

---

## **4.0 ALTERNATIVES**

---



### **4.0.1 INTRODUCTION**

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) states that an environmental impact report (EIR) shall describe and analyze a range of reasonable alternatives to a project. These alternatives should feasibly attain most of the project's basic objectives, while avoiding or substantially lessening one or more of the significant environmental impacts of the project. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project, nor is it required to consider alternatives that are infeasible. The discussion of alternatives shall focus on those alternatives that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if they impede the attainment of the project objectives to some degree or would be more costly (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[b]).

According to the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR need only examine in detail those alternatives that could feasibly meet most of the project objectives. When addressing feasibility, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 states that "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, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the applicant can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to alternative sites." The CEQA Guidelines also specify that the alternatives discussion should not be remote or speculative; however, they need not be presented in the same level of detail as the assessment of the proposed project.

The CEQA Guidelines indicate that several factors need to be considered in determining the range of alternatives to be analyzed and the level of analytical detail that should be provided for each alternative. These factors include (1) the nature of the significant impacts of the proposed project; (2) the ability of alternatives to avoid or lessen the significant impacts associated with the project; (3) the ability of the alternatives to meet the project objectives; and (4) the feasibility of the alternatives. These factors would be unique for each project.

The environmental impacts of the project that the alternatives will seek to eliminate or reduce were determined and based on the findings contained in each technical section evaluated in Sections 3.1 through 3.8 of this Draft EIR. As identified in these sections, the proposed project would not cause any significant and unavoidable impacts.

### **4.0.2 ALTERNATIVES UNDER CONSIDERATION**

Three alternatives were identified for examination and analysis in this Draft EIR:

- Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2 – Reduced Development Alternative
- Alternative 3 – Office/Retail Use Alternative

These alternatives constitute an adequate range of reasonable alternatives as required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6.

### **4.0.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS**

In selecting the alternatives to be evaluated in this EIR, the lead agency (the South Pasadena Unified School District) began with a wide range of alternatives and narrowed the range by eliminating certain alternatives that did not satisfy CEQA's intent or requirements for alternatives.

## 4.0 ALTERNATIVES

---

In addition to the alternatives carried forward for analysis, the lead agency considered but eliminated a variety of alternatives from analysis, including the following:

- **Alternative Location:** An alternative location for the Mission Place Project was considered but rejected from evaluation because it would not meet the basic project objectives of developing the surface parking lot of the District's administrative offices/boardroom building site in a manner that is consistent with the Mission Street Specific Plan and utilizing the District's land resources to enhance revenue through lease agreements in a manner that allows for improved educational facilities and programs. In addition, an alternative location would not avoid or substantially reduce any significant and unavoidable environmental impacts, as the proposed project would cause no such impacts.
- **Public Park/School District Playground:** The use of the site as a public park and/or school district playground was considered but rejected from evaluation because it would not meet the basic project objectives of utilizing the District's land resources to enhance revenue through lease agreements in a manner that allows for improved educational facilities and programs and developing the surface parking lot of the District's administrative offices/boardroom building site in a manner that is consistent with the Mission Street Specific Plan. Likewise, a public park/playground alternative would not meet any of the applicant's project objectives, including the basic project objectives of providing local residents and employers with a luxury living option with access to public transportation and walkable retail locations which satisfies the objectives described in the Mission Street Specific Plan and providing Class A rental housing to address a growing demand for rental apartments. In addition, a public park/playground alternative would not avoid or substantially reduce any significant and unavoidable environmental impacts, as the proposed project would cause no such impacts.
- **YMCA Alternative:** In response to a request for development proposals, the District received a proposal to develop the subject site with a YMCA facility. This proposal consisted of developing the surface parking lot portion of the site with a two-story YMCA facility. In addition to the new building, the YMCA proposed to acquire the existing Boardroom Building for YMCA use. This alternative was considered but rejected from evaluation because it would not meet the basic project objectives. By converting the Boardroom Building for YMCA use, this alternative would not meet the District's objective of allowing continued use of the District's facilities without a long-term reduction in functionality. Additionally, a YMCA use would not be consistent with the Mission Street Specific Plan.
- **Lambert Development Proposal:** In response to a request for development proposals, the District received a proposal from Lambert Development. The Lambert Development proposal is similar to the proposed project in that it consists of development of the surface parking portion of the site with a three-story, mixed-use building. However, the Lambert Development proposal includes more commercial space (18,000 square feet) and fewer residential units (60 units) than the proposed project. In addition, this proposal involved a sale of the property and development of condominium units, rather than apartments. The Lambert Development alternative was considered but rejected from evaluation because it would not meet the basic project objective of enhancing the District's revenue through lease agreements. In addition, this alternative would not reduce or avoid any of the significant environmental impacts of the project.

#### 4.0.4 ALTERNATIVE 1 – NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

##### DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

Under this alternative, the project would not be approved and the parking lot would remain as is. There would be no mixed-use development on the project site and the site would maintain its function as a surface parking lot. Alternative 1 would not entail new housing or commercial development in South Pasadena.

##### ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The following analysis is based on the environmental impacts identified in Sections 3.1 through 3.8 of this EIR. Each section presents a brief discussion of Alternative 1's potential impacts on the respective resource area as compared to the proposed project.

##### Air Quality

Under Alternative 1, there would be no change to the project site, and development would not take place. The project site would not be developed with housing and commercial development, and construction emissions would not occur. Alternative 1 would maintain operational emissions at current levels. As discussed in Section 3.1, Air Quality, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated on air quality due to short-term construction emissions and would otherwise have a less than significant impact due to operational emissions. As such, Alternative 1 would have fewer impacts on air quality as compared with the proposed project.

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 1 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.1.1	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan	No impact	Less than significant
3.1.2	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation	No impact	Less than significant with mitigation
3.1.3	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment	No impact	Less than significant with mitigation
3.1.4	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations	No impact	Less than significant with mitigation
3.1.5	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people	No impact	Less than significant
3.1.6	Cumulative increase in nonattainment criteria pollutants	No impact	Not cumulatively considerable

##### Cultural Resources

Under Alternative 1, the project site would remain as is, and there would be no development on the project site. As such, there would be no potential modifications to the South Pasadena Historic Business District and no effect on the historic buildings on the project site. Alternative 1 would have no impact on cultural resources. Further, there would be no soil disturbance. Impacts to archeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains would not

## 4.0 ALTERNATIVES

take place under Alternative 1. As discussed in Section 3.2 Cultural Resources, the proposed project would impact cultural, archeological, and paleontological resources and human remains due to project construction and would require mitigation. As such, Alternative 1 would have fewer impacts compared with the proposed project to cultural resources.

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 1 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.2.1	Disturb historic resources	No impact	Less than significant with mitigation
3.2.2	Disturb archaeological resources	No impact	Less than significant with mitigation
3.2.3	Disturb paleontological resources	No impact	Less than significant with mitigation
3.2.4	Disturb unknown human remains	No Impact	Less than significant
3.2.5	Cumulative impacts on historic, cultural, and paleontological resources and human remains	No impact	Not cumulatively considerable

### Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under Alternative 1, the project site would remain as is, and the project site would not be developed with a mixed-use development. Construction or operation of new uses on the site would not take place and greenhouse gases would not be emitted during the process. Alternative 1 would have no impact on greenhouse gas emissions over existing levels of operation. As discussed in Section 3.3, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the proposed project would emit approximately 731.89 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e) during construction and 1,557.40 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e during operations, both under the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds of significance. As such, under Alternative 1 there would be fewer impacts compared with the proposed project to greenhouse gas emissions.

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 1 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.3.1	Generation of greenhouse gas emissions	No impact	Not cumulatively considerable
3.3.2	Compliance with state and regional plans	No impact	Less than significant

### Land Use and Planning

Under Alternative 1, the project site would remain as is, and development would not take place on the site. Alternative 1, similar with the proposed project would not require any zoning or General Plan amendments. Under Alternative 1, the parking lot would not be developed, and compact, transit-oriented development would not take place on the project site. Thus, Alternative 1 would not aid in fulfilling the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) plans for sustainable compact development. Alternative 1 would not encourage different modes of transportation since the site would remain a parking lot that would support motor vehicle use.

Alternative 1 would maintain the existing parking lot and would not be incompatible with surrounding land uses. Alternative 1 would not impact agricultural resources and would not disrupt or divide an established community.

As discussed in Section 3.4, Land Use and Planning, the project would be compatible with surrounding land uses and would not conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies. As such, Alternative 1 would have similar impacts regarding applicable environmental plans, surrounding land uses, General Plan designations, agricultural resources, and existing communities. However, unlike the project, it would not aid the City in realizing the vision established in the Mission Street Specific Plan.

<b>Draft EIR Impact Number</b>	<b>Impact Topic</b>	<b>Alternative 1 Impact Significance</b>	<b>Proposed Project Impact Significance</b>
3.4.1	Conflict with a general plan designation or zoning	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.4.2	Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.4.3	Be incompatible with the existing land use in the vicinity	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.4.4	Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impact to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)	No impact	No impact
3.4.5	Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)	No impact	No impact
3.4.6	Cumulative land use impacts	No impact	Not cumulatively considerable

**Noise**

Under Alternative 1, the project site would remain as is and would not be developed as a mixed-use development. There would be no construction on the site. Alternative 1 would have no impacts due to construction noise. Because the site would not be developed, operational noise would remain at present levels. As described in Section 3.5, Noise, the proposed project would introduce new noise sources in the project area during construction and during operation. In comparison to existing traffic noise levels, the project would result in a predicted increase in traffic noise levels of approximately 1.2 dBA at maximum along Fairview Avenue. Project operation would require the installation of HVAC systems that would also increase noise in the project area. Nonetheless, none of the increases would be over the significance thresholds and the proposed project’s impacts would be less than significant. Because there would be a slight increase in noise levels over existing conditions with the proposed project, Alternative 1 would have fewer impacts compared with the proposed project related to construction, operational, and ambient noise.

Project construction would generate vibrations that would expose fragile buildings to potential vibration impacts. Under Alternative 1, there would be no project construction and no increase in existing vibration levels. As such, Alternative 1 would have fewer impacts compared with the proposed project on groundborne vibration.

## 4.0 ALTERNATIVES

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 1 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.5.1	Exposure to noise levels in excess of established standards	No impact	Less than significant
3.5.2	Exposure to groundborne vibration	No impact	Less than significant with mitigation
3.5.3	Substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels	No impact	Less than significant
3.5.4	Substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels	No impact	Less than significant with mitigation
3.5.5	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels	No impact	No impact
3.5.6	For a project in the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels	No impact	No impact
3.5.7	Cumulative noise impacts	No impact	Not cumulatively considerable

### Public Services

Under Alternative 1, the project site would remain as is and would not be developed with a mixed-use development. As such, existing levels of law enforcement and fire services would be maintained and there would be no need for an increase in service levels in the project area. Further, under Alternative 1, the South Pasadena Unified School District (SPUSD) would not need to accommodate additional students. As discussed in Section 3.6, Public Services, the project would add school-age children to at-capacity SPUSD schools. As such, Alternative 1 would have fewer impacts compared with the proposed project to public services.

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 1 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.6.1	Increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical services	No impact	Less than significant
3.6.2	Increased demand for law enforcement services	No impact	Less than significant
3.6.3	Increased demand for school facilities	No impact	Less than significant
3.6.4	Cumulative school demand impacts	No impact	Less than significant
3.6.5	Increased demand for parks and recreation facilities	No impact	Less than significant
3.6.6	Increased demand for other public services	No impact	Not cumulatively considerable

### Utilities and Service Systems

Under Alternative 1, the project site would remain as is and would not be developed with additional housing and commercial development. As such, there would be no increase in water needs at the project site.

As described in Section 3.7, Utilities and Service Systems, the proposed project would have a total water demand of approximately 36,400 gallons per day. This represents approximately 0.8 percent of projected citywide demand during a normal year and 0.7 percent of projected citywide demand during a single dry year. Because the project site would remain unoccupied under Alternative 1, it is assumed that it would have no impact on water supplies. As such, under Alternative 1 there would be fewer impacts compared with the proposed project to utilities.

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 1 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.7.1	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board	No impact	Less than significant
3.7.2	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects	No impact	Less than significant
3.7.3	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects	No impact	Less than significant
3.7.4	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed	No impact	Less than significant
3.7.5	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments	No impact	Less than significant
3.7.6	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs	No impact	Less than significant
3.7.7	Increased demand for electrical, natural gas, and telecommunications services	No impact	Less than significant
3.7.8	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste	No impact	Less than significant
3.7.9	Cumulative water supply impacts	No impact	Not cumulatively considerable

## 4.0 ALTERNATIVES

### Transportation and Traffic

Alternative 1 would have no impacts on transportation. The project site would remain as is, and the existing parking lot would not be developed. Therefore, there would be no increase in traffic to the project area, nor would there be a need for daytime or shared parking.

As discussed in Section 3.8, Transportation and Traffic, the project would not have any significant and unavoidable impacts on traffic in the area or on pedestrian and transit systems. Because Alternative 1 would not impact project area traffic, under Alternative 1 there would be fewer impacts compared with the proposed project to transportation and traffic.

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 1 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.8.1	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy	No impact	Less than significant
3.8.2	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program	No impact	Less than significant
3.8.3	Air traffic pattern impacts under existing plus project conditions	No impact	No impact
3.8.4	Increased hazards due to a design feature	No impact	Less than significant
3.8.5	Emergency access impacts under existing plus project conditions	No impact	Less than significant
3.8.6	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities	No impact	Less than significant
3.8.7	Result in inadequate parking capacity	No impact	Less than significant
3.8.9	Cumulative traffic impacts	No impact	Not cumulatively considerable

### 4.0.5 ALTERNATIVE 2 – REDUCED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

#### DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

Alternative 2 is a variation of the proposed project that does not utilize the bonus provision allowed by the Mission Street Specific Plan for projects in the Core Area of the Specific Plan that provide additional public parking. As such, Alternative 2 does not include any additional public parking and is limited to a height of two stories/32 feet and a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.8.

Alternative 2 would develop the existing parking lot with a mixed-use development, which would include commercial and residential uses. Alternative 2 would maintain the same retail square footage as the project, reduce the number of residential units to 55 (a 36 percent reduction from the project's 91 units), and eliminate the additional parking proposed by the project for general public use. Under Alternative 2 the project's density bonus would not be utilized and the project site would be developed at a FAR of 0.8. Alternative 2 components are as described in **Table 4.0-1** and are compared with the proposed project elements.

**TABLE 4.0-1  
ALTERNATIVE 2 COMPONENTS COMPARISON**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>
Lot Area	82,455 square feet	82,455 square feet
Apartment Units	39, 890 square feet	65,386 square feet
Common Area	7, 040 square feet	12,134 square feet
Commercial Space	7, 000 square feet	7, 000 square feet
Total FAR	0.80 FAR	1.17 FAR
Building Heights	2-story maximum	3-story maximum
Parking	148 spaces (no general public parking)	228 spaces (includes 41 general public parking spaces)
One-Bedroom Units	50 units	83 units
Two-Bedroom Units*	5 units	8 units
Open Space	32,981 square feet	32,981 square feet

\*Alternative 2 would include traditional one- and two-bedroom units, while the project would include a greater variety as described in Section 2.0, Project Description.

Project site circulation under Alternative 2 would be similar to that of the proposed project, with residential access provided via a private driveway. Pedestrian access under Alternative 2 would be the same as the proposed project via existing sidewalks along Mission Street, Diamond Avenue, and Fairview Avenue. Commercial uses would have direct pedestrian access from Mission Street. Pedestrian walkways would be provided from adjacent sidewalks to resident lobbies for the proposed indoor-entry residential units; a walkway would maintain the existing pedestrian access to the north elevation of the District's Administration Building and to the south and west elevations of the Boardroom Building.

Alternative 2 would include connections to the existing water, sewer, electrical, and telecommunications networks. Stormwater flows on-site would be directed to retention planters, with outflows and excess flows directed to the adjacent streets for capture by the City's storm drain system. This would be similar to the proposed project.

Alternative 2 construction would be similar to that of the proposed project and as described in Section 2.0, Project Description. While Alternative 2 may have a reduced construction time frame because of the smaller scale of development, the intensity of daily construction activities would be substantially similar to those of the project. Also like the project, construction of Alternative 2 would comply with City of South Pasadena policies regarding construction noise and duration.

## ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The following analysis is based on the environmental impacts identified in Sections 3.1 through 3.8 of this Draft EIR. Each section presents Alternative 2's potential impacts on the respective resource area and compares it with the proposed project. For Alternative 2, it is assumed that a reduction in the number of residential units would result in a reduction in environmental impacts. Alternative 2 would reduce residential units by approximately 35 units, representing a 36 percent reduction. Therefore, a 36 percent reduction in impact is assumed for the residential

## 4.0 ALTERNATIVES

component. For example, it is assumed that the residential component of Alternative 2 would have 36 percent fewer operational air quality emissions.

### Air Quality

Alternative 2 would develop the project area with a mixed-use development as described in **Table 4.0-1**. The project site would be developed with 7,000 square feet of commercial development, 55 residential units, and 148 parking spaces. Since Alternative 2 would develop 36 percent fewer residential units, it is assumed that there would be 36 percent fewer emissions from the residential component. Commercial component emissions would remain the same. Further, it is assumed that Alternative 2 would have the same construction emissions as the proposed project since daily construction would be similar in scope and intensity. Therefore, although Alternative 2 would reduce residential units, mitigation measures **MM 3.1.2a** and **3.1.2b** would still be required. It is important to note that Alternative 2 would not provide public parking, thus potentially increasing air quality impacts from cars idling waiting for other public parking spaces or circling the neighborhood looking for alternate parking. Such impacts would be offset by the reduction in emissions from residential vehicle trips. Operational emissions of Alternative 2 would not exceed significance thresholds.

As discussed in Section 3.1, Air Quality, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with mitigation on air quality due to short-term construction emissions and would otherwise have a less than significant impact due to operational emissions. Alternative 2 would decrease air quality emissions, and although such reduction would be minimal, it would have fewer impacts on air quality as compared with the proposed project. Alternative 2 would require the same mitigation measures as the proposed project. Therefore, impact significance conclusions are similar to those outlined in Section 3.1 Air Quality of this Draft EIR.

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 2 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.1.1	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.1.2	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.1.3	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.1.4	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.1.5	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.1.6	Cumulative increase in nonattainment criteria pollutants	Not cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable

### Cultural Resources

Under Alternative 2, the project site would be developed with a mixed-use development as described in **Table 4.0-1**. Alternative 3 would include 7,000 square feet of commercial development, 55 residential units, and 148 parking spaces. Alternative 2 would impact the South Pasadena Historic District and other cultural resources in a similar manner to the proposed

project, as it would entail project site development and similar scope of construction as the proposed project, albeit two stories, one story less than the proposed project. Alternative 2 would introduce similar elements into the historic district as the proposed project through the development of two-story mixed-use buildings. The buildings would be visible from adjacent historic properties.

As discussed in Section 3.2, Cultural Resources, the proposed project would impact cultural, archeological, and paleontological resources and human remains due to project construction and would require mitigation. Because Alternative 2 would have the same impacts as the proposed project to cultural resources, it would require implementation of mitigation measures **MM 3.2.1a** and **MM 3.2.1b**, **MM 3.2.2**, and **MM 3.2.3**. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have similar impacts on cultural resources as the proposed project.

<b>Draft EIR Impact Number</b>	<b>Impact Topic</b>	<b>Alternative 2 Impact Significance</b>	<b>Proposed Project Impact Significance</b>
3.2.1	Disturb historic resources	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.2.2	Disturb archaeological resources	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.2.3	Disturb paleontological resources	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.2.4	Disturb unknown human remains	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.2.5	Cumulative impacts on historic, cultural, and paleontological resources and human remains	Less than cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Under Alternative 2, the project site would be developed with a mixed-use development, which would include 7,000 square feet of commercial development, 55 residential units, and 148 parking spaces. Construction of Alternative 2 would have a shorter overall time frame than construction of the proposed project because of the reduced scale of development. Thus, construction of Alternative 2 would emit slightly less CO<sub>2</sub>e. Project operation would entail 36 percent fewer residential units than the proposed project and thus would generate fewer greenhouse gas emissions than the proposed project. Like the proposed project, Alternative 2's greenhouse gas emission levels would be under SCAQMD thresholds of significance.

As discussed in Section 3.3, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the proposed project would emit approximately 731.89 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e during construction and 1,557.40 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e during operations, both under the SCAQMD thresholds of significance. Given the reduced scale of development, under Alternative 2 there would be fewer impacts compared with the proposed project related to greenhouse gas emissions. Nonetheless, because greenhouse gases would be emitted under Alternative 2, impact conclusions are similar to those described in Section 3.3 of this Draft EIR.

## 4.0 ALTERNATIVES

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 2 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.3.1	Generation of greenhouse gas emissions	Not cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable
3.3.2	Compliance with state and regional plans	Less than significant	Less than significant

### Land Use and Planning

Under Alternative 2, the project site would be developed with a mixed-use development as described in **Table 4.0-1**. The project site would be developed with 7,000 square feet of commercial development, 55 residential units, and 148 parking spaces. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would aid in fulfilling SCAG's plans for sustainable compact development and would encourage different modes of transportation. Further, Alternative 2 would also be compatible with surrounding land uses. The alternative would not impact agricultural resources and would not disrupt or divide an established community.

As discussed in Section 3.4, Land Use and Planning, the project would be compatible with surrounding land uses and would not conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies. Alternative 2 proposes the same land uses as the proposed project, but reduces the number of residential units from 91 to 55. The City's General Plan Housing Element includes the project site in its calculation for achieving the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). The Housing Element assumed a base zoning that allows for 72 units of housing on the site. While Alternative 2 would not fully achieve the projected number of units considered in the Housing Element, it would not conflict with a policy adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Nor would it displace any existing housing or residents, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. As such, the reduction in proposed housing units would not result in a significant environmental effect. Alternative 2 would have similar impacts regarding applicable environmental plans, surrounding land uses, General Plan designations, agricultural resources, and existing communities compared to the proposed project.

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 2 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.4.1	Conflict with a general plan designation or zoning	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.4.2	Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.4.3	Be incompatible with the existing land use in the vicinity	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.4.4	Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impact to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)	No impact	No impact
3.4.5	Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)	No impact	No impact
3.4.6	Cumulative land use impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable

**Noise**

Under Alternative 2 the project site would be developed with a mixed-use development and include 7,000 square feet of commercial development, 55 residential units, and 148 parking spaces. Alternative 2 would not include public parking. Alternative 2 would introduce new noise sources in the project area during both project construction and operation. Traffic noise, and noise associated with new residential buildings such as from HVAC systems, would increase noise in the project area. Construction of Alternative 2 would also result in groundborne vibrations that could impact sensitive buildings in the project area. As such, mitigation measure **MM 3.2.1b** would be required.

As described in Section 3.10, Noise, the proposed project would introduce new noise sources in the project area during construction and during operation. In comparison to existing traffic noise levels, the project would result in a predicted increase in traffic noise levels of approximately 1.2 dBA at maximum along Fairview Avenue. Project operation would require the installation of HVAC systems that would also increase noise in the project area. Nonetheless, none of the increases would be over the significance thresholds, and the proposed project’s impacts would be less than significant. Alternative 2 increases would match proposed project noise level increases. Impacts would be similar compared with the proposed project related to construction, operational, and ambient noise.

Project construction would generate vibrations that would expose fragile buildings to potential vibration impacts, similar to Alternative 2, and the same mitigation measure would be required. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have similar impacts compared with the proposed project regarding groundborne vibration.

<b>Draft EIR Impact Number</b>	<b>Impact Topic</b>	<b>Alternative 2 Impact Significance</b>	<b>Proposed Project Impact Significance</b>
3.5.1	Exposure to noise levels in excess of established standards	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.5.2	Exposure to groundborne vibration	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.5.3	Substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.5.4	Substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.5.5	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels	No impact	No impact
3.5.6	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels	No impact	No impact
3.5.7	Cumulative noise impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable

## 4.0 ALTERNATIVES

---

### Public Services

Under Alternative 2, the project site would be developed with 7,000 square feet of commercial development, 55 residential units, and 148 parking spaces. As such, there would be a need for increased law enforcement and fire protection services in the project area. Further, it is possible that Alternative 2 would increase the number of school-age children in the project area and thus enrollment in SPUSD schools. As with the project, payment of school impact fees would be required under Alternative 2.

As discussed in Section 3.6, Public Services, the project would add school-age children to at-capacity SPUSD schools and increase the need for fire and police services. Alternative 2 would have similar impacts compared with the proposed project to public services.

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 2 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.6.1	Increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical services	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.6.2	Increased demand for law enforcement services	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.6.3	Increased demand for school facilities	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.6.4	Cumulative school demand impacts	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.6.5	Increased demand for parks and recreation facilities	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.6.6	Increased demand for other public services	Not cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable

### Utilities and Service Systems

Under Alternative 2, the project would be developed with a mixed-use development as described in the **Table 4.0-1**. Alternative 2 would include 36 percent fewer residential units than the proposed project. South Pasadena's baseline daily per capita water use was determined to be 182 gallons per capita per day. Based on a 36 percent reduction in the number of residential units, Alternative 2 would have a total water demand of approximately 23,296 gallons per day. This is a small percentage of the total citywide demand during normal and dry years, and would be accommodated by the City of South Pasadena.

As described in Section 3.7, Utilities and Service Systems, the proposed project would have a total water demand of approximately 36,400 gallons per day. This represents approximately 0.8 percent of projected citywide demand during a normal year and 0.7 percent of projected citywide demand during a single dry year. Because of the 36 percent reduction in the number of residential units, Alternative 2 would have a smaller water demand. As such, under Alternative 2 there would be fewer impacts compared with the proposed project to utilities. Nonetheless, because Alternative 2 would require water service, the impact conclusions are similar to those described in Section 3.7 of this Draft EIR.

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 2 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.7.1	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.2	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.3	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.4	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.5	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.6	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.7	Increased demand for electrical, natural gas, and telecommunications services	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.8	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.9	Cumulative water supply impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable

### Transportation and Traffic

Under Alternative 2, the project site would be developed with a mixed-use development as described in **Table 4.0-1**. The project would generate a similar amount of construction traffic, since Alternative 2's daily construction activities would be similar in intensity to the proposed project. Since there would be 36 percent fewer residential units, Alternative 2 would generate 36 percent fewer car trips from the residential component of the project for a total of 1,517 daily trips (a 13 percent reduction in total daily trips from the proposed project). Alternative 2 would provide similar pedestrian and bicycle amenities as the proposed project and would not impact policies directed at alternate modes of transportation.

The proposed project would generate approximately 1,735 daily trips, 71 AM peak-hour trips (24 inbound and 47 outbound), and 150 PM peak-hour trips (87 inbound and 63 outbound). As discussed in Section 3.8, Transportation and Traffic, the project would have no significant and unavoidable impacts on project traffic in the area or on pedestrian and transit systems. Because Alternative 2 would generate fewer residential trips, overall it would have fewer impacts on project area traffic. Nonetheless, because Alternative 2 would generate both construction and operational vehicle trips, the impact conclusions are similar to those described in Section 3.8 of this Draft EIR.

## 4.0 ALTERNATIVES

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 2 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.8.1	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.8.2	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.8.3	Air traffic pattern impacts under existing plus project conditions	No impact	No impact
3.8.4	Increased hazards due to a design feature	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.8.5	Emergency access impacts under existing plus project conditions	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.8.6	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.8.7	Result in inadequate parking capacity	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.8.9	Cumulative traffic impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable

### 4.0.6 ALTERNATIVE 3 – OFFICE/RETAIL USE ALTERNATIVE

#### DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

Alternative 3 considers the type and intensity of nonresidential use that could be developed on the project site while still complying with the Mission Street Specific Plan. Therefore, Alternative 3 would develop the existing parking lot with office and restaurant/retail uses and would not include any residential units. Alternative 3 consists of a two-story, 53,930-square-foot commercial development with 26,965 square feet of ground-floor retail/restaurant space, 26,965 square feet of office space on the second floor, and a three-level subterranean parking garage. Alternative 3 components described in **Table 4.0-2**.

**TABLE 4.0-2  
ALTERNATIVE 3 COMPONENTS COMPARISON**

Description	Alternative 3	Proposed Project
Lot Area	82,455 square feet	82,455 square feet
Apartment Units	N/A	65,386 square feet
Office Space	26,965 square feet	N/A
Retail/Restaurant	26,965 square feet	7000
Common Area	N/A	12,134 square feet
Total FAR	0.80 FAR	1.17 FAR
Building Heights	2-story maximum	3-story maximum
Parking	276 spaces <sup>1</sup>	228 spaces (includes public parking)
One-Bedroom Units	N/A	83 units
Two-Bedroom Units <sup>2</sup>	N/A	8 units
Open Space	None required	32,981 square feet

<sup>1</sup> 216 parking spaces to be shared between retail/commercial and office uses.

<sup>2</sup> The project would include a variety of units per Section 2.0, Project Description.

Project site circulation for Alternative 3 would be similar to that of the proposed project, with vehicular access provided via a private driveway. Pedestrian access under Alternative 3 would be provided via existing sidewalks along Mission Street, Diamond Avenue, and Fairview Avenue, similar to the proposed project. Commercial uses would have direct pedestrian access from Mission Street. Alternative 3 would include connections to the existing water, sewer, electrical, and telecommunications networks. Stormwater flows on-site would be directed to retention planters, with outflows and excess flows directed to the adjacent streets for capture by the City's storm drain system.

Construction of Alternative 3 would be similar in size and scope to that of the proposed project and as described in Section 2.0, Project Description. Despite the reduction in height and overall square footage from the proposed project, Alternative 3 involves an equivalent amount of grading and excavation to construct a three-story subterranean parking garage. Like the project, construction would last approximately 18 months and would be consistent with City of South Pasadena policies.

**ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

The following analysis is based on the environmental impacts identified in Sections 3.1 through 3.8 of this Draft EIR. Each section presents Alternative 3's potential impacts on the respective resource area and compares it with the proposed project.

**Air Quality**

Alternative 3 would develop the project site with office/retail uses for a total of 53,930 square feet of office and retail/restaurant space and would not include a residential component. Alternative 3 construction emissions would be similar to those of the proposed project and as described in Section 3.1, Air Quality. Although Alternative 3 would not include a residential component, it would generate vehicular trips associated with office and restaurant/retail uses. Such uses would generate operational emissions that would be slightly greater than the proposed project due to higher trip generation rates.

As discussed in Section 3.1, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with mitigation on air quality due to short-term construction emissions and would otherwise have a less than significant impact due to operational emissions. Alternative 3 would have slightly greater impacts on air quality compared with the proposed project; however, impacts remain less than significant after mitigation.

<b>Draft EIR Impact Number</b>	<b>Impact Topic</b>	<b>Alternative 3 Impact Significance</b>	<b>Proposed Project Impact Significance</b>
3.1.1	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.1.2	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.1.3	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.1.4	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.1.5	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.1.6	Cumulative increase in nonattainment criteria pollutants	Not cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable

## 4.0 ALTERNATIVES

### Cultural Resources

Alternative 3 would develop the project site with office/retail uses for a total of 53,930 square feet of office and retail/restaurant space. Alternative 3 would impact the South Pasadena Historic District and other cultural resources in a similar manner to the proposed project, as it would entail project site development, albeit two-story development, one story less than the proposed project. Construction would be similar in scope to the proposed project, and Alternative 3 would introduce new buildings in the project area. Alternative 3 would require implementation of mitigation measures **MM 3.2.1a** and **MM 3.2.1b**, **MM 3.2.2**, and **MM 3.2.3** to decrease potential impacts on cultural resources in the project area.

As discussed in Section 3.2, Cultural Resources, the proposed project would impact cultural, archeological, and paleontological resources and human remains due to project construction and would require mitigation. As such, Alternative 3 would have the same impacts as the proposed project on cultural resources.

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 3 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.2.1	Disturb historic resources	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.2.2	Disturb archaeological resources	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.2.3	Disturb paleontological resources	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.2.4	Disturb unknown human remains	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.2.5	Cumulative impacts on historic, cultural, and paleontological resources and human remains	Less than cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable

### Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Alternative 3 would develop the project site with office/retail uses for a total of 53,930 square feet of office and retail/restaurant space and would not include residential uses. Construction of Alternative 3 would have a shorter overall time frame than construction of the proposed project because of the reduced scale of development. Thus, construction of Alternative 3 would emit slightly less CO<sub>2</sub>e. Although Alternative 3 would not include residential development, project operation would emit greater quantities of greenhouse gases from office/retail/restaurant uses due to increased trip generation (see the discussion of transportation and traffic below).

As discussed in Section 3.3, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the proposed project would emit approximately 731.89 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e during construction and 1,557.40 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e during operations, both under the SCAQMD thresholds of significance. Under Alternative 3, project impacts would be slightly greater than those described in Section 3.3 of this EIR, but would remain less than significant and not cumulatively considerable.

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 3 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.3.1	Generation of greenhouse gas emissions	Not cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable
3.3.2	Compliance with state and regional plans	Less than significant	Less than significant

## Land Use and Planning

Alternative 3 would develop the project site with office/retail uses for a total of 53,930 square feet of office and retail/restaurant space and would not include a residential component. Alternative 3 would encourage the usage of different modes of transportation, but transportation demand management strategies would have to be studied and implemented.

Alternative 3 would be compatible with surrounding land uses, since there are other retail and office buildings in the area. Alternative 3 would not impact agricultural resources and would not disrupt or divide an established community.

As discussed in Section 3.4, Land Use and Planning, of this Draft EIR, the project would be compatible with surrounding land uses and would not conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies. The City's General Plan Housing Element includes the project site in its calculation for achieving the City's RHNA. The Housing Element assumed a base zoning that allows for 72 units of housing on the site. While Alternative 3 would not achieve the projected number of units considered in the Housing Element, it would not conflict with a policy adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Nor would it displace any existing housing or residents, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. As such, while Alternative 3 would not aid the City in achieving its RHNA numbers, it would not result in any significant environmental impacts related to land use or housing. Compared to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have similar impacts regarding applicable plans, surrounding land uses, General Plan designations, agricultural resources, and existing communities compared to the proposed project.

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 3 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.4.1	Conflict with a general plan designation or zoning	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.4.2	Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.4.3	Be incompatible with the existing land use in the vicinity	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.4.4	Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impact to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)	No impact	No impact
3.4.5	Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)	No impact	No impact
3.4.6	Cumulative land use impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable

## Noise

Alternative 3 would develop the project site with office/retail uses for a total of 53,930 square feet of office and retail/restaurant space and would not include residential uses. Alternative 3 would introduce new noise sources in the project area during both project construction and operation. Traffic noise, and noise associated with new office/retail buildings such as from HVAC systems, would increase noise in the project area. Construction of Alternative 3 would also result in groundborne vibrations that could impact sensitive buildings in the project area. As such, mitigation measure **MM 3.2.1b** would be required.

## 4.0 ALTERNATIVES

As described in Section 3.5, Noise, the proposed project would introduce new noise sources in the project area during construction and during operation. In comparison to existing traffic noise levels, the project would result in a predicted increase in traffic noise levels of approximately 1.2 dBA at maximum along Fairview Avenue. Project operation would require the installation of HVAC systems that would also increase noise in the project area. Nonetheless, none of the increases would be over the significance thresholds, and the proposed project impacts would be less than significant. It is expected that increases in ambient noise levels during operation would be slightly greater than the project under Alternative 3 because of increased trip generation (see the discussion of transportation and traffic below). However, like the project, operational noise impacts under Alternative 3 would remain less than significant. Construction phase noise impacts from Alternative 3 would be similar to those of the proposed project given the similar intensity of daily construction activities. Like the project, Alternative 3 would increase overall ambient noise levels during both construction and operation; however, noise impacts would be less than significant.

Project construction would generate vibrations that would expose fragile buildings to potential vibration impacts, similar to Alternative 3, and the same mitigation measure would be required. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have similar impacts compared with the proposed project regarding groundborne vibration.

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 3 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.5.1	Exposure to noise levels in excess of established standards	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.5.2	Exposure to groundborne vibration	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.5.3	Substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.5.4	Substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant with mitigation
3.5.5	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels	No impact	No impact
3.5.6	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels	No impact	No impact
3.5.7	Cumulative noise impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable

### Public Services

Alternative 3 would develop the project site with office/retail uses for a total of 53,930 square feet of office and retail/restaurant space and would not include residential uses. Since there is no residential component, Alternative 3 would not increase the number of school-age children in the project area; thus, there would be no new enrollment in SPUSD schools.

As discussed in Section 3.6, Public Services, the project would add school-age children to at-capacity SPUSD schools. As such, Alternative 3 would have fewer impacts compared with the proposed project to public services.

<b>Draft EIR Impact Number</b>	<b>Impact Topic</b>	<b>Alternative 3 Impact Significance</b>	<b>Proposed Project Impact Significance</b>
3.6.1	Increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical services	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.6.2	Increased demand for law enforcement services	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.6.3	Increased demand for school facilities	No impact	Less than significant
3.6.4	Cumulative school demand impacts	No impact	Less than significant
3.6.5	Increased demand for parks and recreation facilities	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.6.6	Increased demand for other public services	Not cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable

**Utilities and Service Systems**

Alternative 3 would develop the project site with office/retail uses for a total of 53,930 square feet of office and retail/restaurant space and would not include residential uses. Water demand for office and restaurant/retail uses would vary, depending on the type of tenants selected for the project’s buildings. Office space occupancy would be higher than the 200 full-time residents that the proposed project would include; however, office use water demand per capita tends to be lower than residential water demand per capita. Alternative 3 could result in more restaurant space than the proposed project, depending on the tenant mix. While restaurants are more water intensive than typical retail or office uses, such potential increase in water demand for Alternative 3 would be offset by the reduction in the overall scale of development from the proposed project. The area of landscaping under Alternative 3 is expected to be equivalent to the proposed project; thus, water demand for irrigation would be unchanged from the project. As such, for the purposes of this analysis, the water demand for Alternative 3 is considered similar to that of the proposed project. Therefore, like the project, the water demand of Alternative 3 would be accommodated by the City of South Pasadena and would not have a significant impact on water supplies in the project area.

As described in Section 3.7, Utilities and Service Systems, the proposed project would have a total water demand of approximately 36,400 gallons per day. This represents approximately 0.8 percent of projected citywide demand during a normal year and 0.7 percent of projected citywide demand during a single dry year.

Because Alternative 3 uses would be similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have similar impacts compared with the proposed project to utilities.

## 4.0 ALTERNATIVES

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 3 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.7.1	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.2	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.3	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.4	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.5	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.6	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.7	Increased demand for electrical, natural gas, and telecommunications services	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.8	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7.9	Cumulative water supply impacts	Not cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable

### Transportation and Traffic

Alternative 3 would develop the project site with office/retail uses for a total of 53,930 square feet of office and retail/restaurant space and would not include residential uses. Alternative 3 would generate a similar amount of construction traffic, since daily construction intensity would be similar to the proposed project. Traffic generation rates for office and restaurant/retail uses are different than for residential uses and tend to be higher even for infill development. Office uses generate more trips during AM and PM peak travel times, while residential trips tend to be more disbursed throughout the day. As such, Alternative 3 would have a potentially significant impact on circulation systems and congestion management polices in the project area.

The proposed project would generate approximately 1,735 daily trips, 71 AM peak-hour trips (24 inbound and 47 outbound), and 150 PM peak-hour trips (87 inbound and 63 outbound). As discussed in Section 3.8, Transportation and Traffic, the project would not have any significant and unavoidable impacts on project traffic in the area or on pedestrian and transit systems.

Alternative 3 would generate more vehicular trips than the proposed project because of the increase in retail/restaurant space and the introduction of office use. Trip generation rates for office/retail uses are higher than those for residential uses; therefore, impacts on project area traffic would be greater under Alternative 3.

Draft EIR Impact Number	Impact Topic	Alternative 3 Impact Significance	Proposed Project Impact Significance
3.8.1	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy	Potentially significant	Less than significant
3.8.2	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program	Potentially significant	Less than significant
3.8.3	Air traffic pattern impacts under existing plus project conditions	No impact	No impact
3.8.4	Increased hazards due to a design feature	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.8.5	Emergency access impacts under existing plus project conditions	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.8.6	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.8.7	Result in inadequate parking capacity	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.8.9	Cumulative traffic impacts	Cumulatively considerable	Not cumulatively considerable

#### 4.0.7 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

**Table 4.0-3** summarizes the potential impacts of the alternatives evaluated in this section, as compared with the project's impacts. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2), if the "no project" alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative, an environmentally superior alternative must be identified from among the other alternatives. The environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would result in the fewest or least significant environmental impacts. As described above, under the no project alternative, there would be no significant and unavoidable impacts and project impacts would be lessened. Therefore, Alternative 1, No Project, would be the environmentally superior alternative.

Among the build alternatives, Alternative 2, Reduced Development, would be the environmentally superior alternative. Alternative 2 would result in fewer environmental impacts due to a reduction in the number of residential units. Alternative 2 would reduce project impacts from the residential component of the project by approximately 36 percent and thus would result in fewer overall environmental impacts. However, since the proposed project would not cause any significant and unavoidable impacts, Alternative 2 would not avoid or substantially lessen any such impacts. Likewise, Alternative 2 would not avoid or substantially lessen any significant but mitigable environmental impacts, and all mitigation measures required for the project to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level would be required for Alternative 2. Alternative 3 would potentially result in more environmental impacts as they relate to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and traffic. Further, Alternative 3 could generate more daily AM peak-hour and PM peak-hour vehicle trips than the proposed project and thus could have potentially significant impacts on circulation systems and congestion management policies.

## 4.0 ALTERNATIVES

**TABLE 4.0-3  
SUMMARY COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

<b>Resource Category</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>Alternative 1 No Project</b>	<b>Alternative 2 Reduced Development</b>	<b>Alternative 3 Office/Retail Use</b>
Air Quality	LTSM	NI	LTSM (-)	LTSM (+)
Cultural Resources	LTSM	NI	LTSM	LTSM
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	LTS	NI	LTS (-)	LTS (+)
Land Use and Planning	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS
Noise and Vibration	LTSM	NI	LTSM	LTSM
Public Services	LTS	NI	LTS (-)	LTS (-)
Utilities and Service Systems	LTS	NI	LTS (-)	LTS
Transportation and Traffic	LTS	NI	LTS(-)	PS

Notes:

*PS: Potentially Significant*

*LTSM: Less Than Significant with Mitigation*

*LTS: Less Than Significant*

*NI: No Impact*

*(+) Classification of impact is unchanged but impact is more severe than the proposed project.*

*(-) Classification of impact is unchanged but impact is less severe than the proposed project.*