



**SECTION 6.0**  
**ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

---

## 6.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

### 6.1 INTRODUCTION

CEQA requires EIRs to discuss a range of reasonable alternatives to a project, or to the project location, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(a)).

This section describes alternatives that satisfy these two criteria, i.e., alternatives which both: (a) attain most of the project's basic objectives; and (b) lessen the project's potentially significant environmental effects. Pursuant to Section 15126.6 (f)(1) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are "site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent)." Although these factors do not present a strict limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives to be considered, they help establish the context against which "the rule of reason" is measured when determining an appropriate range of alternatives sufficient to establish and foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making.

#### 6.1.1 ALTERNATIVES TO BE ANALYZED

The analysis focuses on alternatives capable of eliminating significant adverse environmental effects or reducing them to less than significant levels, even if these alternatives would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the project objectives. Potential environmental impacts associated with five separate alternatives are compared to impacts from the proposed project below.

These alternatives include:

Alternative One: No Project/No Development Alternative. No action would be taken to develop the project sites and the sites would remain in their existing state with surface parking and a commercial/retail use. Alternative One serves as the "No Project" Alternative in accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e).

Alternative Two: Corridors Specific Plan Conforming Alternative. Redevelopment of the project sites with mixed-use developments consistent with the development standards established by the *Corridors Specific Plan*.

Alternative Three: Parking Structures Alternative. Redevelopment of the project sites with stand-alone parking structures, consistent with the development standards established by the *Corridors Specific Plan*.

Alternative Four: Mixed-Use Commercial/Office Alternative. Redevelopment of the project sites with mixed-use developments primarily involving commercial and office uses.

Alternative Five: Cultural Arts Center/Open Courtyard Alternative. Redevelopment of the project sites with mixed-use developments primarily involving commercial and office uses with the exception of Parking Lots 8 and 10, which would be developed with either a cultural center and outdoor amphitheater or commercial uses surrounding an open courtyard area.

Alternative Six: Redistribution of Parking Alternative. Redevelopment of the project sites with mixed-use developments similar to the proposed project with public parking distributed between Lot 5 (Marbella) and Lots 8 and 10 (Plaza Del Sol).

Throughout the following analysis, impacts of the alternatives are analyzed for each of the issue areas examined in Section 5.0 of this EIR. In this manner, each alternative can be compared to the proposed project on an issue-by-issue basis. Table 6-1, Comparison of Alternatives, provides an overview of the alternatives analyzed and a comparison of each alternative's impact in relation to the proposed project.

Only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are relevant in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed project. The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts in the following environmental issue areas:

- Land Use
  - Consistency with *San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan* - Encroachment Permit for Lot 5 (Marbella) Development Scenario No. 1.
- Aesthetics
  - Short-Term Construction Aesthetic, Light, and Glare Impacts (Project)
- Traffic
  - Laurel Canyon Road/San Fernando Mission Boulevard (Project and Cumulative)
  - Glenoaks Boulevard/Maclay Avenue (Project and Cumulative)
- Air Quality

- Construction impacts would be significant and unavoidable due to the exceedances of the South Coast Air Quality Management District construction standards for ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions.
  - Operational impacts would be significant and unavoidable for ROG emissions in accordance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District standards.
  - Construction and operational impacts would be significant and unavoidable due to the exceedances of the Localized Significance Thresholds for PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions.
  - The proposed project would also conflict with the *2007 Air Quality Management Plan* in regards to exceedances of the South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds for operational emissions and cause a significant and unavoidable impact.
  - Cumulative construction and operational impacts would be significant and unavoidable.
- Noise
    - Short-Term Construction Noise Impacts

An EIR must identify an “environmentally superior” alternative and, where the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify as environmentally superior an alternative from among the others evaluated. Each alternative’s environmental impacts are compared to the proposed project and determined to be environmentally superior, inferior, or neutral. However, only those impacts found to be significant and unavoidable for the proposed project are used in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed project.

## 6.1.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The following objectives have been established for the San Fernando Mixed Use Development Projects:

The project is located within the *San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan* area. The purpose of the *Specific Plan* is to establish policies and strategies to transform the corridors along Truman Street, San Fernando Road, and Maclay Avenue into attractive, livable, and economically vital districts. The six overall objectives identified in the *Specific Plan* are:

- Objective #1 Establish the City’s corridors as the armature of the City.
- Objective #2 Remedy the feeling of “sprawl” on the corridors.
- Objective #3 Attract new investment appropriate to the envisioned character of the corridors.
- Objective #4 Revitalize the identity and investment climate of the City as a whole.

Objective #5 Make walking and driving along the corridors a more pleasant experience by improving the physical settings of corridor streets.

Objective #6 Use the corridors to enhance San Fernando's identity to visitors.

The project is proposed to assist in achieving the overall intent of the *Specific Plan*. The following project objectives are consistent with the objectives of the *Specific Plan*.

#### Land Use Planning

- Provide development that reflects the vision and intent of the *San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan*, including specific development standards, design guidelines, and site improvements.
- Expand residential opportunities within the Downtown District and in close proximity to existing retail and commercial uses.
- Provide residents with an increased variety of housing options.
- Provide a mix of residential, employment, retail, and commercial uses that encourage activity within the Downtown District.
- Provide storefront retail and commercial uses that accommodate pedestrian-friendly amenities at the street level.
- Provide development that is compatible with surrounding land uses.

#### Economic

- Create economically feasible mixed-use development that improves the City's existing surface public parking lots, increases the City's tax revenue, and provides additional retail, commercial, and housing opportunities in the City.
- Dedicate 20 percent of total residential units for low- to moderate-income households.
- Increase the City's economic base by providing new tax revenue generated from retail sales, commercial uses, residential property tax, and increased assessed value of land and buildings.

#### Circulation

- Provide efficient circulation patterns both on and off the project site(s) that are consistent with the objectives and policies of the *Specific Plan* and that minimize traffic congestion.

#### Parking

- Allow for a more efficient use of surface parking lots while maintaining sufficient public parking within the Area.
- Provide sufficient parking to meet the needs of the project.
- Replace the loss of public parking spaces in surface lots with parking structures on the project site(s).

### Architecture/Aesthetics

- Design buildings with articulation expressed in exterior treatment on all sides.
- Design corner buildings that create street edge and identity, giving prominence to the corner on which they are sited.
- Provide incorporated parking that will not be the focal point of any project.
- Improve the visual character and identity of the City's built environment.
- Encourage quality design that enhances the overall appearance of the Downtown District.
- Use architectural elements and details that reflect primarily Mission, Spanish Colonial Revival, Mediterranean, and Monterey styles.

### Pedestrian Issues

- Provide a safe, efficient, and aesthetically attractive street system that includes pedestrian-friendly walkways in the Downtown District.
- Encourage a human-scale and a pedestrian-friendly environment.
- Design buildings to provide both interest and activity at the pedestrian level.

## **6.2 ALTERNATIVE ONE: NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE**

### **6.2.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE**

The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes that the project would not be implemented and the project sites would remain in their current condition. With this Alternative, the proposed Development Agreement, Variances, Encroachment Permits, and associated ministerial permits, as well as development of new residential (up to 272 units), commercial and retail/restaurant uses (61,348 square feet) would not occur. Additionally, the proposed parking structures would not be constructed. The existing surface parking lots and single-story commercial building (Firestone Tires) would remain on-site.

### **6.2.2 IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

#### **LAND USE**

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in any development on the project sites, and as such would not require a variance or encroachment permit. Therefore, a significant unavoidable impact would not occur in this regard. Additionally, this Alternative would not conflict with any goals or policies of the City of San Fernando General Plan or Zoning Ordinance or SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide or Growth Visioning Report, similar to the proposed project. No additional entitlements would be required under

this Alternative. However, this Alternative would be inconsistent with the goals of the Redevelopment Plan, which seek to encourage commercial rehabilitation and planned new commercial developments and to increase and improve the community's supply of housing affordable to very low-, low- and moderate-income persons. Additionally, this Alternative would be inconsistent with the *San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan*, which establishes policies and strategies to transform Truman Street, San Fernando Road, and Maclay Avenue into an attractive, livable and economically vital district. As both the proposed project and this Alternative would result in significant and unavoidable land use impacts, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered neither environmentally inferior nor superior to the proposed project in this regard.

### **AESTHETICS, LIGHT, AND GLARE**

The No Project/No Development Alternative would maintain the current views of and across the project sites from off-site vantage points. Construction-related visual impacts would not occur with this Alternative. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not obstruct current existing views of and across the project sites with development of new residential, commercial, retail/restaurant and parking uses. Additionally, under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no new light sources would be created. The No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

### **TRAFFIC**

Under this Alternative, no development would occur on-site, and therefore no additional traffic would be added to the local roadway network. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not increase traffic levels, or affect levels of service or overall traffic system function. Because this Alternative would not adversely affect traffic levels or traffic facilities relative to existing conditions, this Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

### **PARKING**

Existing and proposed project parking conditions were evaluated within the downtown parking study area. Parking capacity currently exists within the downtown study area to serve existing parking demand. This would continue with the No Project/No Development Alternative. Since the proposed project would provide adequate parking capacity to serve projected demand during construction and operation of the project, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered neither environmentally inferior nor superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **AIR QUALITY**

Demolition, grading and construction activities associated with the proposed project would not occur with this Alternative. Construction impacts, which have been concluded to exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District construction standards for ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions, would not occur with this Alternative. The No Project/No Development Alternative would be consistent with the regional air quality plan, as it would not exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds for operational emissions. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in significant operational impacts for ROG emissions and would not exceed localized significant thresholds for PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions. The No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project since no significant construction air emissions would occur.

## **NOISE**

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no additional land uses would be developed within the project sites. Nearby sensitive receptors would not be subjected to noise associated with construction activities or additional vehicular activity. New stationary and mobile noise sources would not occur and ambient noise levels would not increase. The No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project since significant short-term construction noise impacts would not occur.

## **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

This Alternative would not develop the project sites with any new urban uses, which would preclude the potential for adverse effects related to emergency response times and evacuation plans, or risks associated with hazardous materials on-site. Because no new development would occur that could result in increased risks related to emergency conditions or hazardous materials relative to existing conditions, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **FIRE PROTECTION**

An increased demand for fire protection services would not occur with the No Project/No Development Alternative, because no new land uses would be developed on the project sites. Since residential, commercial and retail/restaurant uses would not be developed, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **POLICE PROTECTION**

An increased demand for police protection services would not occur with the No Project/No Development Alternative, because no new land uses would be developed on the project sites. Since residential, commercial and retail/restaurant uses would not be developed, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **SCHOOLS**

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in an increased demand for school services, as no new residential uses would be developed on the project sites. Since residential uses would not be developed, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **PARKS AND RECREATION**

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in an increased demand for parks and recreation facilities and services, as no land uses would be developed on the project sites. Since residential, commercial and retail/restaurant uses would not be developed, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **WATER**

Increased demand for water would not occur with the No Project/No Development Alternative, because no land uses would be developed on the project site. Water impacts would be less than those associated with the proposed project, because the existing commercial use would still demand water, but new residential, commercial and retail/restaurant uses would not be developed. Thus, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **WASTEWATER**

Increased wastewater generation would not occur with the No Project/No Development Alternative, because no new land uses would be developed on the project site. Wastewater impacts would be less than those associated with the proposed project, because the existing commercial use would still generate wastewater, but new residential, commercial and retail/restaurant uses would not be developed. Thus, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## SOLID WASTE

Increased solid waste generation would not occur with the No Project/No Development Alternative, because no new land uses would be developed on the project site. Solid waste would be generated at current rates, which would be substantially less than that associated with the proposed project. Thus, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## ELECTRICITY AND NATURAL GAS

Increased demand for electricity and natural gas service would not occur with the No Project/No Development Alternative, because no new land uses would be developed on the project site. Electricity and natural gas demand would continue at current rates, which would be substantially less than that associated with the proposed project. Thus, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

### 6.2.3 ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not implement the overall objectives of the proposed project, which include the objectives identified in the *San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan*. Under this Alternative, the proposed residential, commercial and retail/restaurant, and parking uses would not be developed, and the existing underutilized surface parking lots and commercial use would remain on-site. This Alternative would not meet the proposed project's objectives which include, but are not limited to, providing development that reflects the vision and intent of the *San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan*, including specific development standards, design guidelines, and site improvements; expanding residential opportunities within the Downtown District and in close proximity to existing retail and commercial uses; creating economically feasible mixed-use development that improves the City's existing surface public parking lots, increases the City's tax revenue, and provides additional retail, commercial, and housing opportunities in the City; and encouraging a human-scale and a pedestrian-friendly environment. Under this Alternative, the proposed residential, commercial and retail/restaurant and parking uses would not be developed. Therefore, none of the project objectives identified in Section 3.6, Project Objectives, would be met under the No Project/No Development Alternative. Additionally, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be inconsistent with the *Corridors Specific Plan* and *Redevelopment Plan* for the project sites and surrounding area.

## 6.3 ALTERNATIVE TWO: CORRIDORS SPECIFIC PLAN CONFORMING ALTERNATIVE

### 6.3.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

The Corridors Specific Plan Conforming Alternative assumes development of the project sites with mixed-use developments of similar uses to the proposed project; however, development of the project sites would occur in conformance with the heights, densities, floor area ratios, and setbacks established by the *Corridors Specific Plan*. Development of Lots 4 and 5 would occur at a maximum height of four floors or 50 feet, whichever is less. Development of Lot 5 would occur within the property boundaries, thus an encroachment permit would not be required. Development of Lots 3, 7, 8, and 10 would occur at a maximum height of three floors or 40 feet, whichever is less. *Table 6-1, Corridors Specific Plan Conforming Alternative*, summarizes the development of the project sites under the Corridors Specific Plan Conforming Alternative.

**TABLE 6-1**  
**Corridors Specific Plan Alternative**

Proposed Development	Residential (dwelling units)	Commercial (square feet)	Retail/ Restaurant (square feet)	Parking Spaces	
				On-Site	On-Street
Parking Lots 8 and 10 – Plaza Del Sol Mixed-Use Development	61 <sup>1</sup>		15,000 <sup>2</sup>	320	18
Parking Lot 3 – Gangi Development	56	5,800	4,800	303	20
Parking Lot 5 – Marbella Mixed-Use Development		5,600	7,700 <sup>3</sup>	173	--
Parking Lot 4 – Miraflores Mixed-Use Development	58		25,898	352	--
Parking Lot 7 – Commercial Development			5,550 <sup>5</sup>	--	--
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>11,400</b>	<b>58,948</b>	<b>1,148</b>	
Existing Uses to be Removed		-7,000		-475	0
<b>NET TOTAL</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>4,400</b>	<b>58,948</b>	<b>673</b>	<b>38</b>
1. Includes three live/work units. 2. Proposed for a grocery store. 3. Proposed for retail and/or restaurant use. 4. Includes 48 spaces for the proposed Commercial Development. 5. Proposed for retail and service commercial uses.					

### 6.3.2 IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

#### LAND USE

Alternative Two would develop residential, commercial and retail/restaurant, and parking uses at a lower intensity than the proposed project. Unlike the proposed project, this Alternative would not require a variance for heights, densities, and/or setbacks. Additionally, an alley encroachment permit for Lot 5 (Marbella) – Development Scenario No. 1 of the proposed project would not be required under this Alternative. Although this Alternative would require an encroachment permit for Lots 8 and 10 (Plaza Del Sol), the encroachment would allow for street incursion for the subterranean parking structure, which is considered a less than significant impact. Therefore, this Alternative would be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and the development standards of the *Corridors Specific Plan*. This Alternative would also be consistent with the applicable polices of the *General Plan* and with the SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide policies and Compass Growth Visioning Program strategies, similar to the proposed project. In terms of land use and planning impacts, this Alternative would be consistent with the development standards of the *Corridors Specific Plan*, and therefore would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

#### AESTHETICS, LIGHT, AND GLARE

Alternative Two would develop residential, commercial and retail/restaurant, and parking uses at a lower intensity than compared to the proposed project. The short-term impacts associated with construction activities would be reduced under this Alternative, as it would result in fewer construction activities and associated equipment, and a reduced construction schedule. Alternative Two would also result in reduced light and glare impacts as a result of decreased development intensity. Although the development intensity would be reduced under this Alternative, short-term construction aesthetic impacts would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative Two would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior when compared to the proposed project in this regard.

#### TRAFFIC

As noted in [Section 5.3, Traffic](#), the proposed project is forecast to generate approximately 7,357 daily trips. Comparatively, the ADT projected to occur with this Alternative (6,418 average daily trips) would be approximately 13 percent less than the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, no feasible mitigation measures have been identified to reduce or eliminate the traffic impacts to a level considered less than significant. However, given that fewer daily trips are generated under this Alternative, Alternative Two is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to traffic.

## **PARKING**

Alternative Two would require fewer parking spaces when compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative Two would be required to provide replacement parking for existing parking spaces, as well as parking required to serve the residential, commercial and retail/restaurant uses that would be developed. Adequate parking capacity would be available to serve projected demand during construction and operation conditions under this Alternative, similar to the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative Two would be considered neither environmentally inferior nor superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **AIR QUALITY**

Short-term construction impacts would be comparable to the proposed project, given that both intensify the sites with mixed-use developments over the existing condition of public parking lots. Short-term construction impacts are significant and unavoidable for the proposed project. The short-term construction impacts would also be significant and unavoidable for this Alternative.

Operational mobile-source (vehicular) emissions would be reduced under this Alternative relative to the proposed project; however, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. All other operational and cumulative impacts would be comparable to the proposed project, and thus impacts under this Alternative would be significant and unavoidable. As such, Alternative Two would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **NOISE**

Alternative Two would develop residential, commercial and retail/restaurant, and parking uses at a lower intensity than compared to the proposed project. The short-term impacts associated with construction activities would be reduced under this Alternative, as it would result in fewer construction activities and associated equipment, and a reduced construction schedule. However, similar to the proposed project, construction noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable due to construction noise levels at the property line, resulting in a significant impact. When compared to the proposed project, noise levels would decrease due to less vehicular traffic. Although this Alternative would result in less traffic than the proposed project, noise levels would be similar, as this Alternative results in only 939 fewer daily trips than the proposed project. It should be noted that traffic volumes would need to decrease threefold to result in a readily perceivable (5.0 dBA) decrease in noise. Noise impacts from other operational sources (e.g., mechanical equipment) would be similar to the proposed project and, as with the proposed project, would be less than significant. Noise impacts would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Under this Alternative, impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would not substantially change relative to the proposed project, as commercial and retail/restaurant uses that use, store, handle, and dispose of very limited, if any, quantities of hazardous materials and wastes would be developed. As with the proposed project, removal of the existing Firestone Tire building would occur with this Alternative, requiring removal and disposal of potentially hazardous materials. Emergency response and evacuation plan impacts would be comparable to those of the proposed project. As such, this Alternative would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **FIRE PROTECTION**

This Alternative would result in comparable demands for fire protection services as the proposed project, given that both intensify the sites with mixed-use developments over the existing condition of public parking lots. Impacts for fire protection services were less than significant for the proposed project with the imposition of mitigation measures. The same mitigation would be applicable for Alternative Two; thus, the impacts would also be less than significant. As such, Alternative Two is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to fire protection services.

## **POLICE PROTECTION**

This Alternative would result in comparable demands for police protection services as the proposed project, given that both intensify the sites with mixed-use developments over the existing condition of public parking lots. Impacts for police protection services were less than significant for the proposed project and would also be less than significant for this Alternative. As such, Alternative Two is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to police protection services.

## **SCHOOLS**

Under this Alternative, fewer residential units would be developed, reducing the number of potential students that would attend schools in the project area relative to the proposed project. Development of Alternative Two would involve 175 residential units. Utilizing student generation rates provided by LAUSD, approximately 15 students would potentially be generated by the proposed project, which would be seven fewer students when compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant. Given that this Alternative would create lower demands for school services, it would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **PARKS AND RECREATION**

Alternative Two includes 175 residential units, which is 97 fewer than the proposed project. As with the proposed project, some public open space areas would be provided, which would be open to the residents and public. However, these on-site open space areas do not offset the impacts to park and recreation facilities. The payment of in-lieu fees would help mitigate neighborhood parks and recreation impacts, similar to the proposed project. Given that this Alternative would create lower demand for parks and recreation facilities, it would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to parks.

## **WATER**

Alternative Two would involve 97 fewer residential units, 7,276 fewer square feet of commercial uses and 1,000 fewer square feet of retail/restaurant uses when compared to the proposed project. This Alternative would consume 128,414 gallons of water per person per day, which is approximately 56,914 fewer gallons of water per person per day than the proposed project. Adequate water supply exists to serve the project sites either under the proposed project or Alternative Two, and no significant unavoidable impacts would occur. However, given that this Alternative generates a reduced demand, Alternative Two is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **WASTEWATER**

As noted above, Alternative Two would generate a reduced demand for water compared to the proposed project, and since water and wastewater demand are closely linked, this Alternative would also generate less wastewater than the proposed project. Alternative Two would generate 59,275 gallons of wastewater per day, which is 16,194 fewer gallons per day than the proposed project (75,469 gallons per day). The mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would also be applicable to Alternative Two, ensuring that development-related impacts are mitigated to less than significant levels. Given that this Alternative generates less demand, Alternative Two is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **SOLID WASTE**

Alternative Two would result in similar construction-related solid waste impacts, as the same amount of demolition and site preparation is required, along with comparable site building impacts. Mitigation Measure SW-1 is also applicable to this Alternative. With respect to solid waste generated during project buildout, Alternative Two generates 1,080 pounds per day, which is 350 fewer pounds per day than the proposed project (1,430 pounds per day). Mitigation Measures SW-2 and SW-3 would also be applicable to Alternative Two, further ensuring solid waste impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels. While no significant impacts were identified for the proposed project with respect to solid waste,

Alternative Two is considered environmentally superior since it generates less solid waste, which in turn results in less waste going to local landfills.

## **ELECTRICITY AND NATURAL GAS**

Alternative Two would result in reduced demands for electricity and natural gas compared to the proposed project. Alternative Two would result in 2.84 million kWh per year of electricity, which is 514,378 fewer kWh per year than the proposed project (3.35 million kWh). This Alternative would result in 10.6 million cf per year of natural gas, which is 4.4 million fewer cf per year than the proposed project (15.0 cf per year). Impacts for electricity and natural gas were less than significant for the proposed project and would also be less than significant for Alternative Two. Given that this Alternative generates less demand, Alternative Two is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to electricity and natural gas.

### **6.3.3 ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

Alternative Two would meet the objectives established for the proposed project, which include the objectives identified in the *San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan*. Under this Alternative, residential, commercial and retail/restaurant and parking uses would be developed, and the existing underutilized surface parking lots and commercial use would be removed. Alternative Two would meet the proposed project's objective which include, but are not limited to, providing development that reflects the vision and intent of the *San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan*, including specific development standards, design guidelines, and site improvements; expanding residential opportunities within the Downtown District and in close proximity to existing retail and commercial uses; creating economically feasible mixed-use development that improves the City's existing surface public parking lots, increasing the City's tax revenue, and providing additional retail, commercial, and housing opportunities in the City; and encouraging a human-scale and a pedestrian-friendly environment. Additionally, under this Alternative, provision of residential units for low- to moderate-income households would occur.

## **6.4 ALTERNATIVE THREE: PARKING STRUCTURES ALTERNATIVE**

### **6.4.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE**

The Parking Structures Alternative assumes development of parking lots 3, 4, 5, and 8 and 10 with 12,000 square feet of ground floor commercial uses and four levels of parking on each site. Parking lot 7 would remain as it currently exists. The parking structures would be above street level and built to the property lines. Development of the sites with parking structures would

provide a total of 1,562 parking spaces (450 spaces on Lot 3, 200 spaces on Lot 4, 232 spaces on Lot 5, and 380 spaces on Lots 8 and 10) and approximately 48,000 square feet of commercial uses.

## 6.4.2 IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

### LAND USE

Alternative Three would develop commercial and parking uses at a lower intensity than the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would require a variance for heights and setbacks. However, an alley encroachment permit for Lot 5 (Marbella) – Development Scenario No. 1 of the proposed project would not be required under this Alternative. Additionally, a variance for residential density would not be required, as development of residential uses would not occur. This Alternative would be consistent with the applicable policies of the *General Plan* and with the SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide policies and Compass Growth Visioning Program strategies, similar to the proposed project. In terms of land use and planning impacts, this Alternative would be consistent with the development standards of the *Corridors Specific Plan* and, therefore would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

### AESTHETICS, LIGHT, AND GLARE

Alternative Three would develop commercial and parking uses at a lower intensity than compared to the proposed project. The short-term impacts associated with construction activities would be reduced under this Alternative, as it would result in fewer construction activities and associated equipment, and a reduced construction schedule. Alternative Three would also result in reduced light and glare impacts as a result of decreased development intensity. Although the development intensity would be reduced under this Alternative, short-term construction impacts would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative Three would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior when compared to the proposed project in this regard.

### TRAFFIC

As noted in [Section 5.3, Traffic](#), the proposed project is forecast to generate approximately 7,357 daily trips. Comparatively, the ADT projected to occur with this Alternative (4,234 average daily trips) would be approximately 42 percent less than the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, no feasible mitigated measures have been identified to reduce or eliminate the traffic impacts to a level considered less than significant. However, given that fewer daily trips are generated under this Alternative, Alternative Three is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to traffic.

## **PARKING**

Alternative Three would require fewer parking spaces when compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, Alternative Three would be required to provide replacement parking for existing parking spaces, as well as parking required to serve the commercial uses that would be developed. Adequate parking capacity would be available to serve projected demand during construction and operation conditions under this Alternative, similar to the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative Three would be considered neither environmentally inferior nor superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **AIR QUALITY**

The total square footage of development under this Alternative would be less than the proposed project and, therefore, emissions from building activities would be slightly less on a daily basis. Additionally, the number of vehicle trips would be reduced under this Alternative, resulting in reduced emissions from vehicle trips. Although emissions would be reduced when compared to the proposed project, project and cumulative construction and operational impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Overall, given the reduction in development intensity under Alternative Three and associated vehicle trips and air pollutant emissions, this Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **NOISE**

Alternative Three would develop commercial and parking uses at a lower intensity than compared to the proposed project. The short-term impacts associated with construction activities would be reduced under this Alternative, as it would result in fewer construction activities and associated equipment, and a reduced construction schedule. However, similar to the proposed project, construction noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable due to construction noise levels at the property line, resulting in a significant impact. When compared to the proposed project, noise levels would decrease due to less vehicular traffic. Although this Alternative would result in less traffic than the proposed project, noise levels would be similar, as this Alternative results in only 3,123 fewer daily trips than the proposed project. It should be noted that traffic volumes would need to decrease threefold to result in a readily perceivable (5.0 dBA) decrease in noise. Noise impacts from other operational sources (e.g., mechanical equipment) would be similar to the project and, as with the project, would be less than significant. As such, impacts would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Under this Alternative, impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would not substantially change relative to the proposed project, as commercial uses that use, store, handle, and dispose of very limited, if any, quantities of hazardous materials and wastes would be developed. As with the proposed project, removal of the existing Firestone Tire building would occur with this Alternative, requiring removal and disposal of potentially hazardous materials. Emergency response and evacuation plan impacts would be comparable to those of the proposed project. As such, this Alternative would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **FIRE PROTECTION**

This Alternative, with no residential units and the reduction of commercial and retail/restaurant uses, would result in a slight reduction in impacts to fire protection services relative to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant. Given that this Alternative would create lower demands for fire protection services, it would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **POLICE PROTECTION**

This Alternative, with no residential units and the reduction of commercial and retail/restaurant uses, would result in a slight reduction in impacts to police protection services relative to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant. Given that this Alternative would create lower demands for police protection services, it would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **SCHOOLS**

Alternative Three would not result in an increased demand for school services, as no new residential uses would be developed on the project sites. Since residential uses would not be developed, this Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **PARKS AND RECREATION**

Alternative Four would involve no residential uses or associated open space areas. Additionally, this Alternative would not create an increased demand for park and recreation facilities, and as a result, impacts to parks and recreation facilities would be considered less than significant. Since residential uses would not be developed, Alternative Four is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to parks.

## **WATER**

Alternative Three would involve no residential units and fewer commercial uses when compared to the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would consume 69,336 fewer gallons per day as compared to 185,328 gallons per day for the proposed project. Adequate water supply exists to serve the project sites either under the proposed project or Alternative Three, and no significant unavoidable impacts would occur. However, given that this Alternative generates a reduced demand, Alternative Three is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **WASTEWATER**

As noted above, Alternative Three would generate a reduced demand for water than the proposed project, and since water and wastewater demand are closely linked, this Alternative would also generate less wastewater than the proposed project. Alternative Three would generate 21,883 gallons of wastewater per day, which is 53,586 fewer gallons per day than the proposed project (75,469 gallons per day). The mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would also be applicable to Alternative Three, ensuring that development-related impacts are mitigated to less than significant levels. Given that this Alternative generates less demand, Alternative Three is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **SOLID WASTE**

Alternative Three would result in similar construction-related solid waste impacts, as the same amount of demolition and site preparation is required, along with comparable site building impacts. Mitigation Measure SW-1 is also applicable to this Alternative. With respect to solid waste generated during project buildout, Alternative Three generates 288 pounds per day, which is 1,052 fewer pounds per day than the proposed project (1,430 pounds per day). Mitigation Measures SW-2 and SW-3 would also be applicable to Alternative Three, further ensuring solid waste impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels. While no significant impacts were identified for the proposed project with respect to solid waste, Alternative Three is considered environmentally superior since it generates less solid waste, which in turn results in less waste going to local landfills.

## **ELECTRICITY AND NATURAL GAS**

Alternative Three would result in reduced demands for electricity and natural gas as the proposed project. Alternative Three would result in 1.46 million kWh per year of electricity, which is 1.89 million kWh fewer per year than the proposed project (3.35 million kWh). This Alternative would result in 1.7 million cf per year of natural gas, which is 13.3 million fewer cf per year than the proposed project (15.0 million cf per year). Impacts for electricity and natural

gas were less than significant for the proposed project and would be less than significant for Alternative Three. Given that this Alternative generates less demand, Alternative Three is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to electricity and natural gas.

### **6.4.3 ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

Alternative Three would meet the project's objectives in regards to parking specifically, allowing for a more efficient use of surface parking lots while maintaining sufficient public parking within the area; providing sufficient parking to meet the needs of the project; and replacing the loss of public parking spaces in surface lots with parking structures on the project site(s). However, Alternative Three would not meet the project's land use and economic objectives, which include, but are not limited to, expanding residential opportunities within the Downtown District and in close proximity to existing retail and commercial uses; creating economically feasible mixed-use development that improves the City's existing surface public parking lots, increasing the City's tax revenue, and providing additional retail, commercial, and housing opportunities in the City; and encouraging a human-scale and a pedestrian-friendly environment. Additionally, under this Alternative, provision of residential units for low- to moderate-income households would not occur.

## **6.5 ALTERNATIVE FOUR: MIXED-USE COMMERCIAL/OFFICE ALTERNATIVE**

### **6.5.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE**

The Mixed-Use Commercial/Office Alternative involves redevelopment of the project sites with primarily commercial and office uses, as summarized below and in *Table 6-2, Mixed-Use Commercial/Office Alternative*.

Parking Lot 3. Development of Parking Lot 3 would be similar to the proposed project and would involve the removal of existing parking uses (144 spaces) and the development of a four story mixed-use building with 84 residential condominium units, 4,800 square feet of ground floor commercial/restaurant uses, and 5,800 square feet of ground floor office uses. The units would be market rate.

Two levels of subterranean parking would accommodate 244 parking spaces and an additional 121 parking spaces would be provided on the ground floor. Additionally, 20 off-site parking spaces would be provided parallel to the building frontages on Celis Street and Pico Street. The 385 proposed parking spaces include the replacement of the 144 public parking spaces currently located on the site.

Parking Lot 4. Development of Parking Lot 4 would involve the removal of the adjacent 7,000-square-foot auto service use and existing public parking (120 spaces), and development of a five-story mixed-use building with approximately 25,000 square feet of commercial/restaurant uses on the ground floor, 20,000 square feet of office uses on the second level, and 20 residential condominium units above. The condominium units would be market rate.

Three parking levels, including two subterranean levels, would provide a total of 298 parking spaces. The total parking would include 177 spaces required for the proposed residential, commercial and office uses and replacement of the 120 public parking spaces proposed to be removed.

Parking Lot 5. Development of Parking Lot 5 would involve the removal of the existing parking uses (59 spaces) and the development of a five-story mixed-use building with 12,500 square feet of commercial/restaurant uses on the ground floor and 116 parking spaces within two subterranean levels and 228 parking spaces within levels two through five.

The parking spaces would provide 42 spaces required for the commercial/restaurant uses and replacement of the 59 public parking spaces that would be removed. Of the remaining 243 spaces, 48 spaces would be provided to meet the parking requirements of the Commercial Development at Parking Lot 7 located at the southwest corner of San Fernando Mission Boulevard and Truman Street.

Parking Lot 7. Development of Parking Lot 7 would be similar to the proposed project and would involve the removal of 20 public parking spaces and development of an approximately 5,550-square-foot commercial building.

The 28 parking spaces required for the proposed commercial space and replacement of the 20 public parking spaces would be provided in Parking Lot 5 located across the street.

Parking Lots 8 and 10. Development of Parking Lots 8 and 10 would involve the removal of existing public parking uses (132 spaces) and the development of a five-story mixed-use building with 72 condominium units, three live/work units, and 15,000 square feet of ground floor commercial uses. The condominium units would be market rate.

One level of subterranean parking would accommodate 176 parking spaces, including 158 spaces for the residential uses. The second subterranean parking level would accommodate 136 parking spaces. An additional 92 parking spaces would be developed on the ground floor. Three spaces within the ground floor parking would be designated for the live-work units and the remaining spaces would serve the proposed commercial use. The existing 132 parking spaces would be replaced within the project site. The remaining 54 parking spaces would be available for public use. An additional 18 spaces will be provided off-site and directly adjacent

to the project site on Celis Street and Pico Street to serve residents, guests, and commercial patrons.

**TABLE 6-2  
Mixed-Use Commercial/Office Alternative**

Proposed Development	Residential (dwelling units)	Commercial/ Restaurant (square feet)	Office (square feet)	Parking Spaces	
				On-Site	On-Street
Parking Lot 3	84	4,800	5,800	365	20
Parking Lot 4	20	25,000	20,000	298	--
Parking Lot 5		12,500		344 <sup>1</sup>	--
Parking Lot 7		5,550		--	--
Parking Lots 8 and 10	75 <sup>2</sup>	15,000 <sup>3</sup>		404	18
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>62,850</b>	<b>25,800</b>	<b>1,411</b>	<b>38</b>
Existing Uses to be Removed		-7,000		-475	0
<b>NET TOTAL</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>55,850</b>	<b>25,800</b>	<b>936</b>	<b>38</b>

1. Includes 48 parking spaces for Parking Lot 7.  
2. Includes three live/work units.  
3. Proposed for a grocery store.

## 6.5.2 IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

### LAND USE

Alternative Four would develop the project sites with a mix of residential, commercial, and office uses, which are allowed under the *Corridors Specific Plan*. The overall intensity of development would be similar to that of the proposed project, but the emphasis would be on commercial and office space uses. Development under this Alternative would also require variances for the building heights, setbacks and residential density, along with an encroachment permit for Parking Lots 8 and 10. No encroachment into the alley for Lot 5 is required under this Alternative. However, the increased building heights, residential density, and setbacks, if approved by the Planning Commission and City Council/Agency, are considered less than significant impacts. In addition, Alternative Four would also be consistent with the SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide policies and Compass Growth Visioning Program strategies.

Land use impacts associated with Alternative Four are comparable to those identified for the proposed project, which were concluded to be less than significant with the exception of the need for encroachment permit for Lot 5 (Marbella) Development Scenario No. 1. As such, Alternative Four would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to land use if the encroachment permit for Lot 5 (Marbella) Development Scenario No. 1 is denied. Should the encroachment permit for Lot 5 (Marbella)

Development Scenario No. 1 be approved, Alternative Four would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

### **AESTHETICS, LIGHT, AND GLARE**

Alternative Four would not result in reduced overall intensity and height of development on the project sites; it would be comparable to that under the proposed project. In addition, short-term impacts associated with construction activities would be similar to the proposed project under this Alternative, as the same length of construction is anticipated. A significant unavoidable impact under the proposed project was identified for short-term construction impacts. These same impacts would occur under this Alternative. Alternative Four would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to aesthetics, light, and glare.

### **TRAFFIC**

Alternative Four would generate 6,411 daily trips as compared to 7,357 trips generated by the proposed project. This represents a 13 percent reduction in daily trips. As previously noted, significant unavoidable traffic impacts were identified for two intersections: Laurel Canyon Road/San Fernando Mission Boulevard and Glenoaks Boulevard/Maclay Avenue. Alternative Four would reduce the impacts to these two intersections; however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. However, given that fewer daily trips are generated under this Alternative, Alternative Four is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to traffic.

### **PARKING**

As with the proposed project, Alternative Four is required to both replace existing public parking spaces and provide parking spaces for the new on-site uses. Alternative Four would provide 974 parking spaces, which includes 936 on-site and 38 on-street spaces. No significant unavoidable impacts were identified for the proposed project, and none would be created under this Alternative; thus, the impacts would be comparable. As such, Alternative Four would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to parking.

### **AIR QUALITY**

Short-term construction impacts would be comparable to the proposed project, given that both intensify the sites with mixed-use developments over the existing condition of public parking lots. Short-term construction impacts are significant and unavoidable for the proposed project. The short-term construction noise impacts would also be significant and unavoidable for Alternative Four.

Operational mobile-source (vehicular) emissions would be reduced under this Alternative relative to the proposed project; however, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. All other operational and cumulative impacts would be comparable to the proposed project, and thus impacts under this Alternative would be significant and unavoidable. As such, Alternative Four would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **NOISE**

Development of this Alternative would result in a similar length of the construction period, and thus comparable short-term construction noise impacts, which are significant and unavoidable for the proposed project. The short-term construction noise impacts would also be significant and unavoidable for Alternative Four.

This Alternative would result in a reduction of mobile-source noise levels compared to the proposed project, but mitigation measures would be required to reduce mobile noise impacts to less than significant. As with the proposed project, stationary noise impacts would be considered less than significant. While Alternative Four produces incrementally fewer mobile source noise impacts, it results in comparable construction noise impacts. Given that the significant unavoidable construction-related noise impacts are not reduced under this Alternative, Alternative Four would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Alternative Four would not increase risks to people living and working in the project area associated with hazardous materials use, handling, transport, or disposal. The current hazardous materials practices and programs implemented to minimize associated risks would not be modified under this Alternative, and the volume of associated materials and wastes would not notably change. This Alternative would not result in a substantial reduction in risks associated with hazardous materials compared to the proposed project. As such, Alternative Four would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to hazards and hazardous materials.

## **FIRE PROTECTION**

Alternative Four would result in comparable demands for fire protection services as the proposed project, given that both intensify the sites with mixed-use developments over the existing condition of public parking lots. Impacts for fire protection services were less than significant for the proposed project with the imposition of mitigation measures. The same mitigation would be applicable for Alternative Four; thus, the impacts would also be less than

significant. As such, Alternative Four is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to fire protection services.

### **POLICE PROTECTION**

Alternative Four would result in comparable demands for police protection services as the proposed project, given that both intensify the sites with mixed-use developments over the existing condition of public parking lots. Impacts for police protection services were less than significant for the proposed project, and would also be less than significant for this Alternative. As such, Alternative Four is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to police protection services.

### **SCHOOLS**

Alternative Four includes 179 residential units, which is 93 fewer than the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would generate 15 students, which is seven fewer students than the proposed project (22 students). Under either Alternative Four or the proposed project, school fees would be paid to the Los Angeles Unified School District to fully mitigate the impacts associated with the development. However, given that schools serving San Fernando are currently experiencing overcrowding and this Alternative includes 93 fewer residential units than the proposed project, Alternative Four is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to schools.

### **PARKS AND RECREATION**

Alternative Four includes 179 residential units, which is 93 fewer than the proposed project. As with the proposed project, some public open space areas would be provided, which would be open to the residents and public. However, these on-site open space areas do not offset the impacts to park and recreation facilities. The payment of in-lieu fees would help mitigate neighborhood parks and recreation impacts, similar to the proposed project. Given that this Alternative includes 93 fewer residential units than the proposed project, Alternative Four is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to parks.

### **WATER**

Alternative Four would consume 139,997 gallons per day as compared to 185,328 gallons per day for the proposed project. Adequate water supply exists to serve the project sites either under the proposed project or Alternative Four, and no significant unavoidable impacts would occur. However, given that this Alternative generates less demand, Alternative Four is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **WASTEWATER**

As noted above, Alternative Four would generate a reduced demand for water than the proposed project, and since water and wastewater demand are closely linked, this Alternative would also generate less wastewater than the proposed project. Alternative Four would generate 61,060 gallons of wastewater per day, which is 14,409 fewer gallons per day than the proposed project (75,469 gallons per day). The mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would also be applicable to Alternative Four, ensuring that development-related impacts are mitigated to less than significant levels. Given that this Alternative generates less demand, Alternative Four is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **SOLID WASTE**

Alternative Four would result in similar construction-related solid waste impacts, as the same amount of demolition and site preparation is required, along with comparable site building impacts. Mitigation Measure SW-1 is also applicable to this Alternative. With respect to solid waste generated during project buildout, Alternative Four generates 16 percent fewer pounds per day than the proposed project (1,206 for Alternative Four versus 1,430 for the proposed project). Mitigation Measures SW-2 and SW-3 would also be applicable to Alternative Four, further ensuring solid waste impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels. While no significant impacts were identified for the proposed project with respect to solid waste, Alternative Four is considered environmentally superior since it generates less solid waste, which in turn results in less waste going to local landfills.

## **ELECTRICITY AND NATURAL GAS**

Alternative Four would result in reduced demands for electricity and natural gas as the proposed project. Alternative Four would result in 3.04 million kWh per year of electricity, which is 0.31 million fewer kWh per year than the proposed project (3.35 million kWh). This Alternative would result in 11.2 million cf per year of natural gas, which is 3.8 million fewer cf per year than the proposed project (15.0 million cf per year). Impacts for electricity and natural gas were less than significant for the proposed project and would also be less than significant for Alternative Four. Alternative Four is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to electricity and natural gas.

### 6.5.3 ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Alternative Four would generally meet the objectives established for the proposed project. However, the affordability requirement of dedicating 20 percent of the total residential units for low- to moderate-income households would not be met under Alternative Four, as all residential units would be sold at market rate.

## 6.6 ALTERNATIVE FIVE: CULTURAL ARTS CENTER/OPEN COURTYARD ALTERNATIVE

### 6.6.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

The Cultural Arts Center/Open Courtyard Alternative involves redevelopment of the project sites with primarily commercial and office uses, with the exception of Parking Lots 8 and 10, which would be developed with a cultural arts center/outdoor amphitheater (Version A) or single-story commercial uses surrounding an open courtyard area (Version B), as summarized below and in *Table 6-3, Cultural Arts Center/Open Courtyard Alternative (Version A)* and *Table 6-4, Cultural Arts Center/Open Courtyard Alternative (Version B)*.

Parking Lot 3. Development of Parking Lot 3 would be similar to the proposed project and would involve the removal of existing parking uses (144 spaces) and the development of a four story mixed-use building with 84 residential condominium units, 4,800 square feet of ground floor commercial/restaurant uses, and 5,800 square feet of ground floor office uses. The units would be market rate.

Two levels of subterranean parking would accommodate 244 parking spaces and an additional 121 parking spaces would be provided on the ground floor. Additionally, 20 off-site parking spaces would be provided parallel to the building frontages on Celis Street and Pico Street. The 385 proposed parking spaces include the replacement of the 144 public parking spaces currently located on the site.

Parking Lot 4. Development of Parking Lot 4 would involve the removal of the 7,000 square foot auto service use and existing public parking (120 spaces), and development of a five-story mixed-use building with approximately 25,000 square feet of commercial/restaurant uses on the ground floor, 20,000 square feet of office uses on the second level, and 20 residential condominium units above. The condominium units would be market rate.

Three parking levels, including two subterranean levels, would provide a total of 298 parking spaces. The total parking would include 177 spaces required for the proposed residential, commercial, and office uses and replacement of the 120 public parking spaces proposed to be removed.

Parking Lot 5. Development of Parking Lot 5 would involve the removal of the existing parking uses (59 spaces) and the development of a five-story mixed-use building with 12,500 square feet of commercial/restaurant uses on the ground floor and 116 parking spaces within two subterranean levels and 228 parking spaces within levels two through five.

The parking spaces would provide 42 spaces required for the commercial/restaurant uses and replacement of the 59 public parking spaces that would be removed. Of the remaining 243 spaces, 48 spaces would be provided to meet the parking requirements of the Commercial Development at Parking Lot 7 located at the southwest corner of San Fernando Mission Boulevard and Truman Street.

Parking Lot 7. Development of Parking Lot 7 would be similar to the proposed project and would involve the removal of 20 public parking spaces and development of an approximately 5,550-square-foot commercial building.

The 28 parking spaces required for the proposed commercial space and replacement of the 20 public parking spaces would be provided in Parking Lot 5 located across the street.

Parking Lots 8 and 10.

Version A

Development of Parking Lots 8 and 10 Version A would involve the removal of existing public parking uses (132 spaces) and the development of a cultural arts center with seating capacity for 300 to 400 people. The building would be oriented toward the corner entrance at the intersection of Celis Street and South Brand Boulevard. The rear, north facing façade would be used as a backdrop for outdoor film/summer concerts and an amphitheater site with seating for 200 to 260 people. The maximum height of the building would not exceed three floors or 40 feet (whichever is less).

Two subterranean parking levels would accommodate 264 parking spaces, including replacement of the 132 existing parking spaces. An additional 18 spaces will be provided off-site and directly adjacent to the project site on Celis Street and Pico Street to serve patrons of the cultural arts center and/or amphitheater.

Version B

Development of Parking Lots 8 and 10 Version B would involve the removal of existing public parking uses (132 spaces) and the development of 26,600 square feet of ground floor perimeter retail, service commercial, and/or restaurant space. The development would allow for approximately 14 tenant spaces with street facing entryways with access along South Brand Boulevard, Celis Street, or Pico Street. A north-south paseo from Pico Street to Celis Street with

a minimum width of 30 to 35 feet would be provided. The paseo would open into a large courtyard area that could be used for public open spaces/amphitheater area lined by the commercial uses.

Two levels of subterranean parking, accessed by a ramp on Celis Street, would accommodate 268 parking spaces, including replacement of the 132 existing parking spaces. An additional 18 spaces would be provided off-site and directly adjacent to the project site on Celis Street and Pico Street to serve patrons of the commercial uses and/or open space area.

**TABLE 6-3**  
**Cultural Arts Center/Open Courtyard Alternative (Version A)**

Proposed Development	Residential (dwelling units)	Commercial/ Restaurant (square feet)	Office (square feet)	Cultural Arts Center (seats)	Outdoor Amphitheater (seats)	Parking Spaces	
						On-Site	On-Street
Parking Lot 3	84	4,800	5,800			365	20
Parking Lot 4	20	25,000	20,000			298	--
Parking Lot 5		12,500				344 <sup>1</sup>	--
Parking Lot 7		5,550				--	--
Parking Lots 8 and 10				400	260	264	18
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>47,850</b>	<b>25,800</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>1,271</b>	<b>38</b>
Existing Uses to be Removed		-7,000				-475	0
<b>NET TOTAL</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>40,850</b>	<b>25,800</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>38</b>

1. Includes 48 parking spaces for Parking Lot 7.

**TABLE 6-4**  
**Cultural Arts Center/Open Courtyard Alternative (Version B)**

Proposed Development	Residential (dwelling units)	Commercial/ Restaurant (square feet)	Office (square feet)	Cultural Arts Center (seats)	Outdoor Amphitheater (seats)	Parking Spaces	
						On-Site	On-Street
Parking Lot 3	84	4,800	5,800			365	20
Parking Lot 4	20	25,000	20,000			298	--
Parking Lot 5		12,500				344 <sup>1</sup>	--
Parking Lot 7		5,550				--	--
Parking Lots 8 and 10		26,600				268	18
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>74,450</b>	<b>25,800</b>			<b>1,275</b>	<b>38</b>
Existing Uses to be Removed		-7,000				-475	0
<b>NET TOTAL</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>67,450</b>	<b>25,800</b>			<b>800</b>	<b>38</b>

1. Includes 48 parking spaces for Parking Lot 7.

## **6.6.2 IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

### **LAND USE**

Alternative Five would develop the project sites with a mix of residential, commercial, office, cultural arts, and amphitheater uses, which are allowed under the *Corridors Specific Plan*. The general intensity of development would be similar to that of the proposed project. Development under this Alternative would also require variances for the building heights, setbacks, and/or residential density. Lots 8 and 10 would be a maximum of three floors or 40 feet, whichever is less; thus a variance for height is not necessary. Development on Lots 3, 4, and 5 would still require a variance for building heights and setbacks, similar to the proposed project. Development of Lot 3 would also require a variance for residential density. No encroachment into the alley for Lot 5 is required under this Alternative. However, the increased building heights, setbacks and/or residential density, if approved by the Planning Commission and Redevelopment Agency, are considered less than significant impacts. In addition, Alternative Five would also be consistent with the SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide policies and Compass Growth Visioning Program strategies.

Land use impacts associated with Alternative Five are comparable to those identified for the proposed project, which were concluded to be less than significant with the exception of the need for encroachment permit for Lot 5 (Marbella) Development Scenario No. 1. Given that this Alternative reduces the intensity of development on Lots 8 and 10, and eliminates the need for the encroachment permit on Lot 5, Alternative Five is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

### **AESTHETICS, LIGHT AND GLARE**

Alternative Five would result in reduced overall intensity and height of development on the project sites; specifically Lots 8 and 10 with building heights of three stories or 40 feet, whichever is less. In addition, short-term impacts associated with construction activities would be similar to the proposed project under this Alternative, as the same length of construction is anticipated. A significant unavoidable impact under the proposed project was identified for short-term construction impacts. As such, Alternative Five is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

### **TRAFFIC**

Alternative Five Version A would generate 5,693 daily trips and Version B would generate 6,389 daily trips as compared to 7,357 trips generated by the proposed project. This represents a 23 percent reduction in daily trips for Version A, and a 13 percent reduction in daily trips for Version B. As previously noted, significant unavoidable traffic impacts were identified for two intersections: Laurel Canyon Road/San Fernando Mission Boulevard and Glenoaks

Boulevard/Maclay Avenue. Alternative Five would reduce the impacts to these two intersections; however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. However, given that fewer daily trips are generated under this Alternative for either Version A or B, Alternative Five is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to traffic.

## **PARKING**

As with the proposed project, Alternative Five is required to both replace existing public parking spaces and provide parking spaces for the new on-site uses. Alternative Five Version A would provide 834 parking spaces, which includes 796 on-site and 38 on-street spaces. Alternative Five Version B would provide 838 parking spaces, which includes 800 on-site and 38 on-street spaces. No significant unavoidable impacts were identified for the proposed project, and none would be created under this Alternative; thus, the impacts would be comparable. As such, Alternative Five for either Version A or B would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to parking.

## **AIR QUALITY**

Short-term construction impacts would be comparable to the proposed project, given that both intensify the sites with mix of uses over the existing condition of public parking lots. Short-term construction impacts are significant and unavoidable for the proposed project. The short-term construction air quality impacts would also be significant and unavoidable for Alternative Five.

Operational mobile-source (vehicular) emissions would be reduced under this Alternative relative to the proposed project; however, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. All other operational and cumulative impacts would be comparable to the proposed project, and thus impacts under this Alternative would be significant and unavoidable. As such, Alternative Five would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **NOISE**

Development of this Alternative would result in a similar length of the construction period, and thus comparable short-term construction noise impacts, which are significant and unavoidable for the proposed project would also occur. The short-term construction noise impacts would also be significant and unavoidable for Alternative Five.

This Alternative would result in a reduction of mobile-source noise levels compared to the proposed project, but mitigation measures would be required to reduce mobile noise impacts to less than significant. However, Alternative Five Version A includes both a Cultural Arts Center and an Outdoor Amphitheater, which would be sited in close proximity to sensitive receptors.

While the noise impacts have not been modeled, it can be anticipated that events at these facilities after 7:00 PM would generate greater noise impacts than the stationary noise impacts estimated for the proposed project. It is unknown if these impacts would rise to significant levels or not, and specific mitigation that would be necessary to ensure impacts for stationary sources are mitigated to less than significant levels. For Version B, stationary source noise impacts would be similar to the proposed project.

While Alternative Five produces incrementally fewer mobile source noise impacts, it results in comparable construction noise impacts, and greater stationary noise impacts. As such, Alternative Five is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

### **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Alternative Five would not increase risks to people living and working in the project area associated with hazardous materials use, handling, transport, or disposal. The current hazardous materials practices and programs implemented to minimize associated risks would not be modified under this Alternative, and the volume of associated materials and wastes would not notably change. This Alternative would not result in a substantial reduction in risks associated with hazardous materials compared to the proposed project. As such, Alternative Five would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to hazards and hazardous materials.

### **FIRE PROTECTION**

Alternative Five would result in comparable demands for fire protection services as the proposed project, given that both intensify the sites with mix of uses over the existing condition of public parking lots. Impacts for fire protection services were less than significant for the proposed project with the imposition of mitigation measures. The same mitigation would be applicable for Alternative Five; thus, the impacts would also be less than significant. As such, Alternative Five is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to fire protection services.

### **POLICE PROTECTION**

Alternative Five would result in comparable demands for police protection services as the proposed project, given that both intensify the sites with mix of uses over the existing condition of public parking lots. Impacts for police protection services were less than significant, and also would be less than significant for this Alternative. As such, Alternative Five is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to police protection services.

## **SCHOOLS**

Alternative Five includes 104 residential units, which is 168 fewer than the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would generate eight students, which is 14 fewer students than the proposed project (22 students). Under either Alternative Five or the proposed project, school fees would be paid to the Los Angeles Unified School District to fully mitigate the impacts associated with the development. However, given that schools serving San Fernando are currently experiencing overcrowding and this Alternative includes 168 fewer residential units than the proposed project, Alternative Five is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to schools.

## **PARKS AND RECREATION**

Alternative Five includes 104 residential units, which is 168 fewer than the proposed project. As with the proposed project, some public open space areas would be provided, which would be open to the residents and public. However, these on-site open space areas do not offset the impacts to park and recreation facilities. The payment of in-lieu fees would help mitigate neighborhood parks and recreation impacts, similar to the proposed project. Given that this Alternative includes 168 fewer residential units than the proposed project, Alternative Five is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to parks.

## **WATER**

Version A of Alternative Five would consume 90,006 gallons per day and Version B would consume 88,946 gallons per day, as compared to 185,328 gallons per day for the proposed project. Adequate water supply exists to serve the project sites either under the proposed project or Alternative Five, and no significant unavoidable impacts would occur. However, given that this Alternative generates less demand, Alternative Five is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **WASTEWATER**

As noted above, Alternative Five would generate a reduced demand for water than the proposed project, and since water and wastewater demand are closely linked, this Alternative would also generate less wastewater than the proposed project. Version A of Alternative Five would generate 42,309 gallons of wastewater per day and Version B would generate 52,624 gallons of wastewater per day, as compared to 75,469 gallons per day for the proposed project. The mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would also be applicable to Alternative Five, ensuring that development-related impacts are mitigated to less than significant levels. Given that this Alternative generates less demand, Alternative Five is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **SOLID WASTE**

Alternative Five would result in similar construction-related solid waste impacts, as the similar amounts of demolition and site preparation is required, along with comparable site building impacts. Mitigation Measure SW-1 is also applicable to this Alternative. With respect to solid waste generated during project buildout, Alternative Five would generate less solid waste than the proposed project. Alternative Five would generate 922 pounds per day for Version A and 976 pounds per day for Version B, compared to 1,430 for the proposed project. Mitigation Measures SW-2 and SW-3 would also be applicable to Alternative Five, further ensuring solid waste impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels. While no significant impacts were identified for the proposed project with respect to solid waste, Alternative Five is considered environmentally superior since it generates less solid waste, which in turn results in less waste going to local landfills.

## **ELECTRICITY AND NATURAL GAS**

Alternative Five would result in reduced demands for electricity and natural gas as the proposed project. Version A of Alternative Five would result in 2.38 million kWh per year of electricity and Version B would result in 2.97 million kWh per year of electricity, which is 0.97 million and 0.38 million fewer kWh per year than the proposed project (3.35 million kWh), respectively. Version A of Alternative Five would result in 7.6 million cf per year of natural gas and Version B would result in 7.9 million cf per year of natural gas, which is 7.4 million and 7.1 million fewer cf per year than the proposed project (15.0 million cf per year). Impacts for electricity and natural gas were less than significant for the proposed project and would also be less than significant for Alternative Five. Alternative Five is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to electricity and natural gas.

### **6.6.3 ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

Alternative Five would generally meet the objectives established for the proposed project. However, the affordability requirement of dedicating 20 percent of the total residential units for low- to moderate-income households would not be met under Alternative Four, as all residential units would be sold at market rate. In addition, there is no project objective to provide a cultural arts center or outdoor amphitheater as part of the proposed project. Thus, the inclusion of these two uses minimizes the effectiveness of the land use planning and economic objectives established for the project.

## 6.7 ALTERNATIVE SIX: REDISTRIBUTION OF PARKING ALTERNATIVE

### 6.7.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

The Redistribution of Parking Alternative involves redevelopment of the project sites with mixed-use residential, service commercial, retail, restaurant, and parking uses similar to the proposed project, as summarized below in Table 6-5, Redistribution of Parking Alternative. Under this Alternative, surplus public parking would be distributed between Lot 5 (Marbella) and Lots 8 and 10 (Plaza Del Sol).

Parking Lot 3. Development of Parking Lot 3 would remain unchanged from the proposed project. This Alternative would involve the removal of existing public parking uses (144 spaces) and the development of a four-story mixed-use building with 84 residential condominium units and approximately 10,600 square feet of ground floor commercial uses. Twenty percent of the condominium units (17 units) will be restricted as affordable units for the life of the property.

Two levels of subterranean parking would accommodate 244 parking spaces and an additional 121 parking spaces would be provided on the ground floor. Additionally, 20 off-site parking spaces would be provided parallel to the building frontages on Celis Street and Pico Street. The 385 proposed parking spaces include the replacement of the 144 public parking spaces currently located on the site.

Parking Lot 4. Development of Parking Lot 4 would involve the removal of the 7,000 square foot auto service use and existing public parking (120 spaces), and development of a four-story mixed-use building with approximately 26,000 square feet of ground floor commercial/restaurant uses and 87 residential condominium units above. The condominium units would be at market rate.

Two levels of subterranean parking would accommodate 252 parking spaces and an additional 46 spaces would be provided on the ground floor. A level of parking above the ground floor would provide an additional 122 parking spaces. The 420 proposed parking spaces include the replacement of the 120 public parking spaces currently located on the site.

Parking Lot 5. Development of Parking Lot 5 would involve the removal of the existing parking uses (59 spaces) and the development of a four-story mixed-use building with 12,500 square feet of ground floor commercial/restaurant uses and four levels of parking (234 spaces). The 234 parking spaces would include replacement of the 59 existing spaces, 42 spaces for the proposed ground floor commercial and 48 spaces for Lot 7 (Commercial Development).

Parking Lot 7. Development of Parking Lot 7 would remain unchanged from the proposed project and would involve removal of 20 public parking spaces and development of an approximately 5,550 square foot commercial building.

The 28 parking spaces required for the proposed retail or service commercial space and replacement of the 20 public parking spaces will be provided in Parking Lot 5 (Marbella) located across the street.

Parking Lots 8 and 10. Development of Parking Lots 8 and 10 would involve the removal of the existing parking uses (132 spaces) and the development of a five-story mixed-use building with 15,000 square feet of commercial space designated for a grocery store and two live work units on the ground floor and 88 residential units above.

Two subterranean parking levels would accommodate 176 spaces for the residential units and 136 spaces for public parking. An additional 92 parking spaces would be provided on the ground floor and 18 spaces would be provided off-site.

**TABLE 6-5**  
**Redistribution of Parking Alternative**

Proposed Development	Residential (dwelling units)	Commercial/ Restaurant (square feet)	Office (square feet)	Parking Spaces	
				On-Site	On-Street
Parking Lot 3	84	4,800	5,800	365	20
Parking Lot 4	87	25,898		420	--
Parking Lot 5		12,500		234 <sup>1</sup>	--
Parking Lot 7		5,550		--	--
Parking Lots 8 and 10	90 <sup>2</sup>	15,000 <sup>3</sup>		404	18
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>63,748</b>	<b>5,800</b>	<b>1,423</b>	<b>38</b>
Existing Uses to be Removed		-7,000		-475	0
<b>NET TOTAL</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>56,748</b>	<b>5,800</b>	<b>948</b>	<b>38</b>

1. Includes 48 parking spaces for Parking Lot 7.  
2. Includes two live/work units.  
3. Proposed for a grocery store.

## 6.7.2 IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

### LAND USE

Alternative Six would develop the project sites with similar uses as the proposed project, however, public parking spaces would be distributed between Parking Lot 5 and Parking Lots 8 and 10. The general intensity of development would be similar to that of the proposed project. Development under this Alternative would also require variances for the building heights, setbacks and/or residential density, similar to the proposed project. However, the increased

building heights, setbacks, and/or residential density, if approved by the Planning Commission and Redevelopment Agency, are considered less than significant impacts. No encroachment into the alley for Lot 5 is required under this Alternative. In addition, Alternative Six would also be consistent with the SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide policies and Compass Growth Visioning Program strategies.

Land use impacts associated with Alternative Six are comparable to those identified for the proposed project, which were concluded to be less than significant with the exception of the need for encroachment permit for Lot 5 (Marbella) Development Scenario No. 1. Given that this Alternative eliminates the need for the encroachment permit on Lot 5, Alternative Six is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

### **AESTHETICS, LIGHT AND GLARE**

Alternative Six would not result in reduced overall intensity and height of development on the project sites; it would be comparable to that under the proposed project. In addition, short-term impacts associated with construction activities would be similar to the proposed project under this Alternative, as the same length of construction is anticipated. A significant unavoidable impact under the proposed project was identified for short-term construction impacts. These same impacts would occur under this Alternative. Thus, Alternative Six would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to aesthetics, light, and glare.

### **TRAFFIC**

Alternative Six would generate 6,874 daily trips as compared to 7,357 trips generated by the proposed project. This represents a seven percent reduction in daily trips. As previously noted, significant unavoidable traffic impacts were identified for two intersections: Laurel Canyon Road/San Fernando Mission Boulevard and Glenoaks Boulevard/Maclay Avenue. Alternative Six would reduce the impacts to these two intersections; however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. However, given that fewer daily trips are generated under this Alternative, Alternative Six is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to traffic.

### **PARKING**

As with the proposed project, Alternative Six is required to both replace existing public parking spaces and provide parking spaces for the new on-site uses. Alternative Six would provide 986 parking spaces, which includes 948 on-site and 38 on-street spaces. No significant unavoidable impacts were identified for the proposed project, and none would be created under this Alternative; thus, the impacts would be comparable. As such, Alternative Six would be

considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to parking.

## **AIR QUALITY**

Short-term construction impacts would be comparable to the proposed project, given that both intensify the sites with mix of uses over the existing condition of public parking lots. Short-term construction impacts are significant and unavoidable for the proposed project. The short-term construction noise impacts would also be significant and unavoidable for Alternative Six.

Operational mobile-source (vehicular) emissions would be reduced under this Alternative relative to the proposed project; however, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. All other operational and cumulative impacts would be comparable to the proposed project, and thus impacts under this Alternative would be significant and unavoidable. As such, Alternative Six would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **NOISE**

Development of this Alternative would result in a similar length of the construction period, and thus comparable short-term construction noise impacts, which are significant and unavoidable for the proposed project would also occur. The short-term construction noise impacts would also be significant and unavoidable for Alternative Six.

This Alternative would result in a reduction of mobile-source noise levels compared to the proposed project, but mitigation measures would be required to reduce mobile noise impacts to less than significant. Stationary source noise impacts would be similar to the proposed project.

While Alternative Six produces incrementally fewer mobile source noise impacts, it results in comparable construction noise impacts and stationary noise impacts. As such, Alternative Six is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Alternative Six would not increase risks to people living and working in the project area associated with hazardous materials use, handling, transport, or disposal. The current hazardous materials practices and programs implemented to minimize associated risks would not be modified under this Alternative, and the volume of associated materials and wastes would not notably change. This Alternative would not result in a substantial reduction in risks associated with hazardous materials compared to the proposed project. As such, Alternative Six would be considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to hazards and hazardous materials.

## **FIRE PROTECTION**

Alternative Six would result in comparable demands for fire protection services as the proposed project, given that both intensify the sites with mix of uses over the existing condition of public parking lots. Impacts for fire protection services were less than significant for the proposed project with the imposition of mitigation measures. The same mitigation would be applicable for Alternative Six; thus, the impacts would also be less than significant. As such, Alternative Six is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to fire protection services.

## **POLICE PROTECTION**

Alternative Six would result in comparable demands for police protection services as the proposed project, given that both intensify the sites with mix of uses over the existing condition of public parking lots. Impacts for police protection services were less than significant for the proposed project, and also would be less than significant for this Alternative. As such, Alternative Six is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project with regard to police protection services.

## **SCHOOLS**

Alternative Six includes 261 residential units, which is 11 fewer than the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would generate 21 students, which is one fewer students than the proposed project (22 students). Under either Alternative Six or the proposed project, school fees would be paid to the Los Angeles Unified School District to fully mitigate the impacts associated with the development. However, given that schools serving San Fernando are currently experiencing overcrowding and this Alternative includes 11 fewer residential units than the proposed project, Alternative Six is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to schools.

## **PARKS AND RECREATION**

Alternative Six includes 261 residential units, which is 11 fewer than the proposed project. As with the proposed project, some public open space areas would be provided, which would be open to the residents and public. However, these on-site open space areas do not offset the impacts to park and recreation facilities. The payment of in-lieu fees would help mitigate neighborhood parks and recreation impacts, similar to the proposed project. Given that this Alternative includes 10 fewer residential units than the proposed project, Alternative Six is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to parks.

## **WATER**

Alternative Six would consume 190,047 gallons per day, as compared to 185,328 gallons per day for the proposed project. Adequate water supply exists to serve the project sites either under the proposed project or Alternative Six, and no significant unavoidable impacts would occur. However, given that this Alternative generates greater demand, Alternative Six is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **WASTEWATER**

Alternative Six would generate slightly less wastewater as compared to the proposed project (74,273 compared to 75,469 gallons per day). The mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would also be applicable to Alternative Six, ensuring that development-related impacts are mitigated to less than significant levels. Given that this Alternative generates less demand, Alternative Six is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

## **SOLID WASTE**

Alternative Five would result in similar construction-related solid waste impacts, as the similar amounts of demolition and site preparation is required, along with comparable site building impacts. Mitigation Measure SW-1 is also applicable to this Alternative. With respect to solid waste generated during project buildout, Alternative Six would generate less solid waste than the proposed project. Alternative Six would generate 1,419 pounds per day, compared to 1,430 for the proposed project. Mitigation Measures SW-2 and SW-3 would also be applicable to Alternative Six, further ensuring solid waste impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels. While no significant impacts were identified for the proposed project with respect to solid waste, Alternative Six is considered environmentally superior since it generates less solid waste, which in turn results in less waste going to local landfills.

## **ELECTRICITY AND NATURAL GAS**

Alternative Six would result in slightly less demand for electricity and natural gas as the proposed project. Alternative Six would result in 3.27 million kWh per year of electricity, which is 0.08 million fewer kWh per year than the proposed project (3.35 million kWh). This Alternative would result in 14.7 million cf per year of natural gas, which is 0.3 million fewer cf per year than the proposed project (15.0 million cf per year). Impacts for electricity and natural gas were less than significant for the proposed project and would also be less than significant for Alternative Six. Alternative Six is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project with regard to electricity and natural gas.

### **6.7.3 ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

Alternative Six would meet the objectives established for the proposed project.

## **6.8 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6 indicates that if the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

The context of an environmentally superior alternative for this EIR is based on the consideration of several factors including the project's objectives, as described in Section 3.6, Project Objectives, and earlier in this Section, and the alternative's ability to fulfill the objectives with minimal impacts to the surrounding environment.

### **6.8.1 ALTERNATIVE ONE (NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE)**

The No Project/No Development Alternative would result in similar impacts for land use. This Alternative would result in less impacts for all other topics.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not implement the overall objectives of the proposed project, which include the objectives identified in the *San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan*. Under this Alternative, the proposed residential, commercial and retail/restaurant, and parking uses would not be developed, and the existing underutilized surface parking lots and commercial use would remain on-site. This Alternative would not meet the proposed project's objectives which include, but are not limited to, providing development that reflects the vision and intent of the *San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan*, including specific development standards, design guidelines, and site improvements; expanding residential opportunities within the Downtown District and in close proximity to existing retail and commercial uses; creating economically feasible mixed-use development that improves the City's existing surface public parking lots, increases the City's tax revenue, and provides additional retail, commercial, and housing opportunities in the City; and encouraging a human-scale and a pedestrian-friendly environment. Under this Alternative the proposed residential, commercial and retail/restaurant, and parking uses would not be developed. Therefore, none of the project objectives identified in Section 3.6, Project Objectives, would be met under the No Project/No Development Alternative. Additionally, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be inconsistent with the *Corridors Specific Plan* and *Redevelopment Plan* for the project sites and surrounding area.

### **6.8.2 ALTERNATIVE TWO (CORRIDORS SPECIFIC PLAN CONFORMING ALTERNATIVE)**

Alternative Two would result in similar impacts for aesthetics, light and glare; parking; air quality; noise; hazards and hazardous materials; fire protection; and police protection. This Alternative would result in less impacts for all other topics.

Alternative Two would meet the objectives established for the proposed project, which include the objectives identified in the *San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan*. Under this Alternative, residential, commercial and retail/restaurant, and parking uses would be developed, and the existing underutilized surface parking lots and commercial use would be removed. Alternative Two would meet the proposed project's objectives which include, but are not limited to, providing development that reflects the vision and intent of the *San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan*, including specific development standards, design guidelines, and site improvements; expanding residential opportunities within the Downtown District and in close proximity to existing retail and commercial uses; creating economically feasible mixed-use development that improves the City's existing surface public parking lots, increasing the City's tax revenue, and providing additional retail, commercial, and housing opportunities in the City; and encouraging a human-scale and a pedestrian-friendly environment. Additionally, under this Alternative provision of residential units for low- to moderate-income households would occur.

### **6.8.3 ALTERNATIVE THREE (PARKING STRUCTURES ALTERNATIVE)**

Alternative Three would result in similar impacts for aesthetics, light and glare; parking; noise; and hazards and hazardous materials. This Alternative would result in less impacts for all other topics.

Alternative Three would meet the project's objectives regarding parking specifically, allowing for a more efficient use of surface parking lots while maintaining sufficient public parking within the area; providing sufficient parking to meet the needs of the project; and replace the loss of public parking spaces in surface lots with parking structures on the project site(s). However, Alternative Three would not meet the project's land use and economic objectives, which include, but are not limited to, expanding residential opportunities within the Downtown District and in close proximity to existing retail and commercial uses; creating economically feasible mixed-use development that improves the City's existing surface public parking lots, increasing the City's tax revenue, and providing additional retail, commercial, and housing opportunities in the City; and encouraging a human-scale and a pedestrian-friendly environment. Additionally, under this Alternative provision of residential units for low- to moderate-income households would not occur.

#### **6.8.4 ALTERNATIVE FOUR (MIXED-USE COMMERCIAL/OFFICE ALTERNATIVE)**

Alternative Four would result in similar impacts for aesthetics, light, and glare; parking; air quality; noise; hazards and hazardous materials; fire protection and police protection. This Alternative would result in less impacts for all other topics.

Alternative Four would generally meet the objectives established for the proposed project. However, the affordability requirement of dedicating 20 percent of the total residential units for low- to moderate-income households would not be met under Alternative Four, as all residential units would be sold at market rate.

#### **6.8.5 ALTERNATIVE FIVE (CULTURAL ARTS CENTER/OPEN COURTYARD ALTERNATIVE)**

Alternative Five would result in similar impacts for aesthetics, light and glare; parking; air quality; hazards and hazardous materials; fire protection; and police protection. Fewer impacts would result for land use; traffic; schools; parks and recreation; water; wastewater; solid waste; and electricity and natural gas. However, greater impacts would result for noise.

Alternative Five would generally meet the objectives established for the proposed project. However, the affordability requirement of dedicating 20 percent of the total residential units for low- to moderate-income households would not be met under Alternative Five, as all residential units would be sold at market rate. In addition, there is no project objective to provide a cultural arts center or outdoor amphitheater as part of the proposed project. Thus, the inclusion of these two uses minimizes the effectiveness of the land use planning and economic objectives established for the project.

#### **6.8.6 ALTERNATIVE SIX (REDISTRIBUTION OF PARKING ALTERNATIVE)**

Alternative Six would result in similar impacts for aesthetics, light, and glare; parking; air quality; noise; hazards and hazardous materials; fire protection; and police protection. Fewer impacts would result for land use; traffic; schools; parks and recreation; wastewater; solid waste; and electricity and natural gas. However, greater impacts would result for water.

Alternative Six would meet the objectives established for the proposed project.

### 6.8.7 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

An EIR must identify an “environmentally superior” alternative and, where the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify as environmentally superior an alternative from among the others evaluated.

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

The No Project/No Development Alternative completely eliminates the significant unavoidable traffic, air quality and noise impacts. Although the significant unavoidable land use impact (alley encroachment for Lot 5 (Marbella) – Development Scenario No. 1) would be eliminated, this Alternative would result in significant unavoidable land use impacts regarding inconsistency with the *San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan*. This alternative meets none of the objectives established for the proposed project. In consideration of the factors noted above, Alternative Two (*Corridors Specific Plan Conforming Alternative*) is selected as the Environmentally Superior Alternative to the proposed project.

Alternative Two (*Corridors Specific Plan Conforming Alternative*) reduces but does not eliminate the significant unavoidable impacts for traffic, air quality and noise.

Alternative Two would meet the objectives established for the proposed project, which include the objectives identified in the *San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan*. Under this Alternative, residential, commercial and retail/restaurant, and parking uses would be developed, and the existing underutilized surface parking lots and commercial use would be removed. Alternative Two would meet the proposed project’s objectives which include, but are not limited to, providing development that reflects the vision and intent of the *San Fernando Corridors Specific Plan*, including specific development standards, design guidelines, and site improvements; expanding residential opportunities within the Downtown District and in close proximity to existing retail and commercial uses; creating economically feasible mixed-use development that improves the City’s existing surface public parking lots, increases the City’s tax revenue, and provides additional retail, commercial, and housing opportunities in the City; and encouraging a human-scale and a pedestrian-friendly environment. Additionally, under this Alternative provision of residential units for low- to moderate-income households would occur.

**TABLE 6-6  
Comparison of Alternatives**

Issue	Proposed Project	No Project/ No Development Alternative	Corridors Specific Plan Conforming Alternative	Parking Structures Alternative	Mixed-Use Commercial/ Office Alternative	Cultural Arts Center/Open Courtyard Alternative		Redistribution of Parking Alternative
						Version A	Version B	
<b>Land Use</b>		=	*	*	*	*		*
Requires Variances/ Encroachment	Yes	No	Yes <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
<b>Aesthetics, Light and Glare</b>		*	=	=	=	=		=
<b>Traffic</b>		*	*	*	*	*		*
<i>Average Daily Trips</i>	7,357	No Change <sup>1</sup>	6,418	4,234	6,411	5,693	6,389	6,874
<i>Reduces Significant Unavoidable Traffic Impacts</i>		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
<i>Eliminates Significant Unavoidable Traffic Impacts</i>		Yes	No	No	No	No		No
<b>Parking</b>		*	=	=	=	=		=
<b>Air Quality</b>		*	=	*	=	=		=
<i>Reduces Significant Unavoidable Air Quality Impacts</i>		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
<i>Eliminates Significant Unavoidable Air Quality Impacts</i>		Yes	No	No	No	No		No
<b>Noise</b>		*	=	=	=	^		=
<i>Reduces Significant Unavoidable Noise Impacts</i>		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
<i>Eliminates Significant Unavoidable Noise Impacts</i>		Yes	No	No	No	No		No
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>		*	=	=	=	=		=
<b>Fire Protection</b>		*	=	*	=	=		=
<b>Police Protection</b>		*	=	*	=	=		=
<b>Schools</b>		*	*	*	*	*		*
<b>Parks and Recreation</b>		*	*	*	*	*		*
<b>Water</b>		*	*	*	*	*		^
<i>Gallons Per Day Consumption</i>	185,328	No Change <sup>1</sup>	128,414	16,159	139,997	90,006	88,946	190,047
<b>Wastewater</b>		*	*	*	*	*		*
<i>Gallons Per Day Generated</i>	75,469	No Change <sup>1</sup>	59,275	21,883	61,060	42,309	52,624	74,273
<b>Solid Waste</b>		*	*	*	*	*		*
<i>Tons Per Day Generated</i>	1,430	No Change <sup>1</sup>	1,080	288	1,206	922	976	1,419
<b>Electricity and Natural Gas</b>		*	*	*	*	*		*
<i>Million KWh Per Year Consumed</i>	3.35	No Change <sup>1</sup>	2.84	1.46	3.04	2.38	2.97	3.27
<i>Million cf Per Year Consumed</i>	15.0	No Change <sup>1</sup>	10.6	1.7	11.2	7.6	7.9	14.7

Key:  
 = Indicates an impact that is equal to the proposed project (neither environmentally superior or inferior).  
 ^ Indicates an impact that is greater than the proposed project (environmentally inferior).  
 \* Indicates an impact that is less than the proposed project (environmentally superior).

Notes:  
 1. Assumes no change to existing conditions.  
 2. Requires encroachment for Parking Lots 8 and 10; no additional variances would be required.

This page intentionally left blank.