

## 4.0 ALTERNATIVES

---

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an environmental impact report (EIR) contain an analysis describing a range of reasonable alternatives to a project that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project while avoiding or substantially lessening any significant impacts. The analysis also evaluates the comparative merits of the alternatives (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6). Alternatives that avoid or substantially reduce significant impacts are considered, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives or would be more costly to the project applicant (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(b)). An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project, but rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(a)).

The project has been described and analyzed in the previous chapters with an emphasis on potentially significant and unavoidably significant impacts. The analysis in this section is intended to inform the public and decision-makers of alternatives to the project and to provide a meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison of these alternatives with the proposed project. As required by CEQA, this chapter also includes an analysis of the No Project Alternative.

### 4.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE UPDATED 2009 REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

Key objectives of the proposed Updated 2009 Redevelopment Plan are to

- eliminate blight on the Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town sites;
- extend the time limit of the effectiveness of the Plan in the Dynamite Project Area and reinstate eminent domain powers on certain parcels of land in Dynamite Project Area;
- expand the supply of low- and moderate-income housing;
- expand job opportunities for jobless, underemployed, and low-income persons;
- protect and promote the sound development of the entire redevelopment area and the general welfare of the residents in the adjacent and surrounding neighborhoods by remedying blighting conditions;
- facilitate the reuse of abandoned industrial properties in a manner that complements the surrounding land uses; and
- attain consistency among the land use designations for the subject sites in the City's *General Plan* and *Zoning Ordinance*.

## 4.2 IMPACTS OF THE UPDATED 2009 REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

To develop project alternatives, the City considered the project objectives and reviewed the significant impacts of the proposed project, identified those impacts that could substantially be avoided or reduced through an alternative, and determined the appropriate range of alternatives to be analyzed. **Section 3.0, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures**, of this EIR evaluates the potential for the proposed project to result in significant impacts to the following environmental topics: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems. All impacts were found to be less than significant or less than significant after incorporation of mitigation measures, with the exception of certain impacts related to air quality, which were found to be significant and unavoidable.

### 4.2.1 Aesthetics

**Section 3.1, Aesthetics**, of this EIR identified potentially significant impacts related to scenic resources (Impact Aes-2), visual character (Impact Aes-3), and light and glare (Impact Aes-4). The impacts related to scenic resources and visual character could not be reduced to a less than significant level with project-level mitigation. These aesthetic impacts of the proposed project would remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation.

### 4.2.2 Air Quality

**Section 3.2, Air Quality**, identified potentially significant impacts related to consistency with the Clean Air Plan (Impact AQ-1), toxic air contaminants (Impact AQ-3), violation of BAAQMD air quality standards (Impact AQ-5), and cumulative impacts related to increases in PM10 emissions (Impact AQ-8). These impacts would be significant and unavoidable impacts after mitigation.

### 4.2.3 Biological Resources

**Section 3.3, Biological Resources**, of this EIR identified potentially significant impacts related to sensitive habitats and wetlands (Impact Bio-1), special-status species (Impact Bio-2), and conflicts with the City's *General Plan* as it relates to open space and wetlands (Impact Bio-3), which could be reduced to a less than significant level with project-level mitigation. No significant and unavoidable impacts were identified for biological resources.

### 4.2.4 Cultural Resources

**Section 3.4, Cultural Resources**, of this EIR, identified potentially significant impacts on archaeological resources (Impact Cult-1), paleontological resources (Impact Cult-2), and human remains (Impact Cult-3)

which could be reduced to a less than significant level with project-level mitigation. No significant unavoidable impacts were identified related to cultural resources.

#### **4.2.5 Geology and Soils**

**Section 3.5, Geology and Soils**, identified a potentially significant impact related to exposure of people and structures to seismic ground-shaking hazards (Impact Geo-2), which would be reduced to a less than significant level with project-specific mitigation. This section also identified less than significant impacts related to rupture of an earthquake fault, landslide hazards, substantial soil erosion, and hazard associated with expansive soils. No significant and unavoidable impacts were identified related to geology.

#### **4.2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

**Section 3.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials**, identified potentially significant impacts related to release of hazardous materials from the former industrial uses on site (Impact Haz-1) and transport of hazardous materials (Impact Haz-5). No significant unavoidable impacts were identified for hazards.

#### **4.2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality**

**Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality**, identified potentially significant impacts related to alteration in drainage patterns (Impact Hyd-2) and flooding (Impact Hyd-3), which would be reduced to a less than significant level with project-specific mitigation. No significant and unavoidable impacts were identified for hydrology and water quality.

#### **4.2.8 Land Use and Planning**

**Section 3.8, Land Use and Planning**, identified less than significant impacts. No significant unavoidable impacts were identified related to land use.

#### **4.2.9 Noise**

**Section 3.9, Noise**, identified significant impacts related to exposure of site residents to ambient noise above City thresholds (Impact Noise-2) and construction noise (Impact Noise-3). Impacts related to increases in ambient noise levels could not be reduced to a less than significant level with project-specific mitigation, and these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### 4.2.10 Population and Housing

Section 3.10, **Population and Housing**, identified less than significant impacts. No significant unavoidable impacts were identified related to population and housing.

#### 4.2.11 Public Services

Section 3.11, **Public Services**, identified less than significant impacts. No significant unavoidable impacts were identified related to public services.

#### 4.2.12 Transportation and Circulation

Section 3.12, **Transportation and Circulation**, identified potentially significant impacts related to levels of service at local intersections (Impact Traf-1) and transit operations (Impact Traf-4). The project traffic would make a potentially considerable contribution to the cumulative (2035) traffic congestion impact (Impact Traf-5). These impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with project-specific mitigation, and no significant unavoidable impacts were identified for transportation and circulation.

#### 4.2.13 Utilities and Service Systems

Section 3.13, **Utilities and Service Systems**, identified potentially significant impacts related to wastewater treatment capacity (Impact USS-1), which would be reduced to a less than significant level with project-specific mitigation. No significant unavoidable impacts were identified for utilities and service systems.

### 4.3 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

#### 4.3.1 Alternatives Considered But Not Evaluated in Detail

This section discusses alternatives that were considered for the project but were not evaluated in detail because they did not meet project objectives or were found to be infeasible for technical, environmental, or social reasons.

#### *Alternative Parcels for Inclusion in Redevelopment Plan Area*

Alternative parcels for the Hercules Redevelopment Project Area No. 3 could achieve some of the project objectives identified for the Updated 2009 Redevelopment Plan, including extending the time limit of the effectiveness of the plan and reinstating eminent domain powers in the Dynamite Project Area; expanding the supply of low- and moderate-income housing; expanding job opportunities for jobless, underemployed, and low-income persons; and protecting and promoting the sound development of the

entire redevelopment area. However, an alternative involving the use of other parcels was dismissed from consideration as alternatives because it would not avoid nor substantially lessen any of the project's significant and unavoidable impacts. In addition, no suitable alternative parcels for establishing a new redevelopment project area that meet the requirements of the CRL have been identified

### ***Alternative General Plan Land Use Designations and Zoning***

Alternative zoning and *General Plan* designations for the Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town sites were dismissed from consideration because alternative designations would not attain the basic project objective of attaining consistency among the City's Zoning Map, *General Plan*, and *Regulating Code for the Central Hercules Plan*.

#### **4.3.2 Alternatives Considered in Detail**

As noted earlier in this section, the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, and noise. There would also be potentially significant or significant impacts related to aesthetics, biology, cultural resources, geology, hydrology and water quality, noise, and traffic; these would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation measures. In all other resource areas, the project's impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the focus of this alternatives analysis is the ability of the alternatives presented below to avoid or minimize the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project, especially the significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality. The following alternatives were evaluated in detail for their ability to avoid or minimize the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. Note that in the discussion below, resource areas where project impacts would be less than significant are also discussed with the view to determine whether the alternatives would further reduce less than significant impacts of the proposed project and also to determine whether the alternative would result in a significant impact on a resource area where the project would not result in a significant impact.

#### ***Alternative 1: No Project***

CEQA requires that a "No Project" alternative be considered. "No Project" is generally considered to be equivalent to a "no development" alternative. With this alternative, the proposed project would not be implemented. However, both the existing Redevelopment Plan Area and the Added Area are designated for development by the *General Plan*; thus, future development could be constructed within these areas if the Updated 2009 Redevelopment Plan were not adopted.

## Relationship to Project Objectives

Alternative 1 would not achieve any of the project's key objectives identified above.

## Comparative Analysis of Impacts

### *Aesthetics*

There would be no impact to aesthetics if the proposed Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town projects were not built in the Added Area. However, since the existing Redevelopment Plan Area and the Added Area are designated for development by the *General Plan*, future development could occur in the area and there could be similar or greater impacts to scenic resources as identified for the proposed project.

### *Air Quality*

There would be no impact to air quality if the proposed Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town projects were not built in the Added Area. However, since the existing Redevelopment Plan Area and the Added Area are designated for development by the *General Plan*, future development could occur in the area and there could be similar air quality impacts as identified for the proposed project.

### *Biological Resources*

There would be no impact to on-site and off-site biological resources if the proposed Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town projects were not built in the Added Area. However, since the existing Redevelopment Plan Area and the Added Area are designated for development by the *General Plan*, future development could occur in the area and there could be similar biological resource impacts as identified for the proposed project.

### *Cultural Resources*

There would be no impact to cultural resources if the proposed Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town projects were not built in the Added Area. However, the existing Redevelopment Plan Area and the Added Area are designated for development by the *General Plan*, and there could be similar impacts on cultural resources from future development in the area.

### *Geology and Soils*

There would be no impact related to geology and soils if the proposed Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town projects were not built in the Added Area. However, since the existing Redevelopment Plan Area and the Added Area are designated for development by the *General Plan*, future development could occur in the area and there could be similar geology and soil impacts as identified for the proposed project.

### ***Hazards and Hazardous Materials***

Impacts associated with removal of hazardous materials from the site would occur with or without implementation of the Update 2009 Redevelopment Plan. Since the existing Redevelopment Plan Area and the Added Area are designated for development by the *General Plan*, future development could occur in the area and there could be similar hazards impacts as identified for the Hill Town site.

### ***Hydrology and Water Quality***

There would be no impact to hydrology and water quality if the proposed Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town projects were not built in the Added Area. However, since the existing Redevelopment Plan Area and the Added Area are designated for development by the *General Plan*, future development could occur in the area and there could be similar hydrology and water quality impacts as identified for the proposed project.

### ***Land Use and Planning***

There would be no impact to land use if the proposed general plan and zoning amendments were not adopted and the Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town projects were not built in the Added Area. However, since the existing Redevelopment Plan Area and the Added Area are designated for development by the *General Plan*, future development could occur in the area and there could be similar land use and planning impacts as identified for the proposed project.

### ***Noise***

There would be no impact related to noise if the proposed Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town projects were not built in the Added Area. However, since the existing Redevelopment Plan Area and the Added Area are designated for development by the *General Plan*, future development could occur in the area and there could be similar noise impacts, as identified for the proposed project.

### ***Population and Housing***

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town projects would not be built in the Added Area. However, the existing Redevelopment Plan Area and the Added Area are designated for development by the *General Plan*. Therefore, population and housing impacts similar to those described for the proposed project could occur.

### ***Public Services***

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town projects would not be built in the Added Area. Therefore, there would be no impacts related to public services. However, the

existing Redevelopment Plan Area and the Added Area are designated for development by the *General Plan*. Therefore, less than significant impacts on public services similar to those described for the proposed project could occur.

#### ***Transportation and Traffic***

There would be no impact related to transportation and traffic if the proposed Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town projects were not built in the Added Area. However, since the existing Redevelopment Plan Area and the Added Area are designated for development by the *General Plan*, future development could occur in the area and could increase traffic conditions similar to the impacts identified for the proposed project.

#### ***Utilities and Service Systems***

There would be no impact related to utilities if the proposed Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town projects were not built in the Added Area. However, since the existing Redevelopment Plan Area and the Added Area are designated for development by the *General Plan*, future development could occur in the area and could increase the demand for utilities services, similar to the impacts identified for the proposed project.

#### ***Cumulative Impacts***

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town projects would not be built in the Added Area. Therefore, all of the cumulative impacts would be avoided, including the significant and unavoidable air quality impact. However, the existing Redevelopment Plan Area and the Added Area are designated for development by the *General Plan*. Depending on the development that actually occurs under the existing land use plans and zoning, cumulative impacts similar to those described for the proposed project could occur.

#### ***Alternative 2: Reduced Density Alternative***

This alternative would include a reduced level of development on the Sycamore Crossing site, with approximately 100,000 square feet of retail space, 40 residential townhouses, a 180-room hotel, a 30,000-square-foot supermarket, 40,000 square feet of office space, and two multi-story garages. Access, parking, circulation, and landscape features would be generally similar to those included in the proposed project. Development of the Hill Town site was assumed to have the same number of residential units (640) as under the proposed project, but with fewer buildings and development more closely clustered primarily in the southern and eastern portions of the site. Development would include the courtyard housing (shown in brown on **Figure 3.1-3**), the rowhouses (shown in light tan), and the townhomes (shown in purple). The podium courtyard housing in the east-central portion of the site (shown in green) would be



eliminated and the townhouses in the northern portion of the site would be reduced in height or relocated to avoid visual intrusion above the dominant ridgeline.

The Reduced Density Alternative would amend the City's existing redevelopment plan to include the Added Area and would include the same general plan amendments and zoning code amendments.

### **Relationship to Project Objectives**

The Reduced Density Alternative would achieve many of the project objectives, including eliminating blight in the Added Area, extending the time limit of the effectiveness of the Plan in the Dynamite Project Area and reinstating eminent domain powers on certain parcels of land in Dynamite Project Area, and promoting reuse of abandoned industrial properties. It would not expand the housing supply or job opportunities to the extent that the proposed project would.

### **Comparative Analysis of Impacts**

#### *Aesthetics*

Impacts to scenic resources and visual character for the proposed Sycamore Crossing project would be potentially significant due to the project's conversion of vacant land to urban development. Mitigation measures identified in **Section 3.1, Aesthetics**, would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Under Alternative 2, the amount of development on the site would be lower in density and possibly in height. Impacts would be similar to but could be slightly reduced from those of the proposed project. **MM AES-2** would apply to this alternative and would reduce the potential aesthetic impacts of the Sycamore Crossing site to a less than significant level.

Under the proposed project, impacts to scenic resources and visual character for the Hill Town project would be significant and unavoidable due to the project's conversion of highly visible open space to urban development. Under Alternative 2, the Hill Town site would be developed in a manner that would concentrate buildings in the less visible southern and eastern portions of the site. This would reduce the visual prominence of the development from public viewpoints, including those along San Pablo Avenue and I-80. Alternative 2 would eliminate the most visually prominent aspect of the project, the podium courtyard housing (highlighted in green in the post-development views in **Figure 3.1-3**). Increasing the density of buildings elsewhere on site would likely block some scenic vistas for viewers within the Hill Town site. However, as discussed in **Section 3.1**, impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant because the topography of the Hill Town site blocks distant views from off-site locations and because there are no publicly accessible viewpoints from within the site under existing conditions. Impacts related to scenic resources and visual character would be significant under Alternative 2 because it, like the

proposed project, would dramatically alter the visual character of the site from open space to urban uses. The impacts of Alternative 2 would be somewhat reduced compared to the proposed project, and **MM AES-2** would apply to this alternative and would further reduce these impacts to some extent. However, as with the proposed project, the changes to the project site would be highly visible, and impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

### *Air Quality*

The proposed project would have significant impacts to air quality. Impacts related to criteria air pollutant emissions in excess of the BAAQMD annual or daily thresholds, as well as impacts related to compliance with the applicable clean air plan, would be significant and unavoidable even after implementation of mitigation. All other impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level by mitigation measures identified in **Section 3.2, Air Quality**. Alternative 2 would facilitate development of the Added Area in a manner similar to the proposed project but at a somewhat lower intensity. The primary source of air emissions from project development would be from emissions from vehicle trips generated by new residents and employees. Total vehicle trips for Alternative 2 would be approximately 79 percent of those of the proposed project. Vehicle-related emissions would be expected to be reduced by a corresponding amount. **MM AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3, AQ-5, and AQ-6** would apply to Alternative 2 and would reduce most of these impacts to a less than significant level. For impacts related to criteria air pollutant emissions above the BAAQMD annual or daily thresholds, Alternative 2 would reduce ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions to below the BAAQMD daily threshold. With the implementation of mitigation measures, PM<sub>10</sub> emissions would be reduced to 79.9 pounds per day, fractionally below the PM<sub>10</sub> threshold of 80 pounds per day. Based on the air emissions model, Alternative 2 would therefore reduce this impact to a less than significant level. However, because emissions would be very close to the threshold and the efficacy of mitigation cannot be calculated to such a level of precision, this EIR concludes conservatively that, as with the proposed project, impacts related to PM<sub>10</sub> emissions could remain significant and unavoidable under Alternative 2.

### *Biological Resources*

Impacts to biological resources are related to the land area that would be disturbed by project development. **Section 3.3, Biological Resources**, identified several potentially significant impacts related to development of the Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town sites. Because Alternative 2 would facilitate the development of the majority of both sites with new buildings, pavement, and landscaping, impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project. **MM BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, and BIO-4** would apply to Alternative 2 and would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

### *Cultural Resources*

Impacts to cultural resources are related to the land area that would be disturbed by project development. **Section 3.4, Cultural Resources**, identified several potentially significant impacts related to site disturbance during construction of the Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town sites. Because Alternative 2 would facilitate the development of the majority of both sites in a manner that could disturb unidentified buried cultural resources, impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project. **MM CUL-1, CUL-2,** and **CUL-3** would apply to Alternative 2 and would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

#### *Geology and Soils*

**Section 3.5, Geology and Soils**, identified potentially significant impacts related to seismic risks from development of the Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town sites. Because Alternative 2 would facilitate the development of the majority of both sites with new structures, impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project. **MM GEO-1** and **GEO-2** would apply to Alternative 2 and would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

#### *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*

Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials result both from the presence of hazardous materials on the proposed project site and from the proposed project's potential to release hazardous materials into the environment during and after construction. **Section 3.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials**, identified several potentially significant impacts related to decommissioning and dismantling hazardous materials facilities at the Hill Town site and development of the Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town sites. Because Alternative 2 would involve the decommissioning and dismantling of existing hazardous materials facilities at Hill Town and would facilitate the development of the majority of both sites with new structures, impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project. **MM HAZ-1a** through **HAZ-1c,** **HAZ-2e** through **HAZ-2h,** **HAZ-3d,** and **HAZ-5** would apply to Alternative 2 and would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

#### *Hydrology and Water Quality*

Impacts to hydrology and water quality are related to the land area that would be disturbed by project development. **Section 3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality**, identified several potentially significant impacts related to development of the Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town sites. Because Alternative 2 would facilitate the development of the majority of both sites with new buildings, pavement, and landscaping, impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project. **MM HYD-2** and **HYD-3** would apply to Alternative 2 and would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

### *Land Use and Planning*

Land use and planning impacts are related both to the land area that would be disturbed by project development and to the total population increase associated with development of the Added Area. As discussed in **Section 3.8, Land Use and Planning**, the development of the Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town sites would not conflict with the *General Plan* or any regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Because Alternative 2 would facilitate the development of both sites to be consistent with the *General Plan* and other land use regulations, Alternative 2 would result in a less than significant impact.

### *Noise*

Potential noise and vibration impacts include effects of noise and vibration that would be generated by the proposed project on nearby sensitive land uses, as well as the existing noise from adjacent uses and highways that could impact proposed land uses. **Section 3.9, Noise**, identified several potentially significant impacts related to development of the Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town sites. Impacts related to increased roadway noise in the project vicinity were conservatively assessed as significant and unavoidable. Alternative 2 would involve increased noise levels during construction similar to those of the proposed project. **MM NOI-3a** through **NOI-3e** would apply to Alternative 2 and would reduce the impact to a less than significant level. As mentioned above, total vehicle trips for Alternative 2 would be approximately 79 percent of those of the proposed project, which would result in less roadway noise. **MM NOI-1** and **MM NOI-2** would apply to Alternative 2 and, based on the assumed decrease in noise levels, could reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

### *Population and Housing*

Impacts to population and housing are related to the number of homes or people displaced or population growth induced by project development. As discussed in **Section 3.10, Population and Housing**, development of the Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town sites would result in population growth consistent with the City's *General Plan*. Because Alternative 2 would involve population growth similar to that of the proposed project, it would have a less than significant impact on population and housing.

### *Public Services*

Impacts to public services are related to the population growth induced by project development. As discussed in **Section 3.11, Public Services**, development of the Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town sites would result in less than significant impacts to public services. Because Alternative 2 would involve population growth similar to that of the proposed project, it would have a less than significant impact on public services.

### *Transportation and Traffic*

Impacts to transportation and traffic are related to trips generated by project development. As discussed in **Section 3.12, Transportation and Circulation**, development of the proposed Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town sites, together with development proposed or approved for other sites in Hercules, would cause significant impacts to intersection levels of service (LOS) in the site vicinity. As shown in **Table 4.0-1, Weekday Trip Generation – Alternative 2**, total vehicle trips for Alternative 2 would be approximately 79 percent of those of the proposed project. Traffic-related impacts would be expected to be reduced by a corresponding amount, and could be reduced to a less than significant level for certain intersections. However, the overall increase in traffic associated with Alternative 2 would be significant. **MM TRAF-1** and **TRAF-5** would apply to Alternative 2 and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

### *Utilities and Service Systems*

Impacts to utilities and service systems are related to the land disturbed and the population growth induced by project development. **Section 3.13, Utilities and Service Systems**, identified potentially significant impacts related to development of the Sycamore Crossing and Hill Town sites. Because Alternative 2 would facilitate the development of the majority of both sites with new buildings, pavement, and landscaping, impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project. **MM USS-1** and **USS-3** would apply to Alternative 2 and would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

### *Cumulative Impacts*

The cumulative impacts of Alternative 2 would be similar to those described for the proposed project. Although the reduction of total vehicle trips for Alternative 2 would reduce impacts related to air quality, noise, and transportation and traffic, these impacts would still be cumulatively considerable in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development and would result in significant and unavoidable impacts.

**Table 4.0-1  
Weekday Trip Generation – Alternative 2**

	Units/ksf	AM Peak Hour Trips				PM Peak Hour Trips				Daily Trips						
		Rates	%Enter	Trips	%Exit	Trips	Rates	%Enter	Trips	%Exit	Trips	Rates	%Enter	Trips	%Exit	Trips
<b>Sycamore Crossing Site</b>																
Condo/Townhouses (ITE 230)	40	0.44	17%	3	83%	15	0.52	67%	14	33%	7	5.86	50%	117	50%	117
(-) Public transit use 10%						-2			-1		-1			-12		-12
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>3</b>		<b>13</b>			<b>13</b>		<b>6</b>			<b>105</b>		<b>105</b>
Retail (Specialty Retail ITE-814)	40	0	0%	0	0%	0	2.71	44%	48	56%	61	44.32	50%	886	50%	886
Retail (Specialty Retail ITE-814)	60	0	0%	0	0%	0	2.71	44%	72	56%	91	44.32	50%	1330	50%	1330
(-) Pass-by/Internal 20%									-24		-30			-443		-443
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>			<b>95</b>		<b>122</b>			<b>1773</b>		<b>1773</b>
Hotel (ITE 310)	180	0.67	58%	70	42%	51	0.70	49%	62	51%	64	8.17	50%	735	50%	735
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>70</b>		<b>51</b>			<b>62</b>		<b>64</b>			<b>735</b>		<b>735</b>
Supermarket (ITE 850)	30	3.25	61%	59	39%	38	10.45	51%	160	49%	154	102.3	50%	1535	50%	1535
(-) Pass-by/Internal 20%				-12		-8			-32		-31			-307		-307
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>47</b>		<b>30</b>			<b>128</b>		<b>123</b>			<b>1228</b>		<b>1228</b>
Office (ITE 710)	40	1.55	88%	55	12%	7	1.19	17%	8	83%	40	11.01	50%	220	50%	220
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>55</b>		<b>7</b>			<b>8</b>		<b>40</b>			<b>220</b>		<b>220</b>
<b>Total</b>				<b>175</b>		<b>101</b>			<b>306</b>		<b>354</b>			<b>4061</b>		<b>4061</b>

	Units/ksf	AM Peak Hour Trips				PM Peak Hour Trips				Daily Trips						
		Rates	%Enter	Trips	%Exit	Trips	Rates	%Enter	Trips	%Exit	Trips	Rates	%Enter	Trips	%Exit	Trips
<b>Hill Town Site</b>																
Condo/Townhouses (ITE 230)	640	0.44	17%	48	83%	234	0.52	67%	223	33%	110	5.86	50%	1875	50%	1875
(-) Public transit use 10%				-5		-23			-22		-11			-188		-188
Retail (coffee shop-ITE 933 Table 1)	4	73.03	51%	149	49%	143	28.79	58%	67	42%	48	201.5	50%	403	50%	403
(-) Pass-by/Internal 50%				-75		-75			-33		-24			-201		-201
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>117</b>		<b>279</b>			<b>235</b>		<b>123</b>			<b>1889</b>		<b>1889</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>				<b>292</b>		<b>380</b>			<b>541</b>		<b>477</b>			<b>5950</b>		<b>5950</b>

Note: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 7<sup>th</sup> Edition.

#### 4.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires a comparative evaluation of alternatives to assess whether the alternative would result in similar, greater, or lesser environmental impacts than the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would avoid all of the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. This alternative would therefore be the environmentally superior alternative. It would, however, not meet any of the proposed project's objectives.

If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126(d) (2) requires that an EIR identify the environmentally superior alternative from amongst the other alternatives evaluated in the EIR.

Of the other alternatives evaluated in this EIR, the Reduced Density Alternative (Alternative 2) would reduce the project's significant and unavoidable aesthetic, air quality, noise, and traffic impacts as compared to the proposed project; although, it would not reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, Alternative 2 is considered the environmentally superior alternative. This alternative would meet most of the objectives of the proposed project.