6.0 ALTERNATIVES

6.1 INTRODUCTION

CEQA requires that an EIR include an analysis of a range of project alternatives that could feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives, while avoiding or substantially lessening any of the significant effects identified for the proposed project. The Lead Agency must disclose its reasoning for selecting each alternative. The Lead Agency must also identify any alternatives that were considered, but rejected as infeasible during the scoping process, and disclose the reasons for the exclusion. The range of alternatives is governed by a "rule of reason, which requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. Specifically, *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(a) requires that:

> *"An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selection of a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason."*

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1) provides the following information regarding the "feasibility" of a project alternative:

> *"Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent). No one of these factors establishes a fixed limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives."*

Within every EIR, the *CEQA Guidelines* require that a "No Project" Alternative is analyzed. The "No Project" Alternative allows decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. In addition, the identification of an "Environmentally Superior" Alternative is required. The "No Project" Alternative may be the "Environmentally Superior" Alternative to the proposed project based on the minimization or avoidance of physical environmental impacts. However, the "No Project" Alternative must also achieve most of the basic objectives of the projects in order to be considered the "Environmentally Superior" Alternative. Thus, the *CEQA Guidelines* require that if the "Environmentally Superior" Alternative is the "No Project" Alternative, the EIR shall identify a superior alternative from the remaining alternatives analyzed.

To provide background regarding the selection or rejection of a project alternative, the discussion below summarizes project objectives and describes the significant and unavoidable impacts found to occur upon project implementation.

Throughout the following analysis, impacts of the alternatives are analyzed for each of the issue areas examined in Section 5.0 of this EIR. In this manner, each alternative can be compared to the proposed action on an issue-by-issue basis.

6.2 ALTERNATIVES TO BE ANALYZED

This analysis focuses on alternatives capable of eliminating significant adverse environmental effects or reducing them to less than significant levels, even if these alternatives would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the proposed project objectives. The alternatives to the proposed project under consideration within this EIR consist of:

- Existing Zoning/No Project
- All Residential
- Adaptive Reuse

Table 6-1, *Comparison of Proposed Project and Alternatives* compares the proposed project to the alternatives.

Table 6-1
Comparison of Proposed Project and Alternatives

Land Use	Proposed Project Development Scenario	Alternative One: Existing Zoning Alternative/No Project	Alternative Two: All Residential Alternative	Alternative Three: Adaptive Reuse Alternative[1]
Retail/Restaurant (SF)	12,500	12,000		12,500
Office (SF)	100,000	400,000		150,000
High Density Residential (DU)	1,400	475	1,700	700
Warehouse/Industrial (SF)				
Hotel (Rooms)		250		250
TOTAL	**1,400 DU 112,500 SF**	**475 DU 412,000 SF 250 Rooms**	**1,700 DU**	**700 DU 162,500 SF 250 Rooms**

SF = Square Feet; DU = Dwelling Unit
[1]For the purposes of the impact analysis, a total of 162,500 sf would be available for adaptive reuse.

6.3 SUMMARY OF PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

As stated above, an EIR must only discuss in detail an alternative that is capable of feasibly attaining most of the basic objectives associated with the action, while at the same time avoiding or substantially lessening any of the significant effects associated with the proposed project. Thus, a summary of the goals and objectives as provided within Section 3.0, Project Description, is restated below.

1. GOAL: A MIXTURE OF LAND USES

a. *Objective*: Develop a flexible mixed-use land use pattern that incorporates residential opportunities with options for retail, office, research and development, and hospitality, and that will effectively complement each other and provide maximum land use efficiency, while providing economic and social benefits to all users.

b. *Objective*: Program retail uses that are neighborhood and transit station serving.

2. GOAL: AN ECONOMICALLY FEASIBLE DEVELOPMENT

a. *Objective*: Provide opportunities for adaptive reuse of existing buildings, and design new non-residential spaces with flexibility to allow for shifts in market demand and allow options throughout various economic cycles and scenarios.

b. *Objective*: Create a range of residential unit types that will be accessible to residents of all income levels.

c. *Objective*: Provide residential opportunities to assist the City of Duarte in meeting its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) objectives.

d. *Objective*: Encourage the development of a hotel to create local jobs, support City of Hope lodging needs, provide community meeting space, and increase tax revenues within the community.

3. GOAL: PEDESTRIAN-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

a. *Objective*: Create a development pattern that effectively provides for efficient and comfortable pedestrian movement and connectivity throughout the site.

b. *Objective*: Give precedence to pedestrians and foster multimodal transportation with bicycle, pedestrian, and transit access.

c. *Objective*: Provide supportive commercial uses and an active street frontage on Highland Avenue that facilitates a pedestrian friendly experience and links to other centers in the city.

4. GOAL: SUPERIOR URBAN DESIGN

a. *Objective*: Allow for building types that will achieve desired density ranges to establish a critical mass of residents and employees to support the transit station, maximize transit ridership, and support retail spaces and local employment centers.

b. *Objective*: Minimize setbacks to allow buildings to frame and activate the street.

c. *Objective*: Use trees, shrubs and other landscape and hardscape materials along streets to provide shading, screening, and human scale.

d. *Objective*: Promote high quality architectural design to establish a design character that creates an identity in the Duarte Station Specific Plan area.

e. *Objective*: Establish context-based standards and guidelines that address specific design concerns while also allowing for creativity and flexibility in development projects.

5. GOAL: OUTDOOR SPACES

a. *Objective*: Provide outdoor spaces—such as an urban green space, public plaza, promenade, or linear park—that provide a transition between the station and the surrounding transit village uses and facilitates pedestrian movement and/or public gathering.

b. *Objective:* Encourage rooftop open space areas to increase the amount and the quality of open space while taking advantage of quality views from the site.

c. *Objective:* Program outdoor space(s) to accommodate the needs of various user groups, such as residents, employees, commuters, and visitors.

6. GOAL: AWARENESS OF SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT

a. *Objective*: Provide opportunities for new goods and services uses to support surrounding residents, students, and employees within and around the Duarte Station Specific Plan area.

b. *Objective*: Provide for appropriate transitions with adjacent existing lower-intensity residential uses through height limits, articulation and modulation requirements, design guidelines, and landscape requirements.

c. *Objective:* Upgrade the existing streetscape infrastructure and solidify pedestrian connections between the Plan Area, Duarte Station, and critical areas of interest around the site.

d. *Objective*: Consider the future needs of the City of Hope as part of land use planning.

7. GOAL: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

a. *Objective:* Encourage transit-oriented development that supports multimodal opportunities and adhere to Levels of Sustainable Development Practices as prescribed in Chapter 19.52 of the City's Development Code.

b. *Objective:* Ensure that construction and demolition waste is disposed of in accordance with all City regulations and standards.

c. *Objective:* Consider building layout, siting, and building design to not preclude alternative energy production on-site.

d. *Objective:* Maximize energy efficiency through local and state standards, indoor environmental quality, energy-efficient lighting, building orientation, shading, and implementation of LEED principles (or similar) and/or attaining LEED Certification.

e. *Objective:* Reduce heat island effect through site planning and selection of landscape and hardscape materials.

f. *Objective:* Incorporate water-efficient design features such as permeable surfaces, collection devices, biofiltration devices, green rooftops, cisterns, berms and swales, and/or green rooftops.

g. *Objective:* Include drought-tolerant and climate-appropriate landscape within the Specific Plan area.

6.4 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(a), an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. Only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are relevant in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed project.

Based on the analysis provided within Section 5.0, Environmental Analysis of this EIR, the proposed project would result in significant unavoidable impacts in the following environmental issue areas:

Traffic: Project and cumulative project impacts at the following intersection: Buena Vista Street/Duarte Road

Air Quality: Plan Consistency - exceedance of growth assumptions in the SCAQMD *2016 AQMP*

Noise: Project short-term construction noise impacts

6.5 ALTERNATIVE ONE: EXISTING ZONING/NO PROJECT

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(2), a No Project Alternative must be analyzed within the EIR. The No Project Alternative should discuss what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. In the context of this EIR, the Existing Zoning Alternative is the No Project Alternative in compliance with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(2) and assumes that the amended Duarte Station Specific Plan would not be implemented.

The project site would be governed by the existing Duarte Station Specific Plan, which allows 475 residential units, 400,000 square feet (sf) of office space, 12,000 sf of retail, and a 250-room hotel.

Under this alternative, no development is proposed for the site as well. The project site would remain unaltered and the existing on-site industrial uses would continue to operate as they do currently until such time as property owners choose to redevelop the property consistent with the existing adopted Duarte Station Specific Plan.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Land Use

The Existing Zoning Alternative would not require a General Plan or Specific Plan for the site. This alternative would allow less housing than the proposed project, thereby making it more difficult for the City to meet its RHNA allocations for this RHNA cycle and the next. In this regard, land use impacts would be greater under this alternative.

The proposed uses would be similar to those associated with the proposed project, which have been found to be compatible with surrounding land uses and consistent with long-range plans. In this regard, impacts would be similar to the proposed project (less than significant).

Aesthetics

The Existing Zoning Alternative would allow for new development within the Specific Plan area, consistent with the existing Specific Plan. Aesthetic improvements, such as development consistent with development regulations and design standards/guidelines could occur. However, the existing Specific Plan does not respond to current market trends for development; thus, new development is less likely under this alternative than the proposed revised Duarte Station Specific Plan. The Existing Zoning Alternative would not introduce new landscaping and visual improvements associated with new development consistent in architectural character in the form of a promenade along Highland Avenue, which would link pedestrians to the Metro Station and surrounding uses. This alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

Population and Housing

The Existing Zoning Alternative would allow for fewer housing units but more office space than the proposed project. This alternative could constrain the City's ability to meet its RHNA allocation, as additional housing would be limited to 475 new units. Since this alternative could constrain the City's ability to meet current Housing Element targets and the anticipated RHNA 2021 allocation, this alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project.

Traffic

On a per acre basis, residential uses generate fewer daily trips than retail, restaurant, and office uses. Therefore, under this alternative, which involves more office, hotel, and retail uses, more daily trips would likely occur compared to the net total trips for the proposed project (including the trip discounts for on-site trip capture, location near transit centers/light rail stations, and pass-by reductions for retail). However, there is the potential that the distribution of project-related trips would vary slightly from the proposed project. With the increase in daily trips, it is estimated that the significant unavoidable impacts at Buena Vista Street/Duarte Road would continue to occur. Mitigation measures would still be required to reduce impacts, as with the proposed project. Thus, the Existing Zoning Alternative would have similar impacts as the proposed project since significant traffic impacts would not be avoided.

Air Quality

Short-term construction and long-term operational (stationary source) impacts would be similar to the proposed project under this alternative, given that existing development within the entire plan area would be removed and the site would be redeveloped with new uses. Long-term operational (mobile source) impacts would be greater given that this alternative would generate more daily trips compared to the proposed project.

Most air quality impacts were identified as less than significant or less than significant with the imposition of mitigation measures for the proposed project, with the exception of project plan consistency with respect to the exceedance of growth assumptions in the SCAQMD *2016 AQMP*, which was determined to be a significant unavoidable impact for the proposed project. This impact would remain under this alternative since development on this site, combined with other projects such as the Duarte Town Center and City of Hope Master Plan, since both employment and housing growth assumptions would be exceeded with implementation of this alternative. This alternative would produce fewer new housing units but more employment than the proposed project. Implementation of the Existing Zoning Alternative would be inconsistent with the regional air quality plan, similar to the proposed project. Because additional traffic may be associated with this alternative, the Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Greenhouse gas emissions from construction and operational activities would occur with the Existing Zoning Alternative to a greater degree than the proposed project due to the increase in daily trips associated with additional office and commercial uses. This alternative's combined construction and operational greenhouse gas emissions would also result in greater significant impacts from a cumulative perspective. Therefore, the Existing Zoning Alternative would be

environmentally inferior to the proposed project regarding greenhouse gas emissions associated with increased mobile emissions.

Noise

Short-term construction and long-term operational (stationary source) impacts would be similar to the proposed project under this alternative, given that the entire plan area could be redeveloped. Long-term traffic noise impacts could be greater given that this alternative generates more daily trips compared to the proposed project. Night-time operational noise could be reduced since the alternative would have fewer residences/residents and thus reduced potential for noise.

For the proposed project, noise impacts were identified as less than significant or less than significant with the imposition of mitigation measures, with the exception of short-term construction impacts, which were concluded to be significant unavoidable impacts. This alternative is anticipated to be similar with respect to construction noise impacts. The Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered comparable to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Short-term construction-related impacts involving the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials (i.e., asbestos containing materials, lead-based paints, underground storage tanks) would occur with the Existing Zoning Alternative, as buildings/improvements would be demolished/removed and ground-disturbing activities would occur. Long-term impacts involving accidental release of hazardous materials from spills during storage or transport could occur. The proposed project includes significantly more residential uses, which generally use or produce less hazardous materials than office, research and development, and other commercial uses. All potential impacts associated with the proposed project were concluded to be either less than significant or less than significant with mitigation. Since the Existing Zoning Alternative allows for more office, lab, and commercial uses than the proposed project, the Existing Zoning Alternative could have the potential to produce or use hazardous materials and thus would be considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project.

Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality

This alternative would result in similar amounts of impervious surface area on-site. As such, impacts regarding drainage, hydrology, floodplains, and water quality are anticipated to be comparable to the proposed project. Therefore, hydrology and drainage impacts would be remain less than significant (same as the proposed project); however, mitigation measures would still be required to reduce water quality impacts to a less than significant level, in compliance with NPDES permit requirements. Thus, the Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered comparable to the proposed project.

Public Services and Utilities

Relative to the proposed project, this alternative would result in a lower demand for fire and police protection services since fewer residential units would be produced. Use of water and wastewater facilities would be comparable since facilities would be sized to accommodate demand. The alternative would generally result in higher demand for electricity and natural gas, as well as higher solid waste generation, than the proposed project due to the additional allowed commercial and office uses. As is the case with the proposed project, all public service and utility impacts

would be less than significant with implementation of applicable mitigation measures, including payment of fees to affected agencies. Thus, the Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered generally comparable to the proposed project with respect to public services and facilities impacts.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT GOALS

Under the Existing Zoning Alternative, the proposed residential, retail, restaurant, and office uses could be developed, but in varying degrees of intensity compared to the proposed project.

1. GOAL: A MIXTURE OF LAND USES

a. *Objective*: Develop a flexible mixed-use land use pattern that incorporates retail, office, hospitality, and residential opportunities that will effectively complement each other and provide maximum land use efficiency, while providing economic and social benefits to all users.

b. *Objective*: Program retail uses that are neighborhood- and transit-station serving.

The Existing Zoning Alternative meets the goal of allowing for a mix of land uses and allows for retail uses that are neighborhood and transit-station serving, meeting Objectives a and b. However, the proposed project updates the specific plan allowances for uses to be consistent with current market trends. Thus, while this alternative meets the objectives, the proposed project is more likely to encourage development consistent with the City's goals for a transit-oriented station area.

2. GOAL: AN ECONOMICALLY FEASIBLE DEVELOPMENT

a. *Objective*: Provide opportunities for adaptive reuse of existing buildings, and design new non-residential spaces with flexibility to allow for shifts in market demand and allow options throughout various economic cycles and scenarios.

b. *Objective*: Create a range of residential unit types that will be accessible to residents of all income levels.

c. *Objective*: Provide residential opportunities to assist the City of Duarte in meeting its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) objectives.

d. *Objective*: Encourage the development of a hotel to create local jobs, support City of Hope lodging needs, provide community meeting space, and increase tax revenues within the community.

The Existing Zoning Alternative partially meets this goal, as range of residential types would be provided for, as well as hotel uses. Thus, the Existing Zoning Alternative meets Objectives b, c and d. However the Existing Zoning Alternative would not easily accommodate the flexible adaptive reuse of existing buildings. Thus, the Existing Zoning Alternative does not meet Objective a.

3. GOAL: PEDESTRIAN-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

a. *Objective*: Create a development pattern that effectively provides for efficient and comfortable pedestrian movement and connectivity throughout the site.

b. *Objective*: Give precedence to pedestrians and foster multimodal transportation with bicycle, pedestrian, and transit access.

c. *Objective*: Provide supportive commercial uses and an active street frontage on Highland Avenue that facilitates a pedestrian friendly experience and links to other centers in the city.

The Existing Zoning Alternative meets Objectives a and b of the goal. The existing Specific Plan includes provisions that foster multimodal transportation and that increase connectivity to and throughout the site. However, the Existing Zoning Alternative would not meet Objective c, as the existing plan does not require specific attention paid to Highland Avenue.

4. GOAL: SUPERIOR URBAN DESIGN

a. *Objective*: Allow for building types that will achieve desired density ranges to establish a critical mass of residents and employees to support the transit station, maximize transit ridership, and support retail spaces and local employment centers.

b. *Objective*: Minimize setbacks to allow buildings to frame and activate the street.

c. *Objective*: Use trees, shrubs and other landscape and hardscape materials along streets to provide shading, screening, and human scale.

d. *Objective*: Promote high quality architectural design to establish a design character that creates an identity in the Duarte Station Specific Plan area.

e. *Objective*: Establish context-based standards and guidelines that address specific design concerns while also allowing for creativity and flexibility in development projects.

The Existing Zoning Alternative would meet all objectives of this goal.

5. GOAL: OUTDOOR SPACES

a. *Objective*: Provide outdoor spaces—such as an urban green space, public plaza, promenade, or linear park—that provide a transition between the station and the surrounding transit village uses and facilitates pedestrian movement and/or public gathering.

b. *Objective:* Encourage rooftop open space areas to increase the amount and the quality of open space while taking advantage of quality views from the site.

c. *Objective:* Program outdoor space(s) to accommodate the needs of various user groups, such as residents, employees, commuters, and visitors.

The alternative would meet Objectives a and c of this goal, as plazas and outdoor spaces are included as provisions of the existing Specific Plan. However, the existing specific plan does not encourage outdoor rooftop areas; thus, it does not meet Objective b.

6. GOAL: AWARENESS OF SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT

a. *Objective*: Provide opportunities for new goods and services uses to support surrounding residents, students, and employees within and around the Duarte Station Specific Plan area.

b. *Objective*: Provide for appropriate transitions with adjacent existing lower-intensity residential uses through height limits, articulation and modulation requirements, design guidelines, and landscape requirements.

c. *Objective:* Upgrade the existing streetscape infrastructure and solidify pedestrian connections between the Plan Area, Duarte Station, and critical areas of interest around the site.

d. *Objective*: Consider the future needs of the City of Hope as part of land use planning.

The Existing Zoning Alternative meets this goal. The existing Specific Plan includes provisions to generally comply with all of the Objectives.

7. GOAL: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

a. *Objective:* Encourage transit-oriented development that supports multimodal opportunities and adhere to Levels of Sustainable Development Practices as prescribed in Chapter 19.52 of the City's Development Code.

b. *Objective:* Ensure that construction and demolition waste is disposed of in accordance with all City regulations and standards.

c. *Objective:* Consider building layout, siting, and building design to not preclude alternative energy production on-site.

d. *Objective:* Maximize energy efficiency through local and state standards, indoor environmental quality, energy-efficient lighting, building orientation, shading, and implementation of LEED principles (or similar) and/or attaining LEED Certification.

e. *Objective:* Reduce heat island effect through site planning and selection of landscape and hardscape materials.

f. *Objective:* Incorporate water-efficient design features such as permeable surfaces, collection devices, biofiltration devices, green rooftops, cisterns, berms and swales, and/or green rooftops.

g. *Objective:* Include drought-tolerant and climate-appropriate landscape within the Specific Plan area.

The Existing Zoning Alternative meets this goal. The existing Specific Plan includes provisions to comply with Objectives a through g.

6.6 ALTERNATIVE TWO: ALL RESIDENTIAL

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

Alternative Two would include only high-density residential at a density of up to 90 dwelling units per acre, yielding a total of up to 1,700 dwelling units. It is assumed that this alternative would have similar acreages devoted to recreation/open space and roads as the proposed project.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Land Use

The All Residential alternative would involve new development within the Specific Plan area and would still require an amendment to the General Plan and Duarte Station Specific Plan for the site, similar to the proposed project. The All Residential alternative would create a Specific Plan for future development of the site and would provide for appropriate pedestrian-friendly design to encourage use of the Gold Line as a primary mode of travel, as identified in the Land Use Element. However, this alternative would not provide for a flexible mix of land uses within the plan area as identified in the Land Use Element. Thus, this Alternative would be inconsistent with the Land Use Element. The All Residential alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

Aesthetics

The All Residential alternative would involve new development within the Specific Plan area and would thereby alter the existing visual character/quality of the site. Aesthetic improvements, such as development consistent with development regulations and design standards/guidelines, would occur, as a revised version of the Duarte Station Specific Plan would be implemented. The All Residential alternative would introduce new landscaping and visual improvements associated with new development consistent in architectural character to the proposed project. This alternative would involve short-term impacts associated with construction activities and introduce new sources of light and glare to the area. Furthermore, this alternative would result in shade and shadow impacts on adjacent residential uses, as the height for the on-site residential buildings would be similar to heights of residential uses for the proposed project. In sum, all aesthetic impacts for this alternative are similar to those of the proposed project. Since this alternative would have the same environmental impacts to aesthetics, the All Residential alternative is considered neither environmentally inferior nor superior to the proposed project.

Population and Housing

The All Residential alternative would involve new development and therefore, would result in new population and housing growth within the City. This alternative would better enable the City's ability to meet its Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation. Under this alternative, up to 1,700 additional housing units would be developed. However, this alternative would not allow for additional non-residential development; thus, new employment opportunities would not be provided within the City. Under this alternative, no new jobs would be created, and the existing

jobs would be removed. Thus, the All Residential alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

Traffic

Residential uses generate fewer daily trips compared to retail, restaurant, and office uses. Therefore, under this alternative, fewer daily trips would occur compared to the net total trips for the proposed project, which includes discounts for on-site trip capture, location near transit centers/light rail stations, and pass-by reductions for retail. However, there is the potential that the distribution of project-related trips would vary slightly from the proposed project, given that only residential is proposed. With the reduction in daily trips, it is estimated that the significant unavoidable impacts at Buena Vista Street/Duarte Road would be reduced. Mitigation measures would still be required to reduce impacts to less than significant, as with the proposed project. Thus, the All Residential Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

Air Quality

Short-term construction and long-term operational (stationary source) impacts would be similar to the proposed project under this alternative, given that the entire plan area would remove existing uses and develop the entire area with new uses. Long-term operational (mobile source) impacts would be less given that this alternative generates fewer daily trips compared to the proposed project.

Most air quality impacts were identified as less than significant or less than significant with the imposition of mitigation measures for the proposed project, with the exception of project plan consistency with respect to the exceedance of growth assumptions in the SCAQMD *2016 AQMP*, which was determined to be a significant unavoidable impact for the proposed project. This alternative would reduce the impacts associated with inconsistency in employment projections but would increase the impacts associated with inconsistency in residential projections. Therefore, given the decrease in long-term mobile source impacts but increase in inconsistency in projections, the All Residential alternative would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Greenhouse gas emissions from construction and operational activities would occur with the All Residential alternative, although to a lesser degree than the proposed project due to the reduction in daily trips associated with the elimination of office and commercial uses. This alternative's combined construction and operational greenhouse gas emissions would also result in fewer significant impacts from a cumulative perspective. Therefore, the All Residential alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding greenhouse gas emissions due to decreased mobile emissions.

Noise

Short-term construction and long-term operational (stationary source) impacts would be similar to the proposed project under this alternative, given that the existing uses would be removed and the site redeveloped entirely with residential uses. Long-term mobile source impacts would be less given that this alternative generates fewer daily trips compared to the proposed project.

With regard to other operational noise impacts, all on-site residential activities would be required to comply with the City's noise ordinance, as would be the case for the proposed project. Impacts would be comparable and less than significant.

Most noise impacts were identified as less than significant or less than significant with the imposition of mitigation measures for the proposed project, with the exception of short-term construction impacts, which were concluded to be significant unavoidable impacts. Given the decrease in long-term noise associated with mobile sources, the All Residential alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Short-term construction-related impacts involving the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials (i.e., asbestos containing materials, lead-based paints, underground storage tanks) would occur with the All Residential alternative, as buildings/improvements would be demolished/removed and ground-disturbing activities would occur. Long-term impacts involving accidental release of hazardous materials from spills during storage or transport would not occur with the All Residential alternative since residential uses generally do not generate large volumes of hazardous materials. The proposed project includes commercial uses, which generally use or produce more hazardous materials than residential uses. Given that only residential uses are included, the All Residential alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality

This alternative would result in similar amounts of impervious surface area on site as the proposed project. As such, impacts regarding drainage, hydrology, floodplains, and water quality are anticipated to be comparable to the proposed project. Therefore, hydrology and drainage impacts would remain less than significant, since mitigation measures would be required to reduce water quality impacts to a less than significant level, in compliance with NPDES permit requirements. Thus, the All Residential alternative would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

Public Services and Utilities

Relative to the proposed project, this alternative would generally result in a higher demand for fire and police protection services due to a higher population density. Relative to the proposed project, use of water and wastewater facilities and demand for electricity and natural gas could be lower since the alternative would not include more intensive commercial and office uses. The amount of solid waste requiring disposal at local and regional landfills would be slightly less with this alternative. As is the case with the proposed project, all public service and utility impacts would be less than significant with implementation of applicable mitigation measures, including payment of fees to affected agencies. Thus, the All Residential alternative would be considered comparable to the proposed project.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT GOALS

1. GOAL: A MIXTURE OF LAND USES

a. *Objective*: Develop a flexible mixed-use land use pattern that incorporates retail, office, hospitality, and residential opportunities that will effectively complement each other and provide maximum land use efficiency, while providing economic and social benefits to all users.

b. *Objective*: Program retail uses that are neighborhood- and transit-station serving.

The All Residential alternative does not meet this goal, as only one land use type would be provided: High Density Residential. With only High Density Residential, there would be no provision for retail uses to support either the surrounding neighborhood or the Gold Line Station, thus not meeting Objective a. In addition, there is no flexibility in the land use mix or the inclusion of complementary land uses, thus not meeting Objective b.

2. GOAL: AN ECONOMICALLY FEASIBLE DEVELOPMENT

a. *Objective*: Provide opportunities for adaptive reuse of existing buildings, and design new non-residential spaces with flexibility to allow for shifts in market demand and allow options throughout various economic cycles and scenarios.

b. *Objective*: Create a range of residential unit types that will be accessible to residents of all income levels.

c. *Objective*: Provide residential opportunities to assist the City of Duarte in meeting its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) objectives.

d. *Objective*: Encourage the development of a hotel to create local jobs, support City of Hope lodging needs, provide community meeting space, and increase tax revenues within the community.

The All Residential alternative partially meets this goal, as range of residential types would be provided. Thus, the All Residential alternative meets Objectives b and c. However, the All Residential alternative would not provide for flexible non-residential spaces or a hotel. Thus, the All Residential alternative does not meet Objectives a and d.

3. GOAL: PEDESTRIAN-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

a. *Objective*: Create a development pattern that effectively provides for efficient and comfortable pedestrian movement and connectivity throughout the site.

b. *Objective*: Give precedence to pedestrians and foster multimodal transportation with bicycle, pedestrian, and transit access.

c. *Objective*: Provide supportive commercial uses and an active street frontage on Highland Avenue that facilitates a pedestrian friendly experience and links to other centers in the city.

The All Residential alternative meets Objectives a and b of the goal. The Specific Plan would include requirements for interconnectedness throughout the site, with linkage to the Gold Line Station. However, the All Residential alternative would not meet Objective c since no commercial uses would be allowed.

4. GOAL: SUPERIOR URBAN DESIGN

b. *Objective*: Allow for building types that will achieve desired density ranges to establish a critical mass of residents and employees to support the transit station, maximize transit ridership, and support retail spaces and local employment centers.

b. *Objective*: Minimize setbacks to allow buildings to frame and activate the street.

c. *Objective*: Use trees, shrubs and other landscape and hardscape materials along streets to provide shading, screening, and human scale.

d. *Objective*: Promote high quality architectural design to establish a design character that creates an identity in the Duarte Station Specific Plan area.

e. *Objective*: Establish context-based standards and guidelines that address specific design concerns while also allowing for creativity and flexibility in development projects.

The All Residential alternative would meet all objectives of this goal.

5. GOAL: OUTDOOR SPACES

a. *Objective*: Provide outdoor spaces—such as an urban green space, public plaza, promenade, or linear park—that provide a transition between the station and the surrounding transit village uses and facilitates pedestrian movement and/or public gathering.

b. *Objective:* Encourage rooftop open space areas to increase the amount and the quality of open space while taking advantage of quality views from the site.

c. *Objective:* Program outdoor space(s) to accommodate the needs of various user groups, such as residents, employees, commuters, and visitors.

The All Residential alternative would meet this goal as plazas and outdoor spaces would still be included as provisions of the Specific Plan.

6. GOAL: AWARENESS OF SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT

a. *Objective*: Provide opportunities for new goods and services uses to support surrounding residents, students, and employees within and around the Duarte Station Specific Plan area.

b. *Objective*: Provide for appropriate transitions with adjacent existing lower-intensity residential uses through height limits, articulation and modulation requirements, design guidelines, and landscape requirements.

c. *Objective:* Upgrade the existing streetscape infrastructure and solidify pedestrian connections between the Plan Area, Duarte Station, and critical areas of interest around the site.

d. *Objective*: Consider the future needs of the City of Hope as part of land use planning.

The All Residential alternative partially meets this goal. A Specific Plan would be prepared and would include provisions to generally comply with Objectives b and c. The All Residential alternative would not create a center that provides a mix of good and services available to on-site residents or surrounding residents, students, or employees. The All Residential alternative would provide for future housing available to City of Hope employees but would not consider other future needs of the City of Hope, such as offices or hotel space. Thus, the All Residential alternative does not meet Objectives a and d.

7. GOAL: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

a. *Objective:* Encourage transit-oriented development that supports multimodal opportunities and adhere to Levels of Sustainable Development Practices as prescribed in Chapter 19.52 of the City's Development Code.

b. *Objective:* Ensure that construction and demolition waste is disposed of in accordance with all City regulations and standards.

c. *Objective:* Consider building layout, siting, and building design to not preclude alternative energy production on-site.

d. *Objective:* Maximize energy efficiency through local and state standards, indoor environmental quality, energy-efficient lighting, building orientation, shading, and implementation of LEED principles (or similar) and/or attaining LEED Certification.

e. *Objective:* Reduce heat island effect through site planning and selection of landscape and hardscape materials.

f. *Objective:* Incorporate water-efficient design features such as permeable surfaces, collection devices, biofiltration devices, green rooftops, cisterns, berms and swales, and/or green rooftops.

g. *Objective:* Include drought-tolerant and climate-appropriate landscape within the Specific Plan area.

The All Residential alternative meets this goal. A Specific Plan would be prepared and would include provisions to comply with Objectives a through g.

6.7 ALTERNATIVE THREE: ADAPTIVE REUSE

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

Alternative Three would involve the adaptive reuse, or repurposing, of a portion (approximately half) of the existing 313,955 square feet of industrial and warehouse space with office and commercial space, along with construction of 700 new residential units and hospitality uses, including a 250-room hotel. It is assumed that building heights would be the same as existing conditions for the adaptive reuse portions of the site (thus lower than the proposed project) but consistent with heights associated with the proposed project for new construction.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Land Use

The Adaptive Reuse alternative would involve both new development and new uses within the existing buildings within the Specific Plan area. This alternative would continue to require an amendment to the General Plan and Duarte Station Specific Plan to increase the amount of residential development allowed and to provide standards for adaptive reuse. This Alternative would allow less housing at the project site than the proposed project, thereby making it more difficult for the City to meet its RHNA allocations for this RHNA cycle and the next. Therefore, land use impacts would be greater under this alternative, resulting in an environmentally inferior alternative.

Aesthetics

The Adaptive Reuse alternative would involve both new development and adaptive reuse of existing buildings. Therefore, the alternative would alter the existing visual character/quality of the site. This alternative would involve both exterior and interior improvements and repurposing of the land use from industrial to office, retail, and restaurant uses. The Specific Plan associated would include design criteria for adaptive reuse to ensure that new and old buildings are not in design conflict. The Adaptive Reuse alternative would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project.

Population and Housing

The Adaptive Reuse alternative would result in new population and housing growth within the City. However, this alternative would allow for fewer housing units than the proposed project (but more office and hotel space). This alternative would constrain the City's ability to meet its RHNA allocation. Under this alternative, additional housing would be limited to 475 new units. Since this alternative would constrain the City's ability to meet the targets of the Housing Element and anticipated upcoming RHNA 2021 allocation, this alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

Traffic

Under this alternative, daily operational trips are assumed to occur at approximately the same rate as the net total trips for the proposed project. The same discounts for on-site trip capture, location near transit centers/light rail stations, and pass-by reductions for retail were taken for

both. Given that similar uses are proposed, it is anticipated the distribution of project-related trips would be similar to that of the proposed project. There would continue to be significant unavoidable impacts at Buena Vista Street/Duarte Road. Mitigation measures would still be required to reduce impacts to less than significant, as with the proposed project. Additional intersections may be impacted by this alternative. Thus, Alternative 3 would be considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

Air Quality

Long-term operational (stationary source) impacts would be similar to the proposed project under this alternative, given that this alternative would generate similar daily trips. Short-term construction impacts would be slightly less, given that only a portion of the plan area would redeveloped with new uses.

For the proposed project, air quality impacts were identified as less than significant or less than significant with the imposition of mitigation measures for the proposed project, with the exception of project plan consistency with respect to the exceedance of growth assumptions in the SCAQMD *2016 AQMP*, which was determined to be a significant unavoidable impact for the proposed project. This impact would remain under this alternative. This alternative, combined with other projects within the City such as the Duarte Town Center and the City of Hope Master Plan, would result in both employment and housing growth assumptions being exceeded. Housing growth assumptions would be exceeded to a lesser degree than with the proposed project; employment growth assumptions would be exceeded beyond those of the proposed project. Implementation of the Adaptive Reuse alternative would be inconsistent with the regional air quality plan, similar to the proposed project. The Adaptive Reuse alternative would be considered comparable in impact to the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Greenhouse gas emissions from construction activities for the Adaptive Reuse alternative would be lower than those of the proposed project because of the decrease in construction activities associated with adaptive reuse of existing buildings. Greenhouse gas emissions from operations would be similar to the proposed project. Therefore, the Adaptive Reuse alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project because of lower greenhouse gas emissions.

Noise

Long-term operational (stationary source) impacts would be similar to the proposed project under this alternative. Short-term construction impacts would be slightly less, given that some buildings may be retained for adaptive reuse (and thus have a shorter construction period). Most noise impacts were identified as less than significant or less than significant with the imposition of mitigation measures for the proposed project, with the exception of short-term construction impacts, which were concluded to be significant unavoidable impacts. This alternative is anticipated to be similar with respect to construction noise impacts or slightly reduced. The Adaptive Reuse alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Short-term construction-related impacts involving the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials (i.e., asbestos containing materials, lead-based paints, underground storage tanks) could occur with the Adaptive Reuse alternative since some buildings would be demolished and ground-disturbing activities would occur. The risk of long-term impacts involving accidental release of hazardous materials from spills during storage or transport would be greater under the Adaptive Reuse alternative due to the presence of more commercial uses. Therefore, the Adaptive Reuse alternative is considered environmentally equivalent to the proposed project with regard to construction impacts, but inferior to the proposed project over the long term.

Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality

This alternative would result in similar amounts of impervious surface area on site. As such, impacts regarding drainage, hydrology, floodplains, and water quality are anticipated to be comparable to the proposed project. Therefore, hydrology and drainage impacts would remain less than significant. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be required to reduce water quality impacts to a less than significant level, in compliance with NPDES permit requirements. Thus, the Adaptive Reuse alternative would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project.

Public Services and Utilities

Relative to the proposed project, this alternative would generally result in a lower demand for fire and police protection services due to a lower population density. Relative to the proposed project, use of water and wastewater facilities and demand for electricity and natural gas could be higher lower since the alternative would include more intensive commercial and office uses. The amount of solid waste requiring disposal at local and regional landfills with this alternative would be comparable to the proposed project. As is the case with the proposed project, all public service and utility impacts would be less than significant with implementation of applicable mitigation measures, including payment of fees to affected agencies. Thus, the Adaptive Reuse alternative would be considered neither environmentally inferior or superior to the proposed project.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT GOALS

1. **GOAL: A MIXTURE OF LAND USES**

    a. *Objective*: Develop a flexible mixed-use land use pattern that incorporates retail, office, hospitality, and residential opportunities that will effectively complement each other and provide maximum land use efficiency, while providing economic and social benefits to all users.

    b. *Objective*: Program retail uses that are neighborhood- and transit-station serving.

The Adaptive Reuse alternative meets this goal by allowing for a mix of uses well suited to a transit station environment.

2. GOAL: AN ECONOMICALLY FEASIBLE DEVELOPMENT

a. *Objective*: Provide opportunities for adaptive reuse of existing buildings, and design new non-residential spaces with flexibility to allow for shifts in market demand and allow options throughout various economic cycles and scenarios.

b. *Objective*: Create a range of residential unit types that will be accessible to residents of all income levels.

c. *Objective*: Provide residential opportunities to assist the City of Duarte in meeting its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) objectives.

d. *Objective*: Encourage the development of a hotel to create local jobs, support City of Hope lodging needs, provide community meeting space, and increase tax revenues within the community.

The Adaptive Reuse alternative meets this goal by allowing for adaptive reuse, residential opportunities, and hospitality uses.

3. GOAL: PEDESTRIAN-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

a. *Objective*: Create a development pattern that effectively provides for efficient and comfortable pedestrian movement and connectivity throughout the site.

b. *Objective*: Give precedence to pedestrians and foster multimodal transportation with bicycle, pedestrian, and transit access.

c. *Objective*: Provide supportive commercial uses and an active street frontage on Highland Avenue that facilitates a pedestrian friendly experience and links to other centers in the city.

The Adaptive Reuse alternative partially meets this goal. It will be more difficult with the Adaptive Reuse \alternative to create sufficient pedestrian pathways through the Specific Plan area given the existing size and building length of existing buildings. No new pedestrian connection to the Gold Line Station would be feasible unless a portion of an existing building is removed; thus, this alternative does not meet Objective a. However, this alternative meets Objectives b and c, with the support of a Specific Plan that would be drafted to support these objectives.

4. GOAL: SUPERIOR URBAN DESIGN

a. *Objective*: Allow for building types that will achieve desired density ranges to establish a critical mass of residents and employees to support the transit station, maximize transit ridership, and support retail spaces and local employment centers.

b. *Objective*: Minimize setbacks to allow buildings to frame and activate the street.

c. *Objective*: Use trees, shrubs and other landscape and hardscape materials along streets to provide shading, screening, and human scale.

d. *Objective*: Promote high quality architectural design to establish a design character that creates an identity in the Duarte Station Specific Plan area.

e. *Objective*: Establish context-based standards and guidelines that address specific design concerns while also allowing for creativity and flexibility in development projects.

The Adaptive Reuse alternative partially meets this goal. Because some of the existing structures on the site would remain the same and no new development would occur, there would be less opportunity for achieving desired density ranges. However, allowing office, retail, and restaurant uses in this location would maximize transit ridership and support retail spaces, which partially satisfies Objective a. Furthermore, since this alternative keeps the existing mid-century industrial structures, it would not promote a design character for the area nor would it minimize setbacks along secondary frontages. Thus, the Adaptive Reuse alternative does not meet Objectives b and d.

5. GOAL: OUTDOOR SPACES

a. *Objective*: Provide outdoor spaces—such as an urban green space, public plaza, promenade, or linear park—that provide a transition between the station and the surrounding transit village uses and facilitates pedestrian movement and/or public gathering.

b. *Objective:* Encourage rooftop open space areas to increase the amount and the quality of open space while taking advantage of quality views from the site.

c. *Objective:* Program outdoor space(s) to accommodate the needs of various user groups, such as residents, employees, commuters, and visitors.

The Adaptive Reuse alternative meets the goal. While portions of the existing layout of the site would largely remain the same, additional outdoor spaces would be provided through the proposed pedestrian promenade along Highland. (The existing buildings are set back with adequate space to support the promenade, and development of the promenade would be required with a change of use to office.) Rooftop open space areas could be provided. Existing truck loading spaces may be reconfigured into vehicle parking areas, with remaining space programmed for outdoor open spaces. Thus, the Adaptive Reuse alternative meets Objectives a, b, and c.

6. GOAL: AWARENESS OF SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT

a. *Objective*: Provide opportunities for new goods and services uses to support surrounding residents, students, and employees within and around the Duarte Station Specific Plan area.

b. *Objective*: Provide for appropriate transitions with adjacent existing lower-intensity residential uses through height limits, articulation and modulation requirements, design guidelines, and landscape requirements.

c. *Objective:* Upgrade the existing streetscape infrastructure and solidify pedestrian connections between the Plan Area, Duarte Station, and critical areas of interest around the site.

d. *Objective*: Consider the future needs of the City of Hope as part of land use planning.

The Adaptive Reuse alternative partially meets this goal. For portions of the site associated with adaptive reuse, Objective b may not be achieved. This alternative would, however, provide desired services to the residents, students, and employees in the surrounding area and the City of Hope. In addition, there is adequate space between the building façade and the right-of-way to provide the required pedestrian promenade, thus updating the streetscape infrastructure and solidifying the pedestrian connections. Thus, the Adaptive Reuse alternative meets Objectives a, c, and d, but does not meet Objective b.

7. GOAL: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

a. *Objective:* Encourage transit-oriented development that supports multimodal opportunities and adhere to Levels of Sustainable Development Practices as prescribed in Chapter 19.52 of the City's Development Code.

b. *Objective:* Ensure that construction and demolition waste is disposed of in accordance with all City regulations and standards.

c. *Objective:* Consider building layout, siting, and building design to not preclude alternative energy production on-site.

d. *Objective:* Maximize energy efficiency through local and state standards, indoor environmental quality, energy-efficient lighting, building orientation, shading, and implementation of LEED principles (or similar) and/or attaining LEED Certification.

e. *Objective:* Reduce heat island effect through site planning and selection of landscape and hardscape materials.

f. *Objective:* Incorporate water-efficient design features such as permeable surfaces, collection devices, biofiltration devices, green rooftops, cisterns, berms and swales, and/or green rooftops.

g. *Objective:* Include drought-tolerant and climate-appropriate landscape within the Specific Plan area.

The Adaptive Reuse alternative partially meets this goal, as many efficiencies are provided with the reuse of existing buildings. Adaptive reuse would provide additional employment and use of the site and thus would be considered transit oriented (although not new development). Construction and demolition waste would be minimized with the reuse of buildings. Building layout and site planning may not be able to consider all forms of alternative energy; however, solar production on the existing flat roofs would remain available. Implementing energy efficiency measures may be more difficult within an existing building. Site planning to remove truck loading spaces and replace the spaces with landscaped outdoor areas would reduce heat island effects. Water efficient landscaping would be required with the Adaptive Reuse alternative. Thus, the

Adaptive Reuse alternative meets Objectives a through c and e through g. However, this alternative does not meet Objective d.

6.9 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR must identify an "environmentally superior" alternative, and where the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify as environmentally superior an alternative from among the others evaluated.

As noted above, the determination of an environmentally superior alternative is based on the consideration of how the alternative fulfills the project objectives and how the alternative either reduces significant, unavoidable impacts or substantially reduces the impacts to the surrounding environment.

6.9.1 ALTERNATIVE ONE: EXISTING ZONING/NO PROJECT

Compared to the proposed project, the Existing Zoning alternative results in fewer impacts relative to traffic, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and hazards and hazardous materials. Greater impacts would be anticipated for land use, population and housing, and public services and utilities. Impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, and hydrology, drainage, and water quality would be equivalent. Significant unavoidable impacts related to traffic, air quality, and noise impacts would also occur with this alternative.

The Existing Zoning would not fully implement the overarching goals of the proposed project to provide a mixture of land use, an economically feasible development, traditional pedestrian-oriented street pattern, and awareness of surrounding development. The goals of superior urban design, outdoor spaces, and sustainable development practices could be achieved.

6.9.2 ALTERNATIVE TWO: ALL RESIDENTIAL

Compared to the proposed project, the All Residential alternative would result in similar impacts relative to aesthetics and hydrology, drainage, and water quality. The All Residential alternative results in fewer impacts to traffic, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and hazardous materials. Greater impacts would be anticipated for land use, population and housing, and public services and utilities. Significant unavoidable impacts related to traffic and noise would be reduced, but not eliminated, and impacts related to air quality would remain the same.

The All Residential alternative meets Goals 4, 5, and 7 and does not fully meet Goals 1, 2, 3, and 6.

6.9.3 ALTERNATIVE THREE: ADAPTIVE REUSE

Compared to the proposed project, the Adaptive Reuse alternative would result in similar impacts relative to aesthetics, hazards, and hydrology, drainage, and water quality. The Adaptive Reuse Alternative would result in fewer impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and public utilities and services. Greater impacts would be anticipated for land use, population and housing, and traffic. Significant unavoidable impacts related to traffic, air quality, and noise impacts would also occur with this alternative.

The Adaptive Reuse Alternative meets Goals 1, 2, and 5 but does not fully meet Goals 3, 4, 6, and 7.

6.9.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

As noted above, the determination of an environmentally superior alternative is based on the consideration of how the alternative fulfills the project objectives and how the alternative either reduces significant, unavoidable impacts or substantially reduces the impacts to the surrounding environment. In consideration of these factors, the proposed project is selected as the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Table 6-2, *Comparison of Alternatives*, provides an overview of the alternatives analyzed and a comparison of each alternative's impact in relation to the proposed action.

Table 6-2
Comparison of Impact of Alternatives Relative to the Proposed Project

Impact Area	Alterative One: Existing Zoning Alternative	Alternative Two: All Residential Alternative	Alternative Three: Adaptive Reuse Alternative
Land Use	=	○	○
Aesthetics	○	=	=
Population and Housing	○	○	○
`Traffic	=	◆	○
Reduces Significant Unavoidable Impact?	No	Yes	No
Eliminates Significant Unavoidable Impact?	No	No	No
Air Quality	○	=	=
Reduces Significant Unavoidable Impact?	No	No	No
Eliminates Significant Unavoidable Impact?	No	No	No
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	○	◆	◆
Noise	=	◆	◆
Reduces Significant Unavoidable Impact?	No	Yes	Yes
Eliminates Significant Unavoidable Impact?	No	No	No
Hazardous Materials	○	◆	○
Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality	=	=	=
Public Services and Utilities	=	=	=

= Indicates an impact that is equal to the proposed project (neither environmentally superior nor inferior).
○ Indicates an impact that is greater than the proposed project over the long term (environmentally inferior).
◆ Indicates an impact that is less than the proposed project over the long term (environmentally superior).

Page left intentionally blank.