

7.0 ALTERNATIVES

INTRODUCTION

This section of the EIR provides a comparative analysis of the merits of alternatives to the Project pursuant to Section 15126.6 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, as amended. The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to explain potentially feasible ways to avoid or minimize significant effects of the Project. According to the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR need only examine in detail those alternatives that could feasibly meet most of the basic objectives of the Project. When addressing feasibility, the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 states that "among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the applicant can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to alternative sites." The CEQA Guidelines also specify that the alternatives discussion should not be remote or speculative, and need not be presented in the same level of detail as the assessment of the Project.

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

SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ANALYSIS

According to the *CEQA Guidelines*, the discussion of alternatives should focus on alternatives to a project or its location, which can feasibly avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects of the project. The *CEQA Guidelines* indicate that the range of alternatives included in this discussion should be sufficient to allow decision-makers a reasoned choice. The alternative discussion should provide decision makers with an understanding of the merits and disadvantages of these alternatives.

Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this EIR, concludes that Project implementation would result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. These impacts include cumulative population, shade and shadow, and solid waste impacts; short-term noise impacts; and long-term and cumulative recreation impacts. In response to these impacts, the Glendale Redevelopment Agency (Agency) developed and considered several alternatives to the Project.

These alternatives included the No Project Alternative; development of the Project at a 25 percent reduced density on the site; development of the site under Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) zoning with

maximum incentives; the development of the Project on an alternative site; and development of the Project site as a park.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT EVALUATED IN DETAIL

Section 15126.6(c) of the *CEQA Guidelines* states that an EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed and the reasons for eliminating alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR is the failure of the alternative to meet most of the basic Project objectives, infeasibility, and/or the inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. Provided below are the reasons for not providing detailed evaluation of some of the alternatives initially developed by the Agency.

DSP Zoning with Maximum Incentives Alternative

Section 15126(e) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires an analysis of “what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project was not approved based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.” As a result of the existing designation in the City General Plan and zoning ordinances, and based on a likely proposal by a developer, it is anticipated that development on the Project site would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project were not approved.

Under the DSP General Plan and zoning designations, density is limited by height and maximum floor area ratio (FAR). The height of the building would be limited to 16 stories or 245 feet in height without incentives and 20 stories or 305 feet with incentives. In addition, the amount of intensity allowed on the site by the DSP would be limited to a maximum FAR of 7.0 without incentives and a maximum FAR of 7.5 with incentives. Based on these stipulations, the alternative with incentives could be 20 stories or 305 feet in height and achieve a maximum FAR of 7.5. As there is no limit on the number of residential units under the DSP designation, the Project could contain 325 to 375 units under this alternative (assuming all residential and no hotel use), which is based on the Project average of 13 to 15 units per story. As the Project under this alternative could conceivably be larger than the Project as proposed, the selection of this alternative would not avoid but increase the magnitude of significant impacts. Therefore, this alternative has been eliminated from detailed consideration in this EIR.

Off-Site Alternative

An alternative site would involve the development of the Project at a different location. Given that neither the Project applicant nor the Agency owns or controls any other property in the vicinity of the site

not already proposed for development, the ability of the applicant to find and purchase an alternative site to develop the Project is considered speculative. In addition, the development of an alternative site may not be able to meet the Project objectives. Lastly, the development of the same uses at a different location would result in similar cumulative population, shade and shadow, and solid waste impacts, short-term noise impacts, and long-term and cumulative recreation impacts. Thus, the selection of an alternative site would not avoid significant impacts.

As indicated in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(c), “among factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are (i) failure to meet most of the project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.” As discussed above, the relocation of the project to an alternative site would not be feasible because the obtaining of an alternative site is considered speculative and because development on an alternative site would not avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project. Therefore, this alternative has been eliminated from detailed consideration within this EIR.

Park Alternative

This alternative would include the development of a neighborhood park on the 1.3-acre site. This alternative was initially evaluated as a means of avoiding the significant and unavoidable Project impact of increasing the use of existing parks and recreation facilities. This alternative would also reduce the magnitude of the significant and unavoidable impacts addressed in the EIR, such as cumulative population, shade and shadow, and solid waste impacts. This alternative was ultimately rejected from detailed consideration because it would not meet any of the Project objectives.

ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED IN DETAIL

The alternatives to the Project selected for detailed analysis in this EIR were developed with the aim of minimizing environmental impacts while still, where possible, meeting the basic objectives of the Project. As listed in **Section 3.0, Project Description**, the Agency has defined the following objectives for the Project:

- Support the objectives of the Redevelopment Plan to eliminate blight and revitalize the Central Glendale Redevelopment Project Area;
- Create a diversity of residential and urban uses to activate and strengthen the vitality of downtown Glendale;
- Provide housing opportunities, pursuant to the Glendale Redevelopment Agency's policy, in an urban setting in close proximity to employment opportunities, public transportation, public facilities, and goods and services;

- Provide a high-quality and functionally integrated housing and retail/commercial development that is distinctive and contributes to the creation of a downtown Glendale residential base;
- Utilize architectural design, lighting, and landscape materials to give the project site a distinctive and pleasing appearance;
- Contribute to an attractive and striking skyline in downtown Glendale;
- Focus development of retail and high-density residential uses on a site adjacent to compatible land uses; and
- Provide employment opportunities for City residents.

Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this EIR, concludes that Project implementation would result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. These impacts include cumulative population, shade and shadow, and solid waste impacts; short-term noise impacts; and long-term and cumulative recreation impacts.

A list of the alternatives selected for evaluation in this analysis is provided below.

- Alternative 1 - No Project/No Development; and
- Alternative 2 – 25 Percent Reduced Density.

Alternative 1 - No Project/No Development Alternative

The No Project/No Development Alternative is required to be evaluated by Section 15126(2)(4) of the *CEQA Guidelines*. As required by the *CEQA Guidelines*, the analysis must examine the impacts which might occur if the site is left in its present condition, as well as what may reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the site would not be developed with additional uses, and would remain in its current state as a vacant lot. None of the impacts associated with construction and operational activities would occur if the No Project/No Development Alternative were selected. No cumulative population, shade and shadow, or solid waste impacts; short-term noise impacts; or long-term and cumulative recreation impacts would occur during Project operation. In addition, this alternative would not develop the site to eliminate existing blighted conditions within the downtown area. This alternative is environmentally superior to the Project in all respects.

Relationship of Alternative to Project Objectives

This alternative would directly result in the following objectives for the Project not being attained.

- Support the objectives of the Redevelopment Plan to eliminate blight and revitalize the Central Glendale Redevelopment Project Area;
- Create a diversity of residential and urban uses to activate and strengthen the vitality of downtown Glendale;
- Provide housing opportunities, pursuant to the Glendale Redevelopment Agency's policy, in an urban setting in close proximity to employment opportunities, public transportation, public facilities, and goods and services;
- Provide a high-quality and functionally integrated housing and retail/commercial development that is distinctive and contributes to the creation of a downtown Glendale residential base;
- Utilize architectural design, lighting, and landscape materials to give the project site a distinctive and pleasing appearance;
- Contribute to an attractive and striking skyline in downtown Glendale;
- Focus development of retail and high-density residential uses on a site adjacent to compatible land uses; and
- Provide employment opportunities for City residents.

Alternative 2 – 25 Percent Reduced Density

The 25 Percent Reduced Density Alternative considers development of the entire 1.3-acre site at approximately 75 percent of the density of residential, hotel and commercial uses under the Project. This alternative was formulated to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project by reducing the amount of development. The layout for the land uses under this alternative would be the same as for the Project, and would result in the development of 138 condominiums, 129 hotel rooms, and 3,067 square feet of retail-commercial space. Of the 138 housing units, 50 would be one-bedroom units and 88 would be two-bedroom units. The height of the Hotel/Residential tower building would be 14 stories or approximately 167 feet while the height of the Residential tower would be 15 stories or about 178 feet.

Land Use and Planning

Alternative 2 would establish a mix of commercial and residential uses on the Project site that are allowed by the current General Plan and DSP Zoning designations. The density of the residential uses would be within the maximum amounts allowed by these designations. This alternative would include

143 residential units. This alternative would not conflict with the use or density standards in the General Plan or Zoning Code.

Like the Project, this alternative would not conflict with any of the goals, objectives, or policies of the Glendale General Plan. This alternative would result in the redevelopment of the site and the development of new residential uses in downtown Glendale. As a result, this alternative also would not conflict with the goals of the Downtown Specific Plan, the Redevelopment Plan, or the applicable goals, policies and principals contained in several plans prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

Population and Housing

Alternative 2 would include 138 multi-family residential units consisting of one- and two-bedroom units. Based on a mix of 50 one-bedroom units and 88 two-bedroom units and an average household size of 1.5 persons per one-bedroom unit and 2.5 persons per two-bedroom unit¹, the residential component of the Project would most likely generate approximately 295 residents (50 units x 1.5 persons per household + 88 units x 2.5 persons per household). Based on about 0.80 employees per room and an average of three employees per 1,000 square feet, the hotel and retail components combined would employ approximately 112 workers/employees (3,067 square feet x 3.0 employees/1,000 square feet + 129 hotel rooms x 0.8 employees). Applying a 24 percent ratio (which is the percent of existing employees who work and reside in the City of Glendale)², the employment positions would result in 27 of these new employees residing in the City of Glendale under Alternative 2. If it is conservatively assumed that the new employees would form a single household in the City, then the household could indirectly add approximately 76 additional residents to the City (1 household x 2.8 persons per household). Overall, the increase in population of 295 people that would be associated with the residential units under Alternative 2 and the possible additional increase in population of 76 people associated with employment opportunities under Alternative 2 would result in a total population increase of 371 new residents to the City.

¹ Population generation rates for units were provided by the applicant and represent a more conservative population estimate than if generation rates were used from the Glendale Downtown Specific Plan..

² Alternative 2 would generate approximately 112 employment positions. Based on the existing residence characteristics of the work force in Glendale, it is estimated that approximately one quarter of these employees could relocate to Glendale. Travel time-to-work data collected by the 2000 U.S. Census indicates that approximately 21,800 workers in Glendale aged 16 and over commute less than 15 minutes to their places of employment or work from home. It can be assumed that these workers are employed within the City limits, since it would conceivably take longer than 15 minutes to commute to jobs located outside Glendale. In 2000, the City of Glendale had 91,000 employees based on the number of resident and non-resident employees reported to the State of California Employment Development Division by firms located in Glendale. In 2000, therefore, approximately 21,800 of the 91,000 employees working in Glendale resided in the City, which equates to approximately 24 percent of the worker population.

The Project would include 184 condominium units. Based on a mix of 67 one-bedroom and 117 two-bedroom units and an average household size of 1.5 persons per one-bedroom unit and 2.5 persons per two-bedroom unit, the residential component of the Project would most likely generate approximately 393 residents (67 units x 1.5 persons per household + 117 units x 2.5 persons per household). Based on about 0.80 employees per room and an average of three employees per 1,000 square feet, the hotel and retail components combined would employ approximately 150 workers/employees (4,089 square feet x 3.0 employees/1,000 square feet + 172 hotel rooms x 0.8 employees). Applying a 24 percent ratio (which is the percent of existing employee that work and reside in the City of Glendale), the employment positions would result in 36 of these new employees residing in the City of Glendale. If it is conservatively assumed that each of the new employees forms a single household in the City, these households could indirectly add approximately 101 additional residents to the City (36 households x 2.8 persons per household). Overall, the increase in population of 393 people that would be associated with the residential units and the possible additional increase in population of 101 people associated with employment opportunities provided by the Project would result in a total population increase of 494 new residents to the City.

Despite the Project exceeding the South Coast Association of Governments (SCAG) projection and Alternative 2 coming close to exceeding the SCAG projection, the population increase associated with the Project or Alternative 2 is not considered substantial, as the increase would amount to less than a 1 percent increase in population growth. Furthermore, growth associated with the Project and Alternative 2 has already been accounted for in the Downtown Specific Plan (adopted November 2006), and in turn the Glendale General Plan. As a result, impacts to population would be less than significant with the Project or Alternative 2.

Nonetheless, the cumulative population growth associated with the Project or Alternative 2 and related projects would be considered substantial, as the amount of growth projected for the City would be exceeded, and is considered to be significant. The cumulative population impact associated with Alternative 2 would be less than the Project.

Aesthetics

Under the Project and Alternative 2, the Orange and Wilson Project is located at the southwest corner of the Wilson Avenue and Orange Street directly west of the site. During the winter morning hours, shade from both the Project or Alternative 2 and the Orange and Wilson Project would impact the retail land uses located directly north of the Project. Because no sensitive uses exist directly north of the site, impacts under either the Project or Alternative 2 would be less than significant. Given the location and angle of sunlight in summer and winter, shade from the Project would extend west across Orange Street

and onto the Orange and Wilson Project. Given that the Orange and Wilson Project contains sensitive receptors, the shade caused by the Project would result in a significant cumulative impact. Since the building would be reduced from 223 feet under the Project to 178 feet under the Alternative 2, the shadow would be reduced to the west and would not extend onto the Orange and Wilson Project, thus reducing this impact to a less than significant level. All other visual impact under this alternative would be similar to the Project and would thus be less than significant.

Traffic, Circulation and Parking

Construction activities under Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the Project on a daily and peak hour basis, but may occur over a shorter period as Alternative 2 includes less development. Construction worker and truck trips would occur along major roadways with some of the trips generated during peak hours; however, construction impacts from either the Project or Alternative 2 would be less than significant. While the resulting impact would be less than significant with the Project or Alternative 2, this alternative would result in shorter duration of construction.

As indicated in **Table 7.0-1, Alternative 2 Trip Generation**, this alternative would generate fewer net new vehicle trips as compared to the Project. This alternative would generate approximately 1,692 daily vehicle trips compared to 2,356 daily trips for the Project. In addition, Alternative 2 would generate 123 net new AM peak hour trips compared to 175 net new trips for the Project. During the PM peak hour this alternative would generate approximately 132 net new trips as compared to 186 net new trips generated by the Project. Because there would be less daily and peak-hour traffic generated with this alternative, fewer impacts would occur to the analyzed intersections. While the resulting impact would be less than significant with the Project or Alternative 2, this alternative would result in fewer daily and peak-hour trips.

Air Quality

Construction activities (e.g., equipment use assumptions) under Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the Project on a daily basis but may occur over a shorter period, due to Alternative 2 being a smaller development. The net increase in emissions resulting from Alternative 2, like the Project, would not exceed daily thresholds recommended by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) nor would emissions resulting from Alternative 2 exceed localized significance criteria recommend by the SCAQMD. As a result, construction emissions generated by Alternative 2 are less than significant. While the resulting impact would be less than significant with the Project or Alternative 2, this alternative would result in shorter duration of construction

**Table 7.0-1
Alternative 2 Trip Generation**

Land Use	Size	Daily Trip Ends ¹ Volumes	AM Peak Hour Volumes ¹			PM Peak Hour Volumes ¹		
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Proposed								
Condominiums ²	138 DU	577	9	38	47	32	20	52
Hotel ³	129 Rooms	1,063	44	28	72	41	35	76
Restaurant ⁴	3.067 SF	390	18	17	35	20	14	34
Less 50% Walk-in		(260)	(12)	(12)	(24)	(14)	(9)	(23)
Less 30% Pass-by		(78)	(4)	(3)	(7)	(4)	(3)	(7)
Net New Trips		1,692	55	68	123	75	57	132

Source: Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers, 2007.

¹ Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.

² ITE Land Use Code 232 (High Rise Condominium/Townhouse) trip generation average rates.

³ ITE Land Use Code 310 (Hotel) trip generation average rates.

⁴ ITE Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant) trip generation average rates.

The net increase in daily operational emissions associated with Alternative 2 is presented in **Table 7.0-1, Operational Emissions of Alternative 2 (Year 2010)**, along with the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD. As shown in **Table 7.0-1**, like the Project, Alternative 2 would generate daily operational emissions of carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOC), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), and fine particulate matter (PM₁₀) that would not exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD. While the resulting impact would be less than significant with the Project or Alternative 2, this alternative would result in less generated emissions.

**Table 7.0-2
Operational Emission of Alternative 2 – Year 2010**

Emissions Source	Emissions in Pounds per Day					
	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Summertime Emissions¹						
Operational (Mobile) Sources	12.88	14.43	128.61	0.13	20.76	4.05
Area Sources	8.17	2.46	4.95	0.00	0.02	0.02
Summertime Emission Totals	21/05	16.89	133.56	3	20.78	4.07
SCAQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Source: Impact Sciences, Inc.

Totals in table may not appear to add exactly due to rounding in the computer model calculations.

¹ "Summertime Emissions" are representative of the conditions that may occur during the ozone season (May 1 to October 31).

Implementation of Alternative 2 would add new stationary noise sources to the site, as would the Project. These would include rooftop-mounted equipment, loading docks, parking garages, street sweepers, and on-site entertainment uses. With the implementation of mitigation measures for the Project, impacts resulting from these noise sources under Alternative 2 would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Development activities associated with the Project and Alternative 2 such as earthmoving and construction of on- and off-site infrastructure would involve the use of heavy equipment, such as scrapers, tractors, loaders, concrete mixers, and cranes. Under either the Project or Alternative 2, these construction equipment sources would cause significant and unavoidable noise impacts. These impacts could be reduced but not eliminated under either development scenario through the implementation of mitigation measures recommended for the Project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

In order to evaluate whether subsurface soils at the Project site have been impacted by VOCs from the former on-site dry cleaning facility, and to screen on-site soil fill materials for common urban contaminants, a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment consisting of a laboratory analysis of soil and vapor samples was conducted. A total of eight soil gas samples were collected from the six vapor borings drilled for the investigation in the vicinity of the former dry-cleaning facility. All samples were analyzed on site for VOCs using a Hewlett Packard 5890 Series II Gas Chromatograph equipped with a Flame Ionization Detector (FID) and an Electron Capture Detector (ECD). Based on the laboratory analysis of soil samples, no VOCs were detected above laboratory reporting limits in any of the eight samples analyzed. Laboratory analysis of the eight soil samples collected indicated no concentrations of Total Recoverable Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TRPH) above reporting limits for any of the soil samples analyzed. Title 22 metals were detected in the soil samples during the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Method Series 6000/7000 analyses; however, the concentrations of these metals found present were at levels considered as background or naturally occurring; and no VOCs were detected above laboratory reporting limits in the two samples. Consequently, the development of either the Project or Alternative would result in less than significant impacts.

Hydrology and Water Quality

While the Project site is undeveloped, it is located in a highly urbanized area and is served by an existing storm water collection and conveyance system. The Storm Drain Capacity Study prepared for the Project concluded that sufficient capacity exists in the existing storm drain system to adequately convey stormwater runoff generated on the Project site. No modification to the existing storm drain system serving the Project site is required. As a result, neither the Project nor Alternative 2 would result in

runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or require the construction of new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities. Additionally, while storm water runoff would increase under Project or Alternative 2 implementation due to the introduction of impervious surfaces and would contain pollutant concentrations typical of urban runoff, neither the Project nor Alternative 2 would be considered an additional source of substantial polluted runoff. Based on the above, impacts for either the Project or Alternative 2 would be less than significant.

Public Services

Fire Protection

Alternative 2, like the Project, would increase demand on the City of Glendale Fire Department for fire protection services and emergency medical services. Alternative 2, however, would result in fewer calls for service due to the smaller number of residential units. In addition, Alternative 2 would result in impacts to the City of Glendale Fire Department as an increase in staff would be required to adequately serve the Project. Alternative 2, like the Project, would be required to include mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Police Protection

Alternative 2, like the Project, would increase calls for service to the City of Glendale Police Department. Alternative 2, however, would result in fewer calls for service due to the smaller number of residential units. Alternative 2 would result in impacts to the City of Glendale Police Department as an increase in staff would be required to adequately serve the Project. Impacts for Alternative 2, like the Project, would be less than significant.

Schools

Alternative 2 would generate new students in the Glendale Unified School District as would the Project. Alternative 2 would directly result in the generation of approximately 20 students in grades K through 6, 7 students in grades 7 and 8, and 15 students in grades 9 through 12, for a total of 42 students. This would be a decrease of 15 students over the Project. With the payment of school fees, as required by the Project, Alternative 2 impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Utilities and Services

Water

Alternative 2, like the Project, would result in an increased demand for water. Alternative 2 would demand 65.0 acre-feet of water per year compared to 86.6 acre-feet per year demanded by the Project. The provision of water resulting from the Project implementation would be within the projections of the Glendale Water and Power (GWP). Alternative 2, which demands less water than the Project, would also be within the established GWP projections. Water demand impacts under both Alternative 2 and the Project would be less than significant.

Sewer

Alternative 2, like the Project, would result in an increase in the demand for sewer services. Alternative 2 would result in an increase of 39,405 gallons of sewage per day. The Project would result in an increase of 52,540 gallons of sewage per day. There is adequate treatment capacity at the Hyperion Treatment Plant to accommodate either Alternative 2 or the Project. Impacts to sewage treatment under both Alternative 2 and the Project would be less than significant.

Concerning sewage conveyance, there is adequate capacity in the existing sewage lines surrounding the site. However, the City of Glendale has indicated that the 15-inch sewer main in Central Avenue, as well as other lines downstream within the Colorado Flume, may not be able to handle the anticipated net increase in sewer demand. Consequently, Alternative 2, while generating less sewage would, like the Project, impact the downstream sewer system. Impacts under the Project or Alternative 2 would be considered significant. Payment of the Sewer Impact Fee would reduce impact under both the Project and Alternative 2 to less than significant. For this reason, impacts to the sewage conveyance system under either the Project or Alternative 2 would be less than significant.

Solid Waste

Alternative 2, like the Project, would result in an increase in the demand for solid waste services. Alternative 2 would result in the generation of 83 tons per year of solid waste. The Project would result in the generation of 110 tons per year of solid waste. There is adequate landfill capacity at the Scholl Canyon Landfill to accommodate either Alternative 2 or the Project. Impacts under both Alternative 2 and the Project would be less than significant. However, there is presently insufficient permitted disposal capacity within the existing system serving Los Angeles County. Alternative 2, like the Project, in combination with other development, could contribute to insufficient permitted disposal capacity by contributing additional solid waste to regional landfills. Therefore, the Project's or Alternative 2's

contribution to the cumulative impact would be considered cumulatively considerable, and would be a significant and unavoidable impact.

Alternative 2 would implement a waste diversion program in an effort to help the City meet its waste diversion goal of 50 percent as mandated by Assembly Bill (AB) 939, as would the Project. In addition, Alternative 2, like the Project, would comply with the Municipal Code by enclosing trash collection areas. Impacts under both Alternative 2 and Project would be less than significant.

Recreation

Alternative 2, like the Project, would result in an increase in use of existing neighborhood and community parks. The City currently has a park land-to-resident ratio of approximately 1.4 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents while the City's park planning standard is 6 acres of neighborhood and community parkland per 1,000 residents. Existing park facilities are currently heavily used due to the deficiency in parkland in the City. Alternative 2 would result in the direct generation of approximately 295 residents who would utilize City parks, while the Project would result in direct generation of approximately 393 residents utilizing City parks. Both the Project and the alternative would result in significant and unavoidable Project-specific and cumulative recreation impacts, but Alternative 2 would slightly reduce this impact due to the generation of a smaller population.

Relationship of Alternative to Project Objectives

This alternative would directly result in the following objectives for the Project not being attained or only partially met.

- Support the objectives of the Redevelopment Plan to eliminate blight and revitalize the Central Glendale Redevelopment Project Area;
- Create a diversity of residential and urban uses to activate and strengthen the vitality of downtown Glendale;
- Provide housing opportunities, pursuant to the Glendale Redevelopment Agency's policy, in an urban setting in close proximity to employment opportunities, public transportation, public facilities, and goods and services;
- Provide a high-quality and functionally-integrated housing and retail/commercial development that is distinctive and contributes to the creation of a downtown Glendale residential base;
- Utilize architectural design, lighting, and landscape materials to give the site a distinctive and pleasing appearance;
- Contribute to an attractive and striking skyline in downtown Glendale;

- Focus development of retail and high-density residential uses on a site adjacent to compatible land uses; and
- Provide employment opportunities for City residents.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires an EIR to identify an environmentally superior alternative. Of the alternatives considered in this section, the No Project/No Development Alternative is environmentally superior to the other alternative and the Project because the significant and unavoidable cumulative population, shade and shadow, and solid waste impacts, short-term noise impacts, and long-term and cumulative recreation impacts identified for the Project would be avoided.