\) Overall the workforce on the project site would increase by about 426 employees.

The growth of medical services and associated employment resulting from the proposed project is growth that would occur in the county without the project. The need for medical services and facilities would grow as a function of the needs of the population: Marin’s aging population, more than its projected population growth, is anticipated to increase demands for health care services in coming years (The Lewin Group, 2006). Given Marin General Hospital’s central role in providing medical services to county residents and its central location within the county, without the proposed project it is likely that another project or projects providing related services would be located in the project vicinity to meet increased demands for acute care and ambulatory medical services. Therefore, in terms of induced growth, the project would affect medical services growth within the county, but not the total amount of growth in medical services that is reasonably expected in the area served by Marin General Hospital over time.\(^2\)

Regional Perspective

From the broader perspective of growth inducement in the nine-county Bay Area region, project growth would not represent a net addition of economic activity and employment to the region. This is because the project growth would be growth that otherwise would be expected to occur elsewhere in Marin County or potentially in adjacent counties without the project. Therefore, the project would not affect the amount of regional growth that is projected to occur, although, as noted above, it would affect the location of a limited portion of that projected regional growth.

6.3.2 Employment Growth and Population

The project would add about 426 new jobs at the project site. This number of jobs represents 1.6 percent of the 27,200 jobs in Ross Valley cities and 0.3 percent of the total 143,780 jobs in Marin County (see Table 4.K-3 in Section 4.K, Population, Employment, and Housing). The addition of this many new jobs in the project area would not result in a substantial amount of growth or growth beyond that projected to occur in the county. As discussed under Impact POP-1 in Section 4.K, Population, Employment, and Housing, the conservative estimate of population growth of the 1,036 persons that would result from all 426 new project employees moving to the

---

\(^1\) Although the number of licensed beds would not change, the number of beds in use can increase or decrease depending on demand.

\(^2\) Essentially all of the county south of Novato (The Lewin Group, 2006).
area would not be substantial in that it would not result in induced population growth beyond that assumed in Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) projections and the Marin Countywide Plan. It is very possible that some of the new workers already reside in Marin County or that some might relocate from distant places to nearby counties other than Marin. This conservative potential contribution of 1,036 new persons to the existing Bay Area population (7,341,700) would not be substantial or induce undue growth beyond that assumed in ABAG projections for the region over the next 25 years (1,732,000) – less than 0.01 percent in both cases.

**Housing Demand**

The Marin County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) expects that due to the limited availability of land to develop, new housing will be distributed within existing urban areas and will occur as infill development (Marin County LAFCO, 2007).

Housing vacancy rates provide a measure of how readily demand for housing might be met, although by no means the complete picture. A degree of housing vacancy is considered desirable to allow for normal housing turnover and mobility on the part of renters and home buyers. According to ABAG, a five percent vacancy rate is considered necessary to permit ordinary mobility in rental housing, and a two percent vacancy rate is considered necessary to permit ordinary mobility in for-sale housing. Vacancy rates below these levels indicate a constrained housing market in which residents will have difficulty finding appropriate units and competition for units will drive up housing prices (ABAG, ND.) The U.S. Census Bureau classifies units that are temporarily occupied entirely by persons with primary residences elsewhere as vacant (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011a). Such units, which include second homes and timeshares, would therefore be included in total vacancy rates but would not be included in homeowner or rental vacancy rates since they are not available on the for-sale or rental markets. **Table 6.2-1** shows the number of housing units, total vacancy rate, and homeowner and rental vacancy rates for the nine Bay Area counties in 2010.

**TABLE 6.2-1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>Total Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Homeowner Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Rental Vacancy Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>582,549</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>400,263</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>111,214</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>54,759</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>376,942</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>271,031</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>631,920</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>152,698</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>204,572</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Census Bureau, 2011b.
As the Table 6.2-1 shows, the vacancy rate for ownership housing in Marin County is below that considered optimal, and the vacancy rate for rental housing is slightly greater than the five percent rate considered optimal. However, vacancy rate information alone does not provide information on the affordability of the vacant housing.

**Project Demand for Affordable Housing**

As previously noted, the new jobs will generate demand for housing to accommodate the new workers. Conley Consulting Group conducted an analysis of housing need, which provides the basis for the estimates assumed in this analysis (Conley Consulting Group, 2011). Conley’s methodology and conclusions are summarized below and differs from that presented in the analysis in Section 4.K, *Population, Housing and Employment*, in Chapter 4 of this Draft EIR in that it assumes all 426 new workers would be new to the area (i.e., none currently reside in Marin County).

The estimate of housing demand generated by the project recognizes that each of the 426 new workers does not represent a new household. The number of households needed by the 426 new workers to the area was estimated based on data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) that indicates that there is an average of 1.65 workers per working household in Marin County (MTC, 1998). Applying this factor to the 426 new workers yields 257 new households represented by the project jobs/new workers (Conley Consulting Group, 2011). Applying MTC’s workers-per-working household rate assumes that some workers may come from the same household. To assess the housing needs of the new workers in terms of housing affordability, Conley first estimated the number of employees who would be in two-worker households (i.e., with combined incomes to draw on for housing costs), factored in the income levels by occupation of the new workers to identify the income distribution of the new employee households, and adjusted for household size (assuming an average household size of three persons based on the county average).

Based on these calculations the project would generate a need for housing at different affordability levels as shown in **Table 6.2-2**. In addition to the conservative assumption that all new employees would be new to the area, this assessment conservatively assumes that workers relocating to Marin County would only live in the Greenbrae/Larkspur communities, where, in fact, workers may live throughout Marin County in other cities.

Affordability of housing in Marin is a factor that drives worker commuting patterns. Currently many county workers cannot afford housing in Marin and therefore commute from residences in other counties. As such, existing commuter patterns are not assumed to reflect choices county workers would necessarily make if affordable housing were available closer to their work places. In the absence of adequate housing within the county to accommodate the new project workers, a portion of the project staff (especially those with moderate or below-moderate income levels) would have few options but to seek housing in areas with lower housing costs and commute to Marin for the new project jobs. This would contribute to adverse environmental impacts already common in the area, including traffic congestion and air pollution.

The level of housing demand generated by the project, shown in Table 6.2-2, is less than the county’s current regional housing need allocation (RHNA) for the cities near the project site.
TABLE 6.2-2
HOUSING NEEDS GENERATED BY PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low (0-50% of AMI)</th>
<th>Low (51-80% of AMI)</th>
<th>Moderate (81-120% of AMI)</th>
<th>Above Moderate (over 120% of AMI)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Needs of Project Employees(a)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Allocation for Lower Ross Valley Cities (Larkspur and Corte Madera)(b)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Allocation for Unincorporated County</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: AMI = area median income

\(a\) Conservatively assumes all new employees would be new to Marin County.

\(b\) Conservatively assumes all new households would be established in the Lower Ross Valley area.

SOURCES: Marin County Community Development Agency, 2007 (Table 3-55), ABAG, 2008, Marin County 2009

(summarized in Table 6.2-2, above, and presented in greater detail in Table 4.K-6 in Section 4.K, Population, Housing, and Employment, in Chapter 4) and less than the regional housing need allocation for unincorporated areas of the county overall.\(^3\) Although the County’s 2009 Draft Housing Element – which identifies appropriate sites that would accommodate the allocations – has not been finalized, the comparison of the regional housing need allocation for unincorporated Marin County and cities in the Lower Ross Valley Planning Area with project-generated demand indicates that the housing needs of new project employees are well within levels of new housing expected to be accommodated in the county.

It is noted that the county’s RHNA allocation shown in Table 6.2-2 is for the entire unincorporated county; sites identified to meet the allocation are therefore assumed both to be distributed in different areas of the county and to meet demands generated in unincorporated areas throughout the county for the allocation period. The provision of affordable housing to house local workers has been a challenge in Marin County, which is reflected in goals and policies of its Countywide Plan, its existing and Draft Housing Elements, and its housing regulations.

The project would have demand for 154 units affordable to very low, low, and moderate-income workers, and 103 units affordable to above moderate income workers. Given that, as discussed above and shown in Table 6.2-2, the entire demand for affordable units generated by the project is

\(^3\) The RHNA is a state-mandated process for determining how many housing units, including affordable units, each community (or county for unincorporated areas) must plan to accommodate. Allocations are based on factors that consider existing employment, employment growth, household growth, and the availability of transit; need is determined for households in all income categories from very-low to above-moderate (ABAG, 2008b).

As described in Section 4.L, Population, Housing, and Employment, the County’s 2009 Draft Housing Element identifies sites with the potential to be developed to meet the county’s RHNA goals for the 2007-2014 period. However, although the Draft Housing Element was submitted in 2009 to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for review and approval, HCD has expressed concerns about the feasibility of some of the identified sites and the Draft element has not been approved. The County is continuing to work on identifying sufficient housing sites to address HCD concerns and meet current RHNA goals.
well within the County’s RHNA allocation; the 257 residual units demanded would be accommodated by the RHNA allocation. As a result, the project’s growth inducing effects related housing demand, and more specifically its demand for affordable housing, would be less than significant.

**Current Regional Planning Initiatives Addressing Growth**

Bay Area regional agencies and local jurisdictions have undertaken regional planning efforts to address, accommodate, and mitigate the adverse effects of growth projected for the region. Three key initiatives are described below.

**Focus Initiative**

FOCUS is a regional planning initiative led by ABAG and MTC in coordination with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). It links land use and transportation planning and promotes a connected and more compact land use pattern. Under the initiative, future growth in the region would be focused in locally-identified Priority Development Areas (PDAs), which are areas located near transit that have infill development opportunities (ABAG et al., 2008). The FOCUS initiative does not regulate future development but instead provides guidance and assistance to foster housing and mixed use, infill development in the locally-identified PDAs. Marin County is participating in the initiative and PDAs have been designated near Highway 101 from Marinwood (north of San Rafael) to the southern border of the county (collectively called the Marin County Urbanized 101 Corridor PDA); the city of San Rafael has also identified a PDA in conjunction with the initiative. The population within the Urbanized 101 Corridor PDA is projected to grow by about 5,300 between 2010 and 2035, the number of households is projected to increase by 2,200 and the number of jobs is projected to increase by about 1,400 (ABAG 2009).  

**Senate Bill (SB) 375 and One Bay Area**

As described in Section 4.K, *Population, Housing and Employment*, in Chapter 4, in 2008 the State legislature adopted into law SB 375, which links regional transportation and housing planning with State GHG reduction goals. The law requires the regional transportation plan (RTP) for each region in the state to include a “Sustainable Communities Strategy” (SCS) to achieve its GHG reduction target. The SCS must identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities in the region for the next eight and 25 years. The SCS also must identify areas within the region that will house all economic segments of the region’s population, taking into account migration into the region and population growth over the next eight and 25

---

4 These forecasts were included in ABAG’s 2009 projections series (ABAG, 2009) and are assumed to be preliminary. Ongoing planning efforts described under One Bay Area in this section may well result some changes to these projected growth levels.

5 SB 375 amended California Government Code Sections 65080, 654000, 65583, 65584.01, 65584.02, 65584.04, 65587, and 65588; added Government Code Sections 14522.1, 14522.2, and 65080.01; amended Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21063; and added PRC Section 21159.28 and Chapter 4.2 (commencing with Section 21155) to Division 13 of the PRC relating to environmental quality.
years. Plan Bay Area: Initial Vision Scenario for Public Discussion, described below, is the preliminary draft of the SCS for the Bay Area.

One Bay Area

Led by ABAG, MTC, BAAQMD, and BCDC, One Bay Area is an initiative launched in 2010 to coordinate efforts among the region’s nine counties and 101 towns and cities to “create a more sustainable future” (ABAG and MTC, 2011). A major effort of the agencies, in partnership with the region’s nine counties and 101 cities and towns, is the development of “Plan Bay Area” as the region’s long-range plan for sustainable land use, transportation, and housing. Plan Bay Area is intended to respond to requirements of SB 375, which requires regional transportation plans to contain a “sustainable communities strategy” that integrates land use planning and transportation planning and identifies where the region’s population will be housed. In March 2011 a preliminary version of the plan, Plan Bay Area: Initial Vision Scenario for Public Discussion, was released as a basis for discussion with local governments, the general public, and other stakeholders, about how the Bay Area can accommodate its population growth over the next 25 years. Places for growth included in the Initial Vision Scenario, which were identified by local jurisdictions, were mostly the PDAs already identified through the FOCUS program (described above), although additional “Growth Opportunity Areas” also were identified. Over two years following the plan’s release, the regional agencies will engage local agencies and the public to help identify and assess several detailed scenarios leading to the identification of a preferred scenario (by early 2012) and adoption of a complete Plan Bay Area that includes a Sustainable Communities Strategy by April 2013 (ABAG and MTC, 2011).

6.3.3 Multiplier Effects

Multiplier effects describe those economic interrelationships through which businesses support other businesses by purchasing goods and services; business activity supports household spending by providing jobs and wage and salary income; and household spending generates sales and revenue for consumer-oriented businesses. Increased patient visits and employment at the Marin General Hospital site would have multiplier effects in terms of incrementally supporting growth in other economic sectors and increased business activity elsewhere in Greenbrae, Kentfield, and nearby Ross Valley cities. (See related Section 6.4, Economic Effects, below.)

6.3.4 Conclusion

The project is an urban infill project that would intensify activity and development at the existing Marin General Hospital Campus, in an area that is already a locus for medical services and well-served by existing transportation systems and other infrastructure and utilities. Similarly, the housing to accommodate the projected-related population growth (resulting from project workers moving to the area, a conservative assumption) would occur as infill development in existing

---

6 In general the County’s public transportation options are limited, as discussed further in Section 4.N. Transportation and Circulation: due to the site’s proximity to Highway 101 and Sir Francis Drake Boulevard a number of bus lines provide service to the site vicinity and the site is well served by public transportation and the nearby highway system relative to many other places in the County.
communities served by existing infrastructure and utilities. Although such growth would incrementally increase demand for community services in the communities to which the new employees might move, the level of development would be consistent with anticipated levels of growth and would not require the extension of new roads and other infrastructure and utilities into previously undeveloped areas. Therefore the project would not result in significant growth inducing effects.

6.4 Economic Effects

CEQA Guidelines Section 15131 indicates that the EIR may include economic or social information in whatever form the Lead Agency desires. As Lead Agency, the Marin Healthcare District has included the following discussion in response to public comment received during the public scoping for this EIR regarding the economic impacts of vacating existing medical buildings on South Eliseo (see Appendix A to this Draft EIR). This information is not presented as a potential significant effect on the environment for CEQA purposes, but for information purposes for the public.

According to the Lead Agency, a dozen or so existing medical buildings along South Eliseo Drive south of the project site, and on Bon Air Road and Sir Francis Drake, contain approximately 238,000 square feet of space, of which approximately 45,000 square feet are occupied by hospital-affiliated uses that could potentially relocate to the 100,000-square-foot Ambulatory Services Building proposed by the project. However, the existing tenants and uses in these medical buildings are not under the jurisdiction of the Marin Healthcare District, thus any potential relocation is not part of the proposed project. The remaining 55,000 square feet of the new Ambulatory Services Building would be occupied by new outpatient services that would be new to the hospital campus.

It stands to reason that the economic health of a medical office building depends directly on its adjacency to a financially healthy hospital. The proposed project will improve and expand the services, facilities and operations at Marin General Hospital to provide an increasingly integrated delivery of high quality health care services from the existing campus. Thus, the economic effects of the proposed project could potential bolster the economic viability of the nearby medical buildings, whether occupied by existing tenants or new tenants that would backfill existing tenants relocated to the new Ambulatory Services Building. Only 19 percent of the space in those nearby buildings (45,000 out of 238,000) would qualify for relocation, as the Ambulatory Services Building will be limited to uses closely affiliated with hospital services (see Section 3.5.2, Major Project Components, regarding intended uses of the Ambulatory Services Building). According to the Lead Agency the existing medical buildings along the South Eliseo-Bon Air Road corridor are mostly fully occupied and apparently are considered desirable. There is nothing to suggest that moving some of their tenants to the Ambulatory Services Building would endanger their economic viability.

As discussed above in Section 6.3.1, Net Addition of Project Employment, and consistent with widely documented national trends, increase demands for health care services in coming years
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exist in Marin County due to its aging population. Also, according to a National Medical Office Research Report (Marcus & Millichap, 2010a), while the national and local office market is suffering from the effects of factors involving the economy, the medical office market is outperforming the ordinary office market, although it still has its challenges given the overall national economic downturn. Specific to the project setting, however, the medical office building located nearby the project site benefit uniquely from their physical proximity to the hospital, as discussed above. Also, Marcus & Millichap note that the passage of healthcare legislation in 2010 would translate into increased demand for medical office space, stimulating absorption in existing properties and fueling medical office and hospital construction over the extended outlook ((Marcus & Millichap, 2010b).

Considering collective (1) the local increasing demand for health care, (2) the locational advantage of the Larkspur medical office to the Marin General Hospital Campus, (3) national legislation expected to strengthen medical office space demand, and (4) the assumed continued maintenance and suitability of the existing nearby medical office uses to attract new medical tenants, it is a reasonable determination that the occupancy of the existing medical office building would remain viable in the future. Moreover, the factors that contribute to the future economic health and occupancy are numerous and the relationships of those factors complex; it would be speculative to presume that the existing nearby medical office buildings in Larkspur would experience adverse secondary effects resulting solely or largely due to existing tenants of those facilities choosing to relocate to the new Ambulatory Services Building on the hospital campus. The project would not have direct or secondary economic or physical impacts on existing medical buildings in the City of Larkspur.

6.5 Effects Found Not To Be Significant

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15128, Table 2-1, Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts, provided at the end of Chapter 2 of this EIR, identifies all effects found not to be significant with the proposed project.

6.5.1 CEQA Environmental Factors of No Impact

Agricultural and Forestry and Mineral Resources are environmental factors from the CEQA Environmental Checklist (Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines) that were determined during the scoping for this EIR not to be affected by the project. These two topics are determined to have No Impact (see “No Impact (N)” described under Impact Classifications, in Chapter 4 of this Draft EIR). Therefore, these factors are not addressed in the analysis in Chapter 4, except as noted in Section 4.E, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, as Issues Not Further Evaluated. As determined there, the project site is not located within a Mineral Resource Zone identified by the California Department of Mines and Geology or within an area designated as important Farmland identified by the Soil Conservation Service, as described further below.

Regarding Agricultural and Forestry more specifically, the site is designated by the California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program as Urban and Built-
Up Land (Department of Conservation, 2011). Therefore, the project could not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance to non-agricultural use; could not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract; and could 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.

Regarding Mineral Resources more specifically, the California Geological Survey (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. The intent of designating significant deposits is to identify areas where mineral extraction could occur prior to development. The project site is not in a mineral resource zone and is classified as an urbanized area as mapped by the California Department of Mines and Geology (CDMG) (Stinson, et al., 1987). The project would not have an impact on Mineral Resources.

6.5.2 Effects Less than Significant

Within each environmental factor, the project would result in less-than-significant impacts that do not require mitigation measures (see “Less than Significant (LS)” explained under Impact Classifications, in Chapter 4 of this Draft EIR). Each less-than-significant impact is identified throughout Chapter 4 and summarized in Table 2-1, Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts, in Chapter 2, Summary.

6.6 Organizations and Persons Consulted

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15129, all organizations, persons and all references consulted in the preparation of this EIR are listed as References at the end of each chapter of this document, where applicable. Preparers of this EIR are identified in Chapter 7, Report Preparers.
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