

7.0 ALTERNATIVES

INTRODUCTION

This section of the EIR provides a comparative analysis of the merits of alternatives to the proposed project pursuant to Section 15126.6 of the State 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 proposed 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 proposed project; (2) the ability of alternatives to avoid or lessen the significant impacts associated with the project; (3) the ability of the alternatives to meet the 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 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 short-term noise impacts during construction and long-term population, noise, solid waste and recreation impacts during project operation. 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 project site, development of the project at a 75 percent reduced density on the project site;

development of the project site under Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) zoning with maximum incentives; the development of the project on alternatives sites; 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 failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, infeasibility, or 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 proposed 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 18 stories or 275 feet in height without incentives and 25 stories or 380 feet with incentives. In addition, the amount of intensity allowed on the site by the DSP would be limited to a maximum FAR of 7.25 without incentives and a maximum FAR of 7.50 with incentives. Based on these stipulations, the proposed alternative with incentives could be 25 stories or 380 feet in height and achieve a maximum FAR of 7.50. As there is no limit on the number of residential units under the DSP designation, the proposed project could contain 325 to 375 units under this alternative, which is based on the proposed project average of 13 to 15 units per story. As the proposed project under this alternative could conceivably be larger than the proposed project, the selection of this alternative would not avoid but increase the magnitude of significant impacts. Therefore, this alternative has been eliminated from detailed consideration within 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 proposed project site, the ability of the applicant to find and purchase an alternative site to develop the project on 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 short-term noise impacts during construction and similar long-term population, noise, solid waste, and recreation impacts during operation. Thus, the selection of an alternative site would not avoid significant impacts.

As indicated in CEQA 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 1.8-acre project 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 reduce the magnitude of the significant and unavoidable impacts addressed in the EIR such as short-term noise impacts during construction and long-term population, noise, solid waste, and recreation impacts during project operation; but was initially considered in response to recreational impacts. This alternative was ultimately rejected from detailed consideration since it would not meet any of the project objectives.

ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED IN DETAIL

The alternatives to the proposed Verdugo Gardens project ultimately selected for 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 proposed project:

- Support the objectives of the Redevelopment Plan to eliminate blight and revitalize the Central Glendale Redevelopment Project Area;

- Provide a distinctive landmark project and, at the same time, create a contemporary urban context that responds to the special character of downtown Glendale;
- Create a diversity of residential and urban uses to activate and strengthen the vitality of downtown Glendale;
- Provide housing opportunities, pursuant to the 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 high-density residential and retail-commercial uses on a site adjacent to compatible land uses;
- Boost and expand the viewscape of downtown Glendale through unique architectural features;
- Enhance and diversify the cultural fabric of downtown Glendale by providing space for public art and other amenities; 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 include short-term noise impacts during construction and long-term impacts with regards to population, noise, solid waste, and recreation during project operation. Based on the environmental analysis, alternatives were developed which would provide decision makers with a reasonable range of alternatives that would eliminate or reduce the impacts of the project. A list of the alternatives selected for evaluation in this analysis is provided below.

- Alternative 1 – No Project/No Development;
- Alternative 2 – 25 Percent Reduced Density ; and
- Alternative 3 – 75 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 project site would not be developed with additional uses, and would remain in its current state. Existing restaurant and medical office uses, including parking, would remain. None of the impacts associated with construction and operational activities would occur if the No Project/No Development Alternative were selected. No short-term noise impacts would occur during construction and any long-term population, noise, solid waste and recreation impacts would not 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 proposed 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;
- Provide a distinctive landmark project and, at the same time, create a contemporary urban context that responds to the special character of downtown Glendale;
- Create a diversity of residential and urban uses to activate and strengthen the vitality of downtown Glendale;
- Provide housing opportunities, pursuant to the 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 high-density residential and retail-commercial uses on a site adjacent to compatible land uses;

- Boost and expand the viewscape of downtown Glendale through unique architectural features;
- Enhance and diversify the cultural fabric of downtown Glendale by providing space for public art and other amenities; and
- Provide employment opportunities for City residents.

Alternative 2 – 25 Percent Reduced Density

The 25 Percent Reduced Density Alternative considers development of the entire 1.8-acre site at approximately 75 percent of the density of residential and commercial uses under the proposed project. This alternative was formulated to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project by reducing the amount of development. Under this alternative, all on-site buildings would be demolished and removed. The layout for the land uses proposed under this alternative would be the same as for the proposed project, and would result in the development of 215 condominiums and 2,156 square feet of retail-commercial space. Of the 215 for-sale housing units, 91 would be one-bedroom units, 117 would be two bedroom units, and 7 would be three bedroom units. The height of the building would also be 18 stories or approximately 200 feet.

Land Use and Planning

Alternative 2 would establish a mix of retail-commercial and residential uses on the project site that are allowed by the current General Plan and DSP Zoning designations. The intensity of the residential uses proposed would be within the maximum amounts allowed by these designations. This alternative would include 215 residential units. This alternative would not conflict with the use or density standards in the General Plan or Zoning Code.

Like the proposed 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 project site and the development of new residential and commercial uses in downtown Glendale, which are presently served by existing utilities and public services. As a result, neither this alternative nor the proposed project would conflict with the goals of the Redevelopment Plan, the Downtown Specific Plan or applicable policies contained in regional plans prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG).

Population and Housing

Alternative 2 would include 215 multi-family residential units consisting of one, two, and three bedroom units. Based on a mix of 91 one-bedroom units, 117 two-bedroom units, and seven three-bedroom units and an average household size of 1.5 persons per one-bedroom unit, 2.5 persons per two-bedroom unit, and 3.5 persons per three-bedroom penthouse unit, the residential component of the project would most likely generate approximately 454 residents (91 units x 1.5 persons per household + 117 units x 2.5 persons per household + 7 units x 3.5 persons per household). Based on 3.0 employees per 1,000 square feet, the direct employment growth of Alternative 2 would be 6 employees (2,156 square feet x [3.0 employees/1,000 square feet]). Applying a 24 percent ratio (which is the percent of existing employees who work and reside in the City of Glendale), the employment positions would result in 1 of these new employees residing in the City of Glendale under Alternative 2. If it is conservatively assumed that the new employee would form a single household in the City, then the household could indirectly add approximately 3 additional residents to the City (1 household x 2.8 persons per household). Overall, the increase in population of 454 people that would be associated with the proposed residential units under Alternative 2 and the possible additional increase in population of 3 people associated with employment opportunities under Alternative 2 would result in a total population increase of 457 new residents to the City.

The proposed project is a mixed-use development consisting of 287 condominium units, and 2,875 square feet of retail-commercial space. The project will also include recreational amenities to support the residential units and supporting parking facilities. Based on a mix of 122 one-bedroom units, 156 two-bedroom units, and nine three-bedroom penthouse units and an average household size of 1.5 persons per one-bedroom unit, 2.5 persons per two-bedroom unit, and 3.5 persons per three-bedroom penthouse unit, the residential component of the project would most likely generate approximately 605 residents (122 units x 1.5 persons per household + 156 units x 2.5 persons per household + 9 units x 3.5 persons per household). Based on 3.0 employees per 1,000 square feet, the direct employment growth of the project would be 11 employees (2,875 square feet x 3.0 employees/1,000 square feet). Applying the 24 percent ratio of existing employees that work in the City of Glendale, the employment positions would result in 3 of these new employees residing in the City of Glendale, which in turn could indirectly add approximately 6 additional residents to the City (3 households x 2.8 persons per household). Overall, the increase in population of 605 people that would be associated with the proposed residential units provided by the project and the possible additional increase in population of 8 people associated with employment opportunities provided by the project would result in a total population increase of 613 new residents to the City.

Despite both the proposed project and Alternative 2 exceeding the 2010 SCAG projection for the City, the population increase associated with the proposed 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 proposed 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 either the proposed project or Alternative 2. However, this alternative would be environmentally superior, as Alternative 2 would generate fewer residents and employees.

Nonetheless, the population growth associated with either the proposed 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 a long-term significant and unavoidable cumulative impact. The impact associated with Alternative 2, however, would be much less than the proposed project and would again be considered environmentally superior.

Aesthetics

Under the proposed project and Alternative 2, shade from either the proposed project or Alternative 2 would impact high rise commercial office uses located directly west of the proposed project in the morning and the adjacent parking garage directly to the east in the afternoon. However, no sensitive uses exist directly west or east of the proposed project site and as such, impacts under either the proposed project or Alternative 2 would be less than significant. In addition, since the height of the building would be reduced from 266 feet under the proposed project to 200 feet under the Alternative 2, the amount of shade cast on these uses would be reduced. Therefore, Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project due to its reduced height. All other visual impact under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project and would thus be less than significant.

Traffic, Circulation and Parking

Construction activities under Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the proposed 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. In terms of severity, Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project due to the shorter length 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 20 less net daily vehicle trips compared to 344 net daily trips for the proposed project. In addition, Alternative 2 would generate 48 net new AM peak hour trips compared to 73 net new trips for the proposed project. During the PM peak hour, this alternative would generate 5 less net new trips as compared to 26 net new trips generated by the proposed project. Because there would be less daily and peak hour traffic

generated with this alternative, impacts would be lessened at the analyzed intersections. While the resulting impact would be less than significant with the proposed project or Alternative 2, this alternative would be environmentally superior due to fewer daily and peak hour trips.

**Table 7.0-1
Alternative 2 Trip Generation¹**

Land Use	Size	Daily Trip Ends ² Volumes	AM Peak Hour Volumes ²			PM Peak Hour Volumes ²		
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Proposed Condominiums ³	215 DU	900	14	59	73	51	31	82
Retail ⁴	2,156 GSF	96	n/a	n/a	0	3	3	6
Subtotal		996	14	59	73	54	54	88
Existing Use Medical Office ⁵	10,000 GSF	361	20	5	25	10	27	37
Restaurant ⁶	5,150 GLSF	655	n/a	n/a	n/a	34	22	56
Subtotal		1,016	20	5	25	44	49	93
Net New Trips		(20)	(6)	54	48	10	(15)	(5)

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

¹ ITE "Trip Generation," 7th Edition, 2003.

² Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.

³ ITE Land Use Code 232 (High Rise Condominium/Townhouse) trip generation average rates.

⁴ ITE Land Use Code 814 (Specialty Retail) trip generation average rates.

⁵ ITE Land Use Code 720 (Medical Office Building) trip generation average rates.

⁶ ITE Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant) trip generation average rates. The existing restaurant does not serve breakfast and is not open during the AM commuter peak period.

Air Quality

Construction activities (e.g., equipment use assumptions) under Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the proposed 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 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. However, in terms of severity, Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project due to the length of construction.

The net increase in daily operational emissions associated with Alternative 2 is presented in **Table 7.0-2, Operational Emissions of Alternative 2 (Year 2010)**, along with the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD. As shown in **Table 7.0-2**, like the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not generate daily operational emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} that would exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD under both summer and winter conditions. While the resulting impact would be less than significant with the proposed project or Alternative 2, this alternative would be environmentally superior due to fewer long-term emissions during operation.

**Table 7.0-2
Operational Emissions 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	7.99	8.84	80.58	0.08	12.98	2.53
Area/Stationary Sources	11.77	2.17	3.24	0.00	0.00	0.00
Summertime Emissions Total	19.76	11.01	83.82	0.08	12.58	2.53
Existing Emissions	5.83	5.37	58.59	0.03	4.47	0.96
Net Change in Emissions	13.93	5.64	25.23	0.05	8.11	1.57
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Wintertime Emissions²						
Operational (Mobile) Sources	8.08	10.65	77.53	0.07	12.98	2.53
Area/Stationary Sources	1.66	3.33	1.43	0.00	0.11	0.11
Wintertime Emissions Total	19.74	13.98	78.96	0.07	13.09	2.63
Existing Emissions	6.28	7.57	60.05	0.03	4.47	0.96
Net Change in Emissions	13.55	6.41	18.91	0.04	8.62	1.67
SCAQMD Threshold	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).

² Wintertime Emissions" are representative of the conditions that may occur during the balance of the year (November 1 to April 30).

Implementation of the project would not expose sensitive receptors near roadway intersections to substantial pollutant concentrations. Alternative 2 would generate less vehicular traffic to and from the project site during the AM and PM peak hour periods than the proposed project when localized concentrations of CO are the highest. While the resulting impact would be less than significant with the proposed project or Alternative 2, this alternative would be environmentally superior due to resulting in fewer long-term emissions during operation.

Noise

Development activities associated with the proposed project and Alternative 2 during construction such as demolition, 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 proposed project or Alternative 2, these construction equipment sources would cause significant noise impacts. These impacts could be reduced but not eliminated with either development scenario through the implementation of mitigation measures recommended for the project. As a result, construction of the project under both scenarios would result in short-term significant and unavoidable impacts. However, in terms of severity, Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project, as the alternative proposes a smaller amount of development, which may result in a shorter construction timeframe.

In addition, noise generated by construction of the proposed project or Alternative 2 could combine with construction activities associated with related projects in the downtown area thus resulting in a significant cumulative noise impact. As with the proposed project alone, these impacts could be reduced but not eliminated through the implementation of mitigation measures recommended for each project. As a result, construction of either the proposed project or Alternative 2 and related projects would result in short-term significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts. However, in terms of severity, Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project, as the alternative proposes a smaller amount of development, which may result in a shorter construction timeframe.

Long-term operational noise generated by traffic under this alternative would decrease compared to the proposed project. This is due to the approximately 25 percent decrease in the amount of traffic generated. On the average, like the proposed project, this alternative would result in a less than 1 (dB(A)) increase in the noise levels on affected roadway segments. This small reduction in roadway noise levels would not be noticeable. However, while the resulting impact would be less than significant with the proposed project or Alternative 2, this alternative would be environmentally superior due to less noise being generated during operation.

Noise generated by traffic along Central Avenue and Highway 134, however, would generate noise levels along the exterior of the project site that are above the City Municipal Code exterior noise level of 65 dB(A). Under either the proposed project or Alternative 2, these exterior noise levels would result in significant impact. These impacts could be reduced but not eliminated with either development scenario through the implementation of mitigation recommended for the project. As a result, operation of the project under both scenarios would result in long-term significant and unavoidable noise impacts. However, in terms of severity, Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project, as the alternative would generate less traffic, which may reduce roadway noise in front of the proposed project.

Implementation of Alternative 2 would add new stationary noise sources to the site, as would the proposed project. These would include rooftop-mounted equipment, loading docks, parking garages, street sweepers, and on-site entertainment uses. With the implementation of mitigation measures proposed for the proposed project, long-term operational impacts as a result of these noise sources under Alternative 2 would be reduced to a less than significant level. However, while the resulting impact would be less than significant with the proposed project or Alternative 2, this alternative would be environmentally superior due to less noise being generated during operation.

Cultural Resources

Alternative 2 would be on the same site as the proposed project. Consequently, cultural resources impacts to undocumented resources such as potential burial sites, archaeological sites or material, and paleontological sites and materials would be similar to those of the proposed project and could be mitigated to a less than significant level. Project mitigation measures would apply to Alternative 2 to reduce cultural resources impacts. The resulting impact on cultural resources would be less than significant under either Alternative 2 or the proposed project.

Development of Alternative 2, like the proposed project, would include the demolition of all the buildings on the site. None of the buildings on site is considered a historic resource. Therefore, demolition of the buildings on the site would not result in a significant impact on historic resources under either Alternative 2 or the proposed project.

Public Services

Fire Protection

Alternative 2, like the proposed 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 amount 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 proposed project, would contribute tax revenue, which would help fund the Fire Department, and would also be required to include mitigation measures, both of which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. However, Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior due to its reduced size.

Police Protection

Alternative 2, like the proposed project, would increase demand on the City of Glendale Police Department calls for service. Alternative 2, however, would result in fewer calls for service due to the lower 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. Alternative 2, like the proposed project, would contribute tax revenue, which would help fund the Police Department, and would also be required to include mitigation measures, both of which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. However, Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior due to its reduced size.

Schools

Alternative 2 would generate new students in the Glendale Unified School District, as would the proposed project. Alternative 2 would directly result in the generation of approximately 32 grade K–6 students, 11 grade 7–8 students, and 24 grade 9–12 students for a total of 67 students. This would be a decrease of 22 students over the proposed project. With the incorporation of the mitigation measure requiring the payment of school fees, as required by the proposed project, Alternative 2 impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. In addition, Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project due to its reduced size.

Utilities and Services

Water

Alternative 2, like the proposed project, would result in an increase in net demand for water. Alternative 2 would result in a net demand for water of 41.6 acre-feet per year compared to the proposed net project demand of 55.4 acre-feet per year. The provision of water as a result of the proposed project implementation would be within the projections of the Glendale Water and Power (GWP). Alternative 2, which would demand less water than the proposed project, would also be within the established GWP projections. Water demand impacts under both Alternative 2 and the proposed project would be less than significant. However, Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project due to its reduced demand.

Sewer

Alternative 2, like the proposed project, would result in an increase in the net demand for sewer services. Alternative 2 would result in a net increase of 29,670 gallons of sewage per day while the proposed project would result in a net increase of 39,558 gallons of sewage per day. While there is adequate

treatment capacity at the Hyperion Treatment Plant to accommodate either Alternative 2 or the proposed project, existing sewer capacity within the project area is anticipated not to be adequate to serve the proposed uses under either Alternative 2 or the proposed project. For this reason, impacts under both Alternative 2 and the proposed project could be significant. However, with the incorporation of a mitigation measure requiring the payment of sewer impact fee, as required by the proposed project, Alternative 2 impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. Alternative 2, due to a reduction in sewer flow, would be environmentally superior to the proposed project.

Solid Waste

Alternative 2, like the proposed project, would result in an increase in the net demand for solid waste services. Alternative 2 would result in the net generation of 81 tons of solid waste per year compared to the proposed project net increase of 108 tons of solid waste per year. There is adequate landfill capacity at the Scholl Canyon Landfill to accommodate either Alternative 2 or the proposed project. Therefore, impacts under both Alternative 2 and the proposed project would be less than significant. Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project, as it would generate less solid waste than the proposed project.

Solid waste generated by the proposed project or Alternative 2 would combine with solid waste generated by related projects in the downtown area and would be deposited in area landfills. The current capacity of the Scholl Canyon and Puente Hills Landfills, which receive over 90 percent of the City's waste, are adequate enough to accommodate solid waste disposal needs of either the project or Alternative 2, and development of all related projects, for at least 15 years, if not longer. The City also utilizes five additional landfills, all of which are currently still accepting materials. These landfills are a part of the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (CSDLAC), which provides solid waste management for over half the population in Los Angeles County. The CSDLAC is currently in the process of increasing capacity to accommodate future increases in solid waste through the expansion of local landfills and the use of a regional waste-by-rail system and remote landfills. However, these improvements are not yet in place and will not be completed until at least 2009. Further, there is presently insufficient permitted disposal capacity within the existing system serving Los Angeles County. As a result, either the proposed project or Alternative 2, in combination with other development, could contribute to insufficient permitted disposal capacity by contributing additional solid waste to regional landfills. Therefore, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact would be considered cumulatively considerable, and would be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact. However, in terms of severity, Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project, as it would generate less solid waste.

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 939 (AB 939) as would the proposed project. In addition, Alternative 2, like the proposed project, would comply with the Municipal Code by enclosing trash collection areas. Impacts under both Alternative 2 and proposed project would be less than significant. However, Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project, as it would generate less solid waste.

Recreation

Alternative 2, like the proposed 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 and indirect generation of approximately 457 persons, which would utilize City parks, while the proposed project would result in direct and indirect generation of approximately 613 persons utilizing City parks. Both the project and the alternative would result in a significant impact. As no feasible mitigation exists to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, operation of the project under both scenarios would result in a long-term significant and unavoidable impact to recreational facilities. However, Alternative 2 would be environmentally superior, as fewer residents generated under the alternative would reduce this impact.

In addition, direct and indirect population growth under Alternative 2 and related projects would also result in a significant cumulative impact to recreation facilities. However, Alternative 2 would again be environmentally superior, as fewer residents generated under the alternative would reduce the impact.

Relationship of Alternative to Project Objectives

This alternative would directly result in all project objectives being attained.

Alternative 3 – 75 Percent Reduced Density

The 75 Percent Reduced Density Alternative considers development of the entire 1.8-acre site at approximately 25 percent of the density of residential and commercial uses under the proposed project. This alternative was formulated to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project by reducing the amount of development. Under this alternative, all on-site buildings would be demolished and removed. The layout for the land uses proposed under this alternative would be the same as for the proposed project, and would result in the development of 72 condominiums and 719 square feet of retail-commercial space. Of the 72 for-sale housing units, 31 would be one-bedroom units,

39 would two bedroom units, and two would be three bedroom units. The height of the building would also be six stories or approximately 67 feet.

Land Use and Planning

Alternative 3 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 intensity of the residential uses proposed would be within the maximum amounts allowed by these designations. This alternative would include 72 residential units. This alternative would not conflict with the use or density standards in the General Plan or Zoning Code.

Like the proposed 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 project site and the development of new residential and commercial uses in downtown Glendale, which is presently served by existing utilities and public services. As a result, neither this alternative nor the proposed project would conflict with the goals of the Redevelopment Plan, the Downtown Specific Plan or applicable policies contained in regional plans prepared by the SCAG.

Population and Housing

Alternative 3 would include 72 multi-family residential units consisting of one, two, and three bedroom units. Based on a mix of 31 one-bedroom units, 39 two-bedroom units, and 2 three-bedroom units and an average household size of 1.5 persons per one-bedroom unit, 2.5 persons per two-bedroom unit, and 3.5 persons per three-bedroom unit, the residential component of the project would most likely generate approximately 151 residents (31 units x 1.5 persons per household + 39 units x 2.5 persons per household + 2 units x 3.5 persons per household). Based on 3.0 employees per 1,000 square feet, the direct employment growth of Alternative 3 would be 2 employees (719 square feet x [3.0 employees/1,000 square feet]). Applying the 24 percent ratio of existing employees who work in the City of Glendale, the employment positions would result in none of these new employees residing in the City of Glendale under Alternative 3. However, for the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that 1 employee would reside in the City under this alternative. Therefore, this single household could indirectly add approximately 3 additional residents to the City (1 household x 2.8 persons per household). Overall, the increase in population of 151 people that would be associated with the proposed residential units under Alternative 3 and the possible additional increase in population of 3 people associated with employment opportunities under Alternative 3 would result in a total population increase of 154 new residents to the City.

The proposed project is a mixed-use development consisting of 287 condominium units, and 2,875 square feet of retail-commercial space. The project will also include recreational amenities to support the residential units and supporting parking facilities. Based on a mix of 122 one-bedroom units, 156 two-bedroom units, and 9 three-bedroom penthouse units and an average household size of 1.5 persons per one-bedroom unit, 2.5 persons per two-bedroom unit, and 3.5 persons per three-bedroom penthouse unit, the residential component of the project would most likely generate approximately 605 residents (122 units x 1.5 persons per household + 156 units x 2.5 persons per household + 9 units x 3.5 persons per household). Based on 3.0 employees per 1,000 square feet, the direct employment growth of the project would be 11 employees (2,875 square feet x 3.0 employees/1,000 square feet). Applying the 24 percent ratio of existing employee that work and reside in the City of Glendale, the employment positions would result in the possibility that 3 of these new employees would reside in the City of Glendale, which in turn could indirectly add approximately 8 additional residents to the City (3 households x 2.8 persons per household). Overall, the increase in population of 605 people that would be associated with the proposed residential units and the possible additional increase in population of 8 people associated with employment opportunities provided by the project would result in a total population increase of 613 new residents to the City

Despite both the proposed project and Alternative 3 exceeding the SCAG projection, the population increase associated with the proposed project or Alternative 3 is not considered substantial, as the increase would amount to less than a 1 percent increase in population growth. Furthermore, growth associated with the proposed project and Alternative 3 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 proposed project or Alternative 3. However, this alternative would not be environmentally superior, as Alternative 3 would generate more residents and employees than the proposed project.

Nonetheless, the population growth associated with either the proposed project or Alternative 3 and related projects would be considered substantial, as the amount of growth projected for the City would be exceeded, and is considered to be a long-term significant and unavoidable cumulative impact. The impact associated with Alternative 3, however, would be much less than the proposed project and would again be considered environmentally superior.

Aesthetics

Under the proposed project and Alternative 3, shade from either the proposed project or Alternative 3 would impact high-rise office uses located directly west of the proposed project in the morning and the adjacent parking garage located directly to the east in the afternoon. However, no sensitive uses exist directly west or east of the proposed project site and as such, impacts under either the proposed project or Alternative 3 would be less than significant. In addition, since the height of the building would be reduced from 266 feet under the proposed project to 67 feet under the Alternative 3, the amount of shade cast on these uses would be reduced. Therefore, Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project due to its reduced height. All other visual impact under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project and would therefore be less than significant.

Traffic, Circulation and Parking

Construction activities under Alternative 3 would be similar to those of the proposed 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 3 would be less than significant. In terms of severity, Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project due to the shorter length of construction.

As indicated in **Table 7.0-3, Alternative 3 Trip Generation**, this alternative would generate fewer net new vehicle trips as compared to the project. In fact, with the removal of the existing uses on site, Alternative 3 would result in an overall net reduction of 683 daily trips and 64 PM peak hour trips on the adjacent street system. This alternative would generate a net reduction of 683 daily vehicle trips as compared to 344 net daily trips for the proposed project. In addition, Alternative 3 would generate 1 less net new AM peak hour trips compared to 73 net new trips for the proposed project. During the PM peak hour, this alternative would generate 64 less net new trips as compared to 26 net new trips generated by the proposed project. Because there would be less daily and peak hour traffic generated with this alternative, greater impacts would be lessened at analyzed intersections. While the resulting impact would be less than significant with the proposed project or Alternative 3, this alternative would be environmentally superior due to more daily and peak hour trips.

**Table 7.0-3
Alternative 3 Trip Generation¹**

Land Use	Size	Daily Trip Ends ² Volumes	AM Peak Hour Volumes ²			PM Peak Hour Volumes ²		
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Proposed Condominiums ³	72 DU	301	5	19	24	17	10	27
Retail ⁴	719 GSF	32	--	--	0	1	1	2
Subtotal		340	5	19	24	18	11	29
Existing Use Medical Office ⁵	10,000 GSF	361	20	5	25	10	27	37
Restaurant ⁶	5,150 GLSF	655	n/a	n/a	n/a	34	22	56
Subtotal		1,016	20	5	25	44	49	93
Net New Trips		(683)	(15)	14	(1)	(26)	(38)	(64)

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

¹ ITE "Trip Generation," 7th Edition, 2003.

² Trips are one-way traffic movements, entering or leaving.

³ ITE Land Use Code 232 (High Rise Condominium/Townhouse) trip generation average rates.

⁴ ITE Land Use Code 814 (Specialty Retail) trip generation average rates.

⁵ ITE Land Use Code 720 (Medical Office Building) trip generation average rates.

⁶ ITE Land Use Code 932 (High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant) trip generation average rates. The existing restaurant does not serve breakfast and is not open during the AM commuter peak period.

Air Quality

Construction activities (e.g., equipment use assumptions) under Alternative 3 would be similar to those of the proposed project on a daily basis but may occur over a shorter period due to Alternative 3 being a smaller development. The net increase in emissions resulting from Alternative 3 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 recommended by the SCAQMD. As a result, construction emissions generated by Alternative 3 are less than significant. However, in terms of severity, Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project due to the length of construction.

The net increase in daily operational emissions associated with Alternative 3 is presented in **Table 7.0-4, Operational Emissions of Alternative 3 (Year 2010)**, along with the threshold of significance recommended by the SCAQMD. As shown in **Table 7.0-4**, like the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not generate daily operational emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} that would exceed the

thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD under both summer and winter conditions. While the resulting impact would be less than significant with the proposed project or Alternative 3, this alternative would be environmentally superior due to fewer long-term emissions during operation.

**Table 7.0-4
Operational Emissions of Alternative 3 (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	2.76	2.03	23.23	0.02	2.51	0.54
Area/Stationary Sources	3.78	0.56	0.55	0.00	0.00	0.00
Summertime Emissions Total	6.54	2.59	23.78	0.02	2.51	0.54
Existing Emissions	5.83	5.37	58.59	0.03	4.47	0.96
Net Change in Emissions	0.71	(2.78)	(34.81)	(0.01)	(1.96)	(0.42)
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Wintertime Emissions²						
Operational (Mobile) Sources	1.99	2.92	22.23	0.02	2.51	0.54
Area/Stationary Sources	3.75	0.95	0.41	0.00	0.03	0.03
Wintertime Emissions Total	5.74	3.87	22.64	0.02	2.54	0.57
Existing Emissions	6.28	7.57	60.05	0.03	4.47	0.96
Net Change in Emissions	(0.54)	(3.7)	(37.41)	(0.01)	(1.93)	(.39)
SCAQMD Threshold	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).

² Wintertime Emissions" are representative of the conditions that may occur during the balance of the year (November 1 to April 30).

Implementation of the project would not expose sensitive receptors near roadway intersections to substantial pollutant concentrations. Alternative 3 would generate less vehicular traffic to and from the project site during the AM and PM peak-hour periods than the proposed project when localized concentrations of CO are the highest. While the resulting impact would be less than significant with the proposed project or Alternative 3, this alternative would be environmentally superior due to resulting in fewer emissions.

Noise

Development activities associated with the proposed project and Alternative 3 during construction such as demolition, 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

proposed project or Alternative 3, these construction equipment sources would cause significant noise impacts. These impacts could be reduced but not eliminated with either development scenario through the implementation of mitigation measures recommended for the project. As a result, construction of the project under both scenarios would result in short-term significant and unavoidable impacts. However, in terms of severity, Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project, as the alternative proposes a smaller amount of development which may result in a shorter construction timeframe.

In addition, noise generated by construction of the proposed project or Alternative 3 could combine with construction activities associated with related projects in the downtown area thus resulting in a significant cumulative noise impact. As with the proposed project alone, these impacts could be reduced but not eliminated through the implementation of mitigation measures recommended for each project. As a result, construction of either the proposed project or Alternative 3 and related projects would result in short-term significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts. However, in terms of severity, Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project, as the alternative proposes a smaller amount of development, which may result in a shorter construction timeframe.

Long-term operational noise generated by traffic under this alternative would decrease compared to the proposed project. This is due to the approximately 75 percent decrease in the amount of traffic generated. On the average, like the proposed project, this alternative would result in a less than 1 dB(A) increase in the noise levels on affected roadway segments. This small reduction in roadway noise levels would not be noticeable. However, while the resulting impact would be less than significant with the proposed project or Alternative 3, this alternative would be environmentally superior due to less noise being generated during operation.

Noise generated by traffic along Central Avenue and Highway 134, however, would generate noise levels along the exterior of the project site that are above the City Municipal Code exterior noise level of 65 dB(A). Under either the proposed project or Alternative 3, these exterior noise levels would result in significant impacts. These impacts could be reduced but not eliminated with either development scenario through the implementation of mitigation recommended for the project. As a result, operation of the project under both scenarios would result in long-term significant and unavoidable noise impacts. However, in terms of severity, Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project, as the alternative would generate less traffic, which may reduce roadway noise in front of the proposed project.

Implementation of Alternative 3 would add new stationary noise sources to the site, as would the proposed project. These would include rooftop-mounted equipment, loading docks, parking garages,

street sweepers, and on-site entertainment uses. With the implementation of mitigation measures proposed for the proposed project, long-term operational impacts as a result of noise sources under Alternative 3 would be reduced to a less than significant level. However, while the resulting impact would be less than significant with the proposed project or Alternative 3, this alternative would be environmentally superior due to less noise being generated during operation.

Cultural Resources

Alternative 3 would be on the same site as the proposed project. Consequently, cultural resources impacts to undocumented resources such as potential burial sites, archaeological sites or material, and paleontological sites and materials would be similar to those of the proposed project and could be mitigated to a less than significant level. Project mitigation measures would apply to Alternative 3 to reduce cultural resources impacts. The resulting impact on cultural resources would be less than significant under either Alternative 3 or the proposed project.

Development of Alternative 3, like the proposed project, would include the demolition of all the buildings on the site. None of the buildings on the site is considered a historic resource. Therefore, demolition of the buildings on the site would not result in a significant impact on historic resources.

Public Services

Fire Protection

Alternative 3, like the proposed project, would increase demand on the City of Glendale Fire Department for fire protection services and emergency medical services. Alternative 3, however, would result in fewer calls for service due to the smaller amount of residential units. In addition, Alternative 3 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 3, like the proposed project, would contribute tax revenue, which would help fund the Fire Department, and would also be required to include mitigation measures, both of which reduce impacts to a less than significant level. However, Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior due to its reduced size.

Police Protection

Alternative 3, like the proposed project, would increase demand on the City of Glendale Police Department for calls for service. Alternative 3, however, would result in fewer calls for service due to the lower number of residential units. In addition, Alternative 3 would also result in impacts to the City of Glendale Police Department, as an increase in staff would be required to adequately serve the project.

Alternative 3, like the proposed project, would contribute tax revenue, which would help fund the Fire Department, and would also be required to include mitigation measures, both of which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. However, Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior due to its reduced size.

Schools

Alternative 3 would generate new students in the Glendale Unified School District, as would the proposed project. Alternative 3 would directly result in the generation of approximately 11 grade K–6 students, 4 grade 7–8 students, and 8 grade 9–12 students for a total of 23 students. This would be a decrease of 66 students over the proposed project. With the incorporation of project design features, requiring the payment of school fees, as required by the proposed project, Alternative 3 impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. In addition, Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project due to its reduced size.

Utilities and Services

Water

Alternative 3, like the proposed project, would result in an increase in net demand for water. Alternative 3 would result in a net demand for water of 13.9 acre-feet per year compared to the proposed net project demand of 55.3 acre-feet per year. The provision of water as a result of the proposed project implementation would be within the projections of the Glendale Water and Power (GWP). Alternative 3, which would demand less water than the proposed project, would also be within the established GWP projections. Water demand impacts under both Alternative 3 and the proposed project would be less than significant. However, Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project due to its reduced demand.

Sewer

Alternative 3, like the proposed project, would result in an increase in the net demand for sewer services. Alternative 3 would result in a net increase of 9,890 gallons of sewage per day while the proposed project would result in a net increase of 39,558 gallons of sewage per day. While there is adequate treatment capacity at the Hyperion Treatment Plant to accommodate either Alternative 3 or the proposed project, existing sewer capacity within the project area is anticipated not to be adequate to serve the proposed uses under either Alternative 3 or the proposed project. For this reason, impacts under both Alternative 3 and the proposed project could be significant. However, with the incorporation of a mitigation measure requiring the payment of sewer impact fee, as required by the proposed project, Alternative 3 impacts

would be reduced to a less than significant level. Alternative 3, due to a reduction in sewer flow, would be environmentally superior to the proposed project.

In addition, sewage generated by the proposed project or Alternative 3 and related projects would also result in a significant cumulative impact to the City's sewage collection system. Nonetheless, Alternative 3, due to a reduction in sewer flow, would again be environmentally superior to the proposed project.

Solid Waste

Alternative 3, like the proposed project, would result in an increase in the net demand for solid waste services. Alternative 3 would result in the net generation of 27 tons of solid waste per year compared to the proposed project net increase of 108 tons of solid waste per year. There is adequate landfill capacity at the Scholl Canyon Landfill to accommodate either Alternative 3 or the proposed project. Therefore, impacts under both Alternative 3 and the proposed project would be less than significant. Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project, as it would generate less solid waste than the proposed project.

Solid waste generated by the proposed project or Alternative 3 would combine with solid waste generated by related projects in the downtown area and would be deposited in area landfills. The current capacity of the Scholl Canyon and Puente Hills Landfills, which receive over 90 percent of the City's waste, are adequate enough to accommodate solid waste disposal needs of either the project or Alternative 3, and development of all related projects, for at least 15 years, if not longer. The City also utilizes five additional landfills, all of which are currently still accepting materials. These landfills are a part of the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (CSDLAC), which provides solid waste management for over half the population in Los Angeles County. The CSDLAC is currently in the process of increasing capacity to accommodate future increases in solid waste through the expansion of local landfills and the use of a regional waste-by-rail system and remote landfills. However, these improvements are not yet in place and will not be completed until at least 2009. Further, there is presently insufficient permitted disposal capacity within the existing system serving Los Angeles County. As a result, either the proposed project or Alternative 3, in combination with other development, could contribute to insufficient permitted disposal capacity by contributing additional solid waste to regional landfills. Therefore, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact would be considered cumulatively considerable, and would be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact. However, in terms of severity, Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior to the proposed project, as it would generate less solid waste than the proposed project.

Alternative 3 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 939 (AB 939) as would the proposed project. In addition, Alternative 3, like the proposed project, would comply with the Municipal Code by enclosing trash collection areas. Impacts under both Alternative 3 and proposed project would be less than significant. Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior due to the proposed project, as it would generate less solid waste than the proposed project.

Recreation

Alternative 3, like the proposed 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 3 would result in the direct and indirect generation of approximately 153 persons, which would utilize City parks, while the proposed project would result in direct and indirect generation of approximately 613 persons utilizing City parks. Both the project and the alternative would result in a significant impact. As no feasible mitigation exists to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, operation of the project under both scenarios would result in a long-term significant and unavoidable impact to recreational facilities. However, Alternative 3 would be environmentally superior, as fewer residents generated under the alternative would reduce this impact.

Direct and indirect population growth under Alternative 3 and related projects would also result in a significant cumulative impact to recreation facilities. However, Alternative 3 would again be environmentally superior, as fewer residents generated under the alternative would reduce the impact.

Relationship of Alternative to Project Objectives

This alternative would directly result in the following project objectives not being attained:

- Provide a distinctive landmark project and, at the same time, create a contemporary urban context that responds to the special character of downtown Glendale.
- 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.
- Boost and expand the viewscape of downtown Glendale through unique architectural features.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the *CEQA Guidelines* 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 alternatives and the project as proposed, because the significant and unavoidable short-term noise impacts during construction and similar long-term population, noise, sewer, solid waste and recreation impacts during project operation would be avoided. According to CEQA if the No Project/No Development Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, “the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.”

Alternative 3 is considered environmentally superior, as it would result in an incremental reduction of the overall level of impact when compared to the proposed project due to the reduction of residential units and retail-commercial space. While the overall impacts of the proposed project could be incrementally reduced by the selection of Alternative 3, the significant and unavoidable short-term noise impacts during project construction and cumulative population, solid waste and long-term noise and recreation impacts during project operation would not be eliminated by this alternative. However, under Alternative 3, some of the project objectives would not be met.

With regards to Alternative 2, none of the other identified significant impacts would be substantially reduced or avoided to the same degree as Alternative 3. Alternative 2, however, would meet all the objectives of the proposed project.