

## 7.0 ALTERNATIVES

The following discussion considers alternatives to implementation of the Project. The discussion examines the potential environmental impacts resulting from each alternative. Through comparison of these alternatives to the project, the relative advantage(s) of each can be weighed and analyzed.

The Alternatives Section of this EIR has been changed from the previously circulated EIR. In addition to the overall changes listed in the Project Description Section of this EIR, some quantitative data was added for all alternatives within this Section to better analyze and compare potential impacts. The prior 25% Reduction from Maximum Allowable Densities Alternative was modified to a 40% Reduction from Maximum Allowable Densities Alternative to better differentiate it from the General Plan under the Typical development scenario (the Project). This allows the City to analyze a greater range of alternatives and impacts related to density.

The CEQA Guidelines require that a range of alternatives be addressed, “governed by a rule of reason.” Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR, “describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.”

The CEQA Guidelines also state that the discussion of alternatives must focus on options capable of either avoiding any significant environmental effects of the Project or substantially lessening those impacts, while achieving most of the major Project objectives. According to the analysis presented in the prior sections, adoption of the Project as described in the Typical development scenario will result in unavoidable significant impacts with regard to the following issue areas:

### Significant Unavoidable Impacts:

- **Agricultural Resources:** Convert designated farmlands or agriculture soils to non-agriculture uses, conflict with existing zoning for agriculture, result in indirect impacts from surrounding land uses to land subject to Proposition R and Measure C and changes related to non-conforming agricultural uses.
- **Air Quality:** Conflict with or violate air quality standards, contribute to an increase in criteria pollutants and GHG emissions, and expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- **Hydrology:** Flooding resulting from the failure of a dam or levee, and cumulative water quality impacts
- **Noise:** Exceed General Plan standards for noise due to long-term roadway and freeway noise exposure to existing sensitive land uses, ambient noise increases, and ground-borne noise impacts to existing sensitive receptors located along rail lines
- **Population & Housing:** Induces population growth
- **Recreation:** Cumulative deficiency in existing neighborhood and community parks.
- **Transportation/Traffic:** Level of Service intersection and roadway linkage impacts, substantial increase from existing traffic load and capacity

As identified in the revised EIR, in addition to these significant unavoidable impacts, the analysis presented in the prior sections identified significant impacts related to the following issue areas, all of which can be mitigated below a level of significance:

#### Significant Impacts Which Can be Mitigated

- Aesthetics: Light and glare impacts associated with Mount Palomar Observatory.
- Biological Resources: Impacts to special or sensitive species
- Cultural Resources: Impacts to archaeological resources or any human remains
- Geological Resources: Impacts from septic tanks or other waste water disposal systems
- Noise: Exceed General Plan standards for noise due to long-term roadway and freeway noise exposure to planned sensitive land uses, temporary construction-related ambient noise increases
- Public Services: Police and Libraries
- Utilities – Need for expanded water supplies at Max. or Max. w/PRD levels, wastewater treatment, new power supplies

Project alternatives have been selected on the basis of their capability of either avoiding significant environmental effects of the Project or substantially lessening those impacts, while at the same time seeking to fulfill most Project Objectives, which are listed in Section 3.0, Project Description, and below for ease of reference.

The discussion in this section provides:

- A discussion of alternatives considered but rejected
- A description of alternatives considered in greater depth
- An analysis of whether each alternative meets most of the basic objectives of the proposed project
- A comparative analysis of the alternatives under consideration and the proposed Project. The focus of this analysis is to determine if alternatives are capable of avoiding or reducing the significant environmental effects of the project to a less than significant level while meeting Project objectives.

Throughout the course of Project Planning and environmental review, numerous possible alternatives were considered, as discussed below. The following Project alternatives were selected for further consideration:

**Alternative 1:** No Project

**Alternative 2:** 40 Percent Reduction from Maximum Allowable Densities

**Alternative 3:** Increased Mixed Use along the “L” Corridor

## Project Objectives

The analysis of alternatives to the proposed project is guided by the project's objectives. Specifically, the alternatives analyzed must be capable of accomplishing most of the basic objectives of the project. (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6.) The project objectives, as set out in Section 3.0, Project Description, of this EIR, are set forth in full below.

### *General Plan*

- Encourage the revitalization of underutilized commercial properties through redesignation of lands for mixed use development.
- Enact “smart growth principles” to improve quality of life for City residents and reduce urban sprawl.
- Allow for higher density residential uses at underutilized in-town locations where residents will have access to transit and supportive commercial services.
- Establish neighborhoods as the fundamental planning units of the City.
- Preserve and enhance the City's natural and cultural assets.
- Provide circulation facilities adequate to serve proposed land uses and meet community needs.
- Minimize the negative impacts of regional traffic upon the City's local roadways.
- Establish policies to facilitate partnerships among Riverside's cultural and educational institutions to achieve community goals.
- Establish policies and programs to enhance the City's standing as the arts and culture center of the Inland Empire.
- Establish policies and programs that will contribute to the improvement of local and regional air quality.
- Establish policies to ensure that people are protected from health and safety hazards and unwanted noise intrusion.
- Ensure the provision of adequate public facilities and public services to existing and to-be-developed portions of the Planning Area.
- Accommodate the growth projected by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) in an environmentally sensitive manner, while promoting the Smart Growth principles.

### *Zoning Code Update*

- Update Zoning Code text and map to reflect new land use policies contained in the updated General Plan.
- Reorganize to create a logical and intuitive format to facilitate use by citizens, interested parties and City staff responsible for zoning administration.
- Make consistent with the most recent changes in State and Federal laws and regulations.
- Reduce and reorganize residential, commercial, and industrial zones to simplify the land use classification system.
- Simplify and streamline administrative procedures and processes.

### *Subdivision Code Revision*

- Reorganize to create a logical and intuitive format to facilitate use by citizens, land developers and City staff responsible for subdivision administration.
- Make consistent with the most recent changes in State and Federal laws and regulations.
- Update to reflect new land use and circulation policies contained in the updated General Plan.
- Simplify and streamline administrative procedures and processes.

### *Noise Code Amendment*

- Make consistent with State regulations concerning exterior noise levels for single family residential uses.
- Update to reflect new Zone designations.

### *Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan*

- Provide a detailed framework of growth and change for the City's transportation backbone consistent with land use, urban design and circulation objectives and policies within the General Plan update.
- Enhance the public streetscape of Magnolia Avenue.
- Facilitate transit usage along Riverside's principal arterial roadway.
- Encourage quality design that enhances the overall appearance of Magnolia Avenue.

### *Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines*

- Provide visual examples of desirable and allowable design features applicable to all new future development.
- Reduce uncertainty in the discretionary review of new developments.
- Provide for quality building design.
- Provide for signage that complements developments and achieves the City's overall design objectives.
- Improve the visual character of the City's built environment.

## **Alternatives Rejected from Consideration**

### *Alternative Location*

The CEQA Guidelines recommend considering an alternative location to reduce potential impacts of a proposed project. The project, which is a General Plan for the City of Riverside, is a comprehensive, long range policy document that guides the physical development of Riverside until the year 2025. All components comprising the proposed Project are specific to the Planning Area's geographic and jurisdictional context, and therefore, adoption of any of the Project components at an alternative location is not feasible and could not achieve the Project's Objectives. No alternative location can thus be considered.

### *Balance Increased Densities in Along “L” Corridor with Decreased Densities Elsewhere*

During public review of the prior draft of this EIR, one commenter suggested analysis of an alternative that would balance increased densities along the “L” Corridor with decreased densities elsewhere in the City, coupled with public acquisition of certain open-space areas. Adoption of a General Plan that compensated for increased densities in some parts of the City with decreases elsewhere would essentially be a No Growth Alternative. Such an alternative would not allow the City to accommodate the growth projected by SCAG and WRCOG, however. Moreover, as explained below, pushing growth into other jurisdictions would not reduce foreseeable traffic, noise, agricultural, or other impacts resulting from continued growth and development. Further, the proposed Project includes several policies directed at protecting open space within the City. Therefore, because this proposed alternative would not provide a more meaningful analysis of alternatives, it has not been analyzed in detail.

### *Increased Development within Arlington Heights Greenbelt*

The Arlington Heights Greenbelt is home to Victoria Avenue, a mile-long scenic drive, historic resource, and proposed linear park, as well as home to the California Citrus State Historic Park. A key General Plan Objective is to preserve and enhance the character of areas designated as Agricultural/Rural Residential. This designation permits residential development at one dwelling unit per five acres. Currently, the Arlington Heights Greenbelt is designated as Agricultural/Rural Residential, but because the greenbelt area is in relatively close proximity to higher intensity urban uses and infrastructure, a land use alternative permitting higher density residential development of portions of the Arlington Heights Greenbelt was initially considered.

Higher density development within the several thousand acres of the Arlington Heights Greenbelt would potentially provide housing opportunities equal to or greater than those called for elsewhere in the General Plan. However, such an alternative would introduce additional new significant and adverse impacts, including but not limited to the loss of agricultural land, loss of cultural and historic resources, increased stormwater runoff and conflicts with voter-approved land use measures (Proposition R and Measure C). Additionally, this alternative would likely create air quality and traffic impacts comparable to or in excess of those of the Project. Therefore, because of the negative potential impacts from this alternative, it was rejected from further consideration.

### *Major Surface Transportation Improvements*

The transportation analysis in this EIR indicated significant and unavoidable impacts to roadway linkages, as well as to all of the freeway segments traversing the Planning Area.

The Project, through the proposed Master Plan of Roadways within the Circulation and Community Mobility Element, includes a number of intersection and roadway improvements to City streets. As intersection improvements are not usually considered in a General Plan, the intersections and possible improvements identified are noted for information only. Further analysis and consideration will be made related to these intersections as the Circulation and Community Mobility Element is implemented.

For the most part, the proposed Circulation and Community Mobility Element is identical to the existing 1994 Circulation and Community Mobility Element with the addition of a few key improvements. As detailed in the history of the Circulation Element Update Process (contained in the Traffic Study Appendix), the Project reflects policy recommendations made by the Citizens Advisory Committee, Planning Commission and City Council. During that process, a conscious decision was made to avoid alterations to the circulation system that would attract or facilitate regional cut-through traffic. In particular, traffic impeded on the SR-91, SR-60, and I-215 freeways and other regional routes could seek relief on City streets, and interfere with local neighborhood function. Further, as explained in the Circulation Element of the General Plan, “Riverside has reached a point where few or no feasible opportunities exist to add or expand roadways due to fiscal, political, environmental and other constraints.” (Circulation and Community Mobility Element, at page CCM-2.) Thus, additional roadway widenings and intersection improvements were not considered due to concerns about cost, localized environmental issues (for example, river and arroyo crossings), and concerns about inducing regional cut-through trips by widening the roadways, ultimately worsening traffic at additional locations. As such, alternatives examining surface transportation improvements beyond those included in the Circulation and Community Mobility Element were not considered.

#### *No Extension of Overlook Parkway*

The Project includes connecting the two ends of Overlook Parkway after evaluation and construction of improvements between Washington Street/Overlook Parkway, and the 91 Freeway. The route between Washington Street and the 91 Freeway design of the arroyo crossing will be determined following a specific plan. No matter the final configuration, the extension will require a crossing over an existing arroyo east of Washington. Although the Project incorporates this extension in concept, no detailed crossing is currently proposed. At the time actual crossing plans are prepared and specific details regarding the crossing are available, a CEQA review will be conducted to assess the crossing’s potential environmental impacts. The Overlook Parkway connection was included on the Circulation Element of the 1994 General Plan but was never constructed.

Overlook Parkway was modeled in the final model run of the Transportation Study for the proposed General Plan as a two-lane roadway between Washington Street and Alessandro Boulevard. The levels of service shown on the Transportation Study plots, and the listing of roadways which are projected to operate at LOS E or F in the Transportation/Traffic Section, are based on a two-lane configuration. However Overlook Parkway already exists as a four-lane roadway from Washington to Bodewin Court, and from Sandtrack Road to Alessandro Boulevard. Since the City does not plan to reduce the number of lanes on the existing four-lane sections, the v/c ratio and corresponding level of service could be revised to reflect the existing four-lane portions of the roadway. The levels of service would then be better than LOS D on the four-lane portions (rather than E or F as shown above), and could be removed from the list in the Transportation/Traffic Section; however, the Transportation Study presents a conservative analysis of impacts based on a two-lane configuration. Since further study of this roadway connection will be conducted through the specific plan process, which will include appropriate

site-specific traffic studies and environmental review, this alternative was removed from further consideration at this time.

### *Completion of Central Avenue*

Completing Central Avenue (between its end points at Alessandro and Chicago Avenues) was initially considered as a General Plan circulation alternative to relieve conditions at the Arlington/Alessandro/Chicago intersection. However, the analysis found that roadway and intersection improvements could improve future level of service at this intersection to acceptable levels without the Central Avenue connection (See Table 5.15-I, Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvements Recommendations, within the Transportation/Traffic section of this EIR). The completion of Central Avenue is thus not needed to reduce impacts at this intersection. Moreover, traffic modeling indicated that the completion of Central Avenue would increase Central Avenue volumes to a degree that would create new unacceptable intersections and roadway linkages in the vicinity. For these reasons, the completion of Central Avenue was excluded from further consideration.

## **Project Alternatives**

As explained above, the alternatives analysis of an EIR should focus on those alternatives that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. Given the nature of the Project, a general plan and code update, nearly any alternative would entail population growth and development in general, and would therefore involve similar significant impacts. This is particularly so in the Inland Empire region because the Southern California Association of Governments has projected growth of nearly 5 million new residents by 2030, approximately half of which is expected to occur in the Inland Empire. In addition, the alternatives analyzed must meet most project objectives and be feasible. The City chose to analyze reduced density and increased density alternatives, in addition to the No Project Alternative, in order to present a range of potential impacts. These alternatives are described and analyzed below.

### ***No Project Alternative***

This alternative is analyzed within this EIR as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e). According to Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the “no project” analysis shall discuss, “. . . what is reasonably 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.”

### **Description of Alternative**

As provided in State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e)(3)(A), the No Project Alternative assumes that all components of the Project – the updates to the General Plan, Noise Code, Zoning Code and Subdivision Code – would not be adopted. Instead, the No Project Alternative compares environmental impacts associated with development of the Planning Area per the

existing General Plan, Zoning Code and Subdivision Codes. Further, neither the proposed Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines nor the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan would be adopted.

A key innovation of the proposed Project involves land use changes in about two dozen focus areas. Many of these focus areas are located along Magnolia and University Avenues and are planned for mixed-use development. Although the existing General Plan included mixed-use land use designations, the application of these designations was quite limited. In addition, the existing Zoning Code does not include corresponding mixed-use zoning classifications. As such, the likelihood of new mixed use development is much lower under the existing General Plan than under the proposed Project. As a result, new development pursuant to the existing General Plan would be somewhat more broadly diffused throughout the Planning Area, whereas the Project seeks some concentration of new development along already urbanized major travel corridors.

## **Environmental Effects Relative to Areas of Significant and Unavoidable Impacts Identified in this EIR**

### *Traffic*

Continued implementation of the existing General Plan, Noise Code, Zoning Code and Subdivision Code would result in a similar level of development and population growth as the proposed Project, although under the No Project Alternative such new development would occur on the periphery of the planning area, whereas the proposed Project would concentrate this development along already urbanized major travel corridors.

Existing City policies do not facilitate mixed-use development as effectively as the proposed Project. For example, the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan will provide detailed guidance for development along this corridor, where a significant portion of new mixed-use development is proposed. Notably, mixed-use development will contribute fewer vehicle trips relative to developments along the urban periphery.

The proposed Project is built on Smart Growth principles. By carefully integrating land use with transportation, both the number and duration of trips can be significantly reduced. By encouraging a mixture of compatible and synergistic land uses, the interaction between residential, commercial and employment uses will be strengthened, resulting in a reduced dependency on automobiles. Other benefits include decreased urban sprawl, improved air quality, increased use of transit and better conservation of land resources.

In particular, three separate mixed use land use designations are being established as part of this General Plan update. These designations have been concentrated along the major transportation corridors and in key in-fill locations. This will encourage residents to live, work and shop in the same area, thus reducing their need to own or use private automobiles. It also encourages other forms of transportation, including walking, bicycling and transit. Transit will be a particularly viable option for reducing vehicle trips since the Riverside Transit Authority is proposing a Bus Rapid Transit route along the Magnolia Avenue corridor. Opportunities also exist for transit

oriented development at the two Metrolink stations, with transit links to the Magnolia Avenue corridor, further reducing vehicle trips.

New growth focused on mixed-use development that includes residential and commercial functions will reduce reliance on vehicular traffic. (Circulation and Community Mobility Element, at pp. CCM-3 to CCM-4.) Mixed-use development allows for reductions in overall vehicular trips due to “internal trip capture.” For example, patrons of a restaurant may also visit an adjacent commercial use thereby resulting in one vehicular trip instead of two. Similarly, residents in a mixed-use development would not require vehicular transport to access other amenities in the development. Additionally, development of restaurants and retail along established transportation corridors also reduces overall trips by encouraging “pass-through” trips. In other words, patrons may stop at such establishments while passing from one destination to another, which reduces trips on the surrounding circulation system. (*Trip Generation Handbook (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2nd Edition, 2004).*)

Another feature of the Project that reduces reliance on single-occupancy vehicles is an expanded network of bicycle and pedestrian trails that connect schools, parks, activity centers and residential areas. Similarly, because new growth will be focused along the City’s major corridors, bus rapid transit service can connect mixed-use and high-density residential uses with major employment and educational centers. (Circulation and Community Mobility Element, at p. CCM-4.)

In addition, the No Project Alternative would not include policies designed to minimize cut-through traffic intrusion into residential neighborhoods.

The Transportation Study included analysis which looked at the 1994 General Plan roadway network with the proposed Project Typical Density forecasted volumes on it. This approximates the No Project Alternative. Review of this analysis and related exhibits compared to Exhibit 12 of the Transportation Study (the proposed Project) shows that many streets that operate at LOS E or F with the proposed Project operate at those same levels of service (LOS) under the No Project Alternative. In other locations, the LOS of a roadway segment is improved with the proposed Project. For example, Washington Street between Indiana Avenue and Victoria Avenue would operate at LOS F under the No Project Alternative while the same roadway segment will operate at LOS D or better under the proposed Project. In all, the No Project Alternative has similar or greater traffic impacts relative to the proposed Project.

#### *Air Quality*

Air pollutant emissions are most closely tied to traffic volumes, but are also related to construction activity. Under the No Project alternative, development would continue in existing patterns, with higher-intensity urban development more broadly diffused throughout the Planning Area than with the Project. Thus, an increase in the number and length of vehicle trips would occur under the No Project Alternative to a greater degree than under the proposed Project. Increased vehicle miles traveled also translates into increased production of greenhouse gases (GHG) such as CO<sub>2</sub>. Additionally, the proposed Project’s “smart growth” elements, discussed above, result in fewer VMT because more residential units are built at higher densities

which produce shorter trips and thus can contribute to reduce air pollutants and GHG emissions. Analysis also indicates that anticipated improvements in vehicle emissions are likely through improved technologies and stricter regulation over the long-term that will provide dramatic reductions in daily emissions of criteria pollutants, with the notable exception of PM10. The No Project Alternative would thus be expected to have similar or greater air quality and GHG impacts to the proposed Project.

Also, under the No Project Alternative, the Air Quality Element would not be adopted, and its policies and objectives would not be implemented.

### *Agriculture*

The proposed Project includes policies and programs associated with protection of agricultural resources that were not included in the 1994 General Plan. The proposed General Plan includes the following new policies which require implementation of Proposition R and Measure C for agricultural preservation: LU-6.1, LU-6.3, LU-54.1, LU-54.3, LU-63.5, and OS-4.1. Specifically, LU-63.5 relates to R and C being implemented in the Rancho La Sierra Specific Plan to preserve agricultural land, among other resources; and LU-54.1 and 54.3 relate to R and C implementation in the Hawarden Hills. The General Plan also incorporates smart growth principals, as discussed above, in an effort to concentrate growth in more urban areas where infrastructure already exists; thereby preserving agriculture, Proposition R and Measure C lands, and other open space areas.

In addition, this General Plan is built on Smart Growth principles. By carefully integrating land use with transportation, both the number and duration of trips can be significantly reduced. By encouraging a mixture of compatible and synergistic land uses, the interaction between residential, commercial and employment uses will be strengthened, resulting in a reduced dependency on automobiles. Other benefits include decreased urban sprawl, improved air quality, increased use of transit and better conservation of land resources.

Therefore, the No Project alternative would result in greater potential significant impacts to agricultural resources than would result from development under the proposed Project.

### *Noise*

As with air quality, noise impacts are closely tied to surface traffic volumes, but are also dependent upon air traffic patterns and proposed land uses. Noise forecasts for roadways, freeways, railways and air traffic indicate that larger portions of the Planning Area will in the future be subject to noise levels that may not be acceptable for certain types of development. However, roughly the same increases in freeway, railway and air traffic – and associated noise – will occur without the proposed Project, as these are only tangentially connected to increases in Planning Area population growth. The No Project alternative does not take these noise increases into account and as such, could result in the development of land uses incompatible with localized ambient noise levels.

Under the No Project Alternative, the Noise Code would not be revised, and would retain a higher standard for interior noise than existing state standards. However, the existing exterior noise limitation sets a standard that is below most ambient noise levels. Thus, future projects may continue to be inconsistent with the existing Noise Code.

#### *Hydrology/Water Quality*

Potential impacts resulting from dam failure would be similar within both the No Project Alternative and the Project because significant unavoidable impacts result primarily in areas of the City which are already developed.

The City of Riverside would be subject to meeting water quality standards stipulated by the State and pursuant to their MS-4 permit under both the No Project Alternative and the proposed Project. On an individual development-by-development basis, potential water quality impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels under both this alternative and the Project. Cumulatively, however, because the No Project alternative would not focus growth in already developed areas, more land could be impacted causing greater cumulative water quality impacts than the proposed Project. Therefore, the No Project alternative would result in worse cumulative impacts to downstream waters than the proposed Project due to sprawl and the development of potentially more land area.

#### *Population and Housing*

Under the No Project alternative, development would continue at its present pace, which is faster than the 1994 General Plan predicted. The existing 1994 General Plan anticipated a population of 285,000 people within the City's then-limits by 2010. In 2004, SCAG projected that the City's population (excluding any sphere areas) would be 286,935 and would rise to 307,847 by 2010. Therefore, the 1994 General Plan underestimated the rate of population growth. The Proposed Project better reflects expected growth than the No Project Alternative, and provides policies to deal with the level of growth the City is experiencing, such as LU-8.1, LU-8.3, AQ-1.5, AQ-1.6, AQ-1.7, AQ-1.12, H-2.2, Tool H-9 and Tool H-15, which deal with encouraging/ensuring infill, mixed use, and increased density projects throughout the City, near job centers and along transportation corridors. Policies such as LU-25.4, H-1.1, and H-1.2 support redevelopment of older underutilized properties and/or the rehabilitation of the existing housing stock to increase housing and job opportunities. Other policies such as H-2.1 assure that adequate infrastructure will be in place to support growth. Special areas of growth, such as student populations associated with the universities located within the Planning Area is provided for through policies and tools such as H-2.4, H-4.3, and Tool H-13. Growth resulting from larger household sizes is accommodated through policies such as H-4.2. Thus, because the No Project Alternative provides less guidance for how to effectively deal with increased population growth than the proposed Project, it is considered to have worse potential impacts.

#### *Recreation*

Existing recreational facilities do not meet the needs of the community based on City standards. In 2003, the City adopted a Park and Recreation Master Plan. It is assumed that the goals and policies of the Master Plan will be implemented with or without adoption of the proposed

Project. As such, impacts to recreational resources will be generally the same for the No Project alternative as those under the proposed Project.

## **Environmental Effects Relative to Areas of Significant Impacts Identified in this EIR Which Can be Mitigated**

### *Aesthetics*

As shown on Figure 5.1-2, Mount Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area, Mt. Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area covers a portion of the Orangecrest Neighborhood and the Southern Sphere Area. This Policy Area represents a radius of 45 miles from the observatory and restricts nighttime lighting hours, types and techniques of lighting. The majority of the land uses designated within the proposed Project for this area are uses that will not generate significant light and glare (Agriculture, Agriculture/Rural Residential, Hillside Residential, Very Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Public Facilities, Open Space/Natural Resources, RAT-Kangaroo Rat Habitat, and C-Commercial). The commercial uses are limited to existing locations on Cajalco Road and Van Buren Boulevard, as shown on Figure 5.1-2. The portion of the Planning Area located within the Policy Area north of Mariposa Avenue, includes both existing and planned uses which are General Plan designated as Very Low Density Residential, Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Commercial, Public Facilities, and Public Parks. New sources of light within the Mount Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area that would contribute to light and glare and affect the nighttime sky include street lights, park lighting, commercial parking lots, and residential/other outdoor security lighting. The No Project Alternative (1994 General Plan) assumes similar land use designations and would be subject to existing City standards related to street lights, but MM Aes 1 would not apply to the No Project alternative so potential impacts of additional light and glare would be less controlled and would have greater potential impacts resulting from the Project.

The proposed Project also includes new General Plan policies which require that Proposition R and Measure C be implemented for the protection of hillsides which provide viewsheds in addition to habitat preservation: LU-4.1, LU-4.4, LU-59.1, LU-64.1, and OS-2.1. These policies would not be in place under the No Project Alternative.

And finally, the proposed Project includes Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines that are intended to improve the visual quality of all new development. Further, the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan will provide detailed site planning guidance for development along the Magnolia Avenue corridor; such guidance is intended in part to improve the visual quality of the corridor. Under the No Project Alternative, neither the Design and Sign Guidelines nor the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan would be in effect. As such, the No Project alternative would not achieve the aesthetic improvements to the degree associated with the proposed Project.

### *Biological Resources*

Under the No Project Alternative, habitat-protective General Plan designations would not be implemented, potentially causing conflict with the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Program (MSHCP) and limiting the ability of the City to work with the County to ensure protection of dedicated wildlife corridors. The proposed Project, however, has been designed to complement and implement the MSHCP. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would potentially introduce new impacts to biological resources.

Potential impacts to sensitive species would be similar under both the No Project Alternative and the Project except MM Bio 1 would not be implemented.

### *Cultural Resources*

In 2002, the City adopted a Historic Preservation Element separate from the Project. The Project incorporates but does not significantly change the Historic Preservation Element. Therefore, impacts under the No Project Alternative would be similar to those of the Project.

### *Geology/Soils*

The Project includes an updated City-wide geotechnical study and identifies places within the Planning Area susceptible to seismic and geologic hazards. Although this information would not be included in the General Plan EIR document associated with the proposed Project, it would still be available to the City and potential geologic hazards could be avoided under the No Project Alternative. Therefore impacts would be similar to the proposed Project.

In addition, potential impacts associated with new development that proposes the use of septic tanks would be reduced to less than significant levels with MM Geo 1 implemented. MM Geo 1 requires an investigation be conducted by a registered hydrologist and geotechnical or soils engineer that addresses the site's suitability for septic systems and its impact to groundwater supplies, if such systems are proposed. Also, lots must be at least one acre in size. Prior to installation of septic systems, approval must come from the County of Riverside Environmental Health Department and the Water Quality Control Board. Since the No Project Alternative would not be subject to this mitigation measure, potential impacts resulting from the installation of septic systems could be worse than the proposed Project.

### *Noise*

Noise impacts for the No Project Alternative from all sources would be similar to the proposed Project since population is considered the same, traffic will be at similar levels, and construction and rail noise would be the same. Under the No Project Alternative, however, MM Noise 1, 2, and 4 will not be implemented therefore potential impacts would remain significant.

### *Library Services*

Section 5.13 of the EIR indicates that existing library facilities and services do not meet City standards and that the addition of planned library facilities will not achieve City-established

library standards. As such, because population will be similar under both the Project and the No Project alternative, the No Project alternative would have similar library service impacts relative as the proposed Project, but would not be required to meet the mitigation measure, MM PS 2. Therefore, the No Project alternative would result in more significant impacts to libraries than the proposed Project.

### *Police*

Development consistent with the No Project alternative would lead to similar population increases as the proposed Project, and thus similar Public Service impacts, relative to the proposed Typical Project population projections. Without guidance and objectives provided in the proposed General Plan and MM PS 1 which requires that Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles be applied to development projects, the No Project Alternative would result in more significant impacts to police services than the proposed Project.

### *Utilities*

Similar potential significant cumulative impacts to landfills, water supplies, power supplies, and wastewater treatment would result from the proposed Project or the No Project alternative if population projections exceeded the Typical level. The proposed Project includes mitigation measures (MM UTL 1, 2 and 3) which cause ongoing review of service needs with respect to capacity. Such reviews can cause significant impacts to be avoided by planning and implementing facilities ahead of identified need. The Wastewater Master Plan is currently being reviewed and adopted. This plan identifies the infrastructure necessary to accommodate the anticipated population growth with or without the Project. MM UTL 2 requires the projected facilities to be reviewed against actual population growth and use at key 5- and 10-year intervals throughout the life of the Project. Electricity is being used at a faster rate per household than in the past, according to Riverside Public Utilities. If, in addition to population growth, electrical use outpaces anticipated supply or transmission facilities, MM UTL 3 requires review every two years to keep pace with demand. Water supply is projected to be adequate for future demand, however if actual demand outpaces supplies anticipated to meet the Project Typical demand, then MM UTL 1 will require the City to address the issue before problems arise. If, as with the 1994 General Plan, growth has been underestimated, the proposed Project has these safeguards to assure that utilities will be provided and deficiencies identified and addressed. The No Project alternative would not have mandatory review of these important plans. Without such measures built into the 1994 General Plan, the No Project alternative could result in significant impacts to one or more utilities before projected deficiencies were identified if population growth or service demand outpaces projections. Therefore, the No Project has the potential to result in significant impacts to utilities that will be avoided under the Project.

## **Other Issue Areas**

### *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*

The No Project Alternative does not include the same careful land use planning within the influences areas of Riverside Municipal Airport and March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

as are proposed within the Project. As such, the No Project Alternative would have potentially greater impacts relative to airport hazards.

### *Land Use and Planning*

The existing 1994 General Plan includes two mixed use designations (residential and office) but does not have corresponding zoning designations. Therefore, if mixed use development, even as described in the 1994 General Plan was proposed under the No Project Alternative, an amendment to the Zoning Code would be required. The proposed Project provides a higher degree of coordination between the General Plan and the Zoning Code.

The 1994 General Plan and the proposed General Plan mixed use designations are also different in several key ways. The 1994 General Plan has only two mixed use designations where the proposed General Plan has three, and the intensity of uses allowed varies. The 1994 designations are applied to a few areas sporadically throughout the City, whereas the proposed Project designations have been focused on the University Avenue/Magnolia Avenue Corridor and other under utilized shopping center locations throughout the City. The proposed designations have been located within the City based on Smart Growth principles. The proposed Project includes the corresponding changes to the Zoning Code such that the mixed use designations can be implemented, while the existing Zoning Code does not allow for implementation of the 1994 mixed use designations.

Notably, the No Project Alternative would lead to greater conflicts with such regional plans as the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and SCAG's Compass Growth Vision – 2% Strategy (2% Strategy). For example, even though the City would still be a permittee under the MSHCP with or without the Project, the MSHCP was not anticipated in the 1994 General Plan and EIR, so no direction or policies exist under the No Project alternative to encourage or assist the City in meeting its obligations as a permittee under the MSHCP. SCAG's RCP and specifically the 2% Strategy look to Riverside to shoulder a given percentage of the growth in the region by increasing density along the University Avenue/Magnolia Avenue corridor. These increases in the City, and other key areas throughout the region, represent an increase in the infill housing opportunities, rail transit stops, and bus rapid transit available region-wide. The proposed Project addresses this specifically through its Mixed Use and High Density Residential designations along the University Avenue/Magnolia Avenue Corridor, MASP and Downtown SP. The Downtown SP has would still be implemented under the No Project alternative, but the Mixed Use and High Density designations, bus rapid transit, and the MASP would not be implemented, thus not meeting the goals of the 2% Strategy.<sup>1</sup> Since the Project, specifically the General Plan and the MASP, fully support this regional approach, the 2% Strategy is incorporated by reference and summarized below.

---

<sup>1</sup> Southern California Association of Governments, *Compass Growth Vision and 2% Strategy*, April 2004. (Available at [www.compassblueprint.com/2percent](http://www.compassblueprint.com/2percent) and [www.scag.ca.gov/rcp/](http://www.scag.ca.gov/rcp/))

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) takes the full body of planning and policy work produced by SCAG, and ties it together. The RCP is intended to be a usable reference document for local planners, business people, and other individuals whose work affects the future built environment in Southern California. The SCAG RCP current draft is built around the *Compass Blueprint Growth Vision and 2% Strategy* adopted by the Regional Council in April 2004.

The 2% Strategy is a guideline for how and where the Growth Vision for Southern California's future can be implemented. It calls for modest changes to current land use and transportation trends on only 2% of the land area of the region. Riverside's University Avenue/Magnolia Avenue Corridor is the focus of an Opportunity Area identified in SCAG's 2% Strategy to include rail transit stops such as the Downtown Metrolink Station and possibly in the future near UC Riverside on the proposed the Perris Valley Line corridor, bus rapid transit and priority residential infill areas within Riverside's city center area. Riverside's General Plan includes these identified regional needs in a manner which supports the major proposals of the 2% Strategy, below.

The 2% Strategy proposes increasing the region's *mobility* by:

- Encouraging transportation investments and land use decisions that are mutually supportive
- Locating new housing near existing jobs and new jobs near existing housing
- Encouraging transit-oriented development
- Promoting a variety of travel choices

The *livability* of our communities can be enhanced by:

- Promoting in-fill development and redevelopment to revitalize existing communities
- Promoting developments which provide a mix of uses
- Promoting "people-scaled," walkable communities
- Supporting the preservation of stable neighborhoods

Our *prosperity* will be enabled by:

- Providing a variety of housing types in each community to meet the housing needs of all income levels
- Supporting educational opportunities that promote balanced growth
- Ensuring environmental justice regardless of race, ethnicity or income class
- Supporting local and state fiscal policies that encourage balanced growth
- Encouraging civic engagement

We can promote *sustainability* for future generations by:

- Preserving rural, agricultural, recreational and environmentally sensitive areas
- Focusing development in urban centers and existing cities
- Developing strategies to accommodate growth that use resources efficiently, and minimize pollution and waste

The proposed Project includes measures to ensure greater consistency with these plans; the No Project alternative would result in land use planning conflicts both internally between City plans and regulations, and regionally between the City and other agencies.

### **Ability to Achieve Project Objectives**

The No Project Alternative would fail to meet most of the most critical Project Objectives, including implementation of smart growth principles, increased infill and mixed-use development and reduced cut-through traffic in residential neighborhoods. The No Project alternative would not achieve the goal of greater development on underutilized parcels along travel corridors but would instead foster perpetuation of existing growth patterns, including increased growth along the urban periphery.

Existing City policies do not facilitate mixed-use development as effectively as the proposed Project. For example, the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan will provide detailed guidance for development along this corridor, where a significant portion of new mixed-use development is proposed. Notably, mixed-use development will contribute fewer vehicle trips relative to developments along the urban periphery.

The proposed Project is built on Smart Growth principles. By carefully integrating land use with transportation, both the number and duration of trips can be significantly reduced. By encouraging a mixture of compatible and synergistic land uses, the interaction between residential, commercial and employment uses will be strengthened, resulting in a reduced dependency on automobiles. Other benefits include decreased urban sprawl, improved air quality, increased use of transit and better conservation of land resources.

In particular, three separate mixed use land use designations are being established as part of this General Plan update. These designations have been concentrated along the major transportation corridors and in key in-fill locations. This will encourage residents to live, work and shop in the same area, thus reducing their need to own or use private automobiles. It also encourages other forms of transportation, including walking, bicycling and transit. Transit will be a particularly viable option for reducing vehicle trips since the Riverside Transit Authority is proposing a Bus Rapid Transit route along the Magnolia Avenue corridor. Opportunities also exist for transit oriented development at the two Metrolink stations, with transit links to the Magnolia Avenue corridor, further reducing vehicle trips.

New growth focused on mixed-use development that includes residential and commercial functions will reduce reliance on vehicular traffic. (Circulation and Community Mobility Element, at pages CCM-3 to CCM-4.) Mixed-use development allows for reductions in overall vehicular trips due to “internal trip capture.” For example, patrons of a restaurant may also visit an adjacent commercial use thereby resulting in one vehicular trip instead of two. Similarly, residents in a mixed-use development would not require vehicular transport to access other amenities in the development. Additionally, development of restaurants and retail along established transportation corridors also reduces overall trips by encouraging “pass-through” trips. In other words, patrons may stop at such establishments while passing from one destination to another, which reduces trips on the surrounding circulation system. (*Trip Generation Handbook (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2nd Edition, 2004)*).

### **Conclusion**

Development under the No Project Alternative would not avoid the significant unavoidable impacts of the proposed Project and would not achieve most of the Project Objectives. For example, the No Project Alternative would not allow for higher density residential uses at underutilized in-town locations where residents will have access to transit and supportive commercial services, provide circulation facilities adequate to serve anticipated population and minimize the negative impacts of regional pass-through traffic upon the City’s local roadways, establish policies to facilitate partnerships among Riverside’s cultural and educational institutions to achieve community goals, establish policies and programs to enhance the City’s standing as the arts and culture center of the Inland Empire, establish policies and programs that will contribute to the improvement of local and regional air quality, would not ensure the provision of adequate public facilities and public services to existing and to-be-developed portions of the Planning Area. Most importantly, the No Project Alternative would not implement the “smart growth” innovations contained in the proposed Project to improve quality of life for City residents and reduce urban sprawl. Thus, under the No Project Alternative, continued development could be expected to result in greater traffic, greater air pollutant and GHG emissions, and generally more suburban sprawl. Moreover, the No Project alternative would have additional potentially significant impacts in the areas of noise, aesthetics, biological resources, cumulative water quality, land use planning, utilities and public services. See Table 7.0-B, Alternatives Comparison, for a summary of the No Project Alternative’s impacts.

### ***Forty Percent Reduction Alternative***

This alternative is analyzed within this EIR as a means of reducing environmental impacts related to traffic, air, noise, and public services compared to those of the proposed Project by reducing development capacity within the Planning Area.

### **Description of Alternative**

This alternative would impose a 40 percent reduction in the maximum allowable densities of all residential land uses in the Planning Area except for the Agricultural (A), Agricultural/Rural Residential (A/RR), and the Hillside Residential (HR) which are already at very low densities. The maximum intensities of all commercial, industrial, office and public facilities land uses are

also presumed to be reduced by 40 percent. Reduced density may not mean reduced population or commercial/industrial growth, because some areas of the Planning Area are currently built at densities which exceed 60 percent of the maximum allowable density. The projected growth within the region would have to occur somewhere, but would not be allowed to occur within the Planning Area. Instead, it is assumed that the growth would have to be accommodated within other surrounding communities. The 40% Reduction Alternative could generally be assumed to result in more sprawl region-wide. Under this alternative, all uses within the MASP would also be reduced by 40 percent to be consistent with the assumed General Plan reduction. Zoning designations in the updated Zoning Code would be altered so that the maximum intensities/densities of the zoning classifications would correspond to the General Plan land use designations. There would be no change to the Noise Code, Subdivision Code update or the Design and Sign Guidelines as proposed.

It is difficult to quantify the estimated population and non-residential uses associated with this alternative because some existing uses within the City are already built at densities higher than this alternative would allow. Although not a detailed parcel-by-parcel level analysis, for comparison purposes, all land use categories would also be reduced by 40 percent except for those listed above, as shown in Table 7.0-A, below. The decrease would represent approximately 129,641 people or 43,214 units. Using the average density of this alternative (24 du/ac), approximately 1,801 acres would be needed to accommodate the loss in units this alternative causes within the Planning Area. As shown in **Table 7.0-A, 40 Percent Reduction Alternative**, non-residential floor area ratios (FARs) are also reduced. The decrease would be approximately 236,621,029 square feet within the Planning Area. Thus, the projected number of residents and square feet of non-residential uses would need to be accommodated elsewhere in the region. This alternative involves changes primarily to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan; the Noise Code, Subdivision Code, and the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines would not change under this alternative.

<b>Table 7.0-A 40% Percent Reduction Alternative</b>			
<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Column “A” Proposed Project DU/Population (Typical Entire PA)</b>	<b>Column “B” 40% Reduction from Max. without/PRD DU/Population</b>	<b>A – B = Difference</b>
Residential	114,334/343,003	86,297/258,891	-28,037/-84,112
Mixed Use	10,856/32,569	20,116/60,347	-9,260/-27,778
Agriculture	524/1,572	524/1,572	0/0
Specific Plan	1,978/5,933	5,199/15,598	-3,221/-9,665
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>-15,556/-56,334</b>

<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Column “A” Proposed Project Square Feet Non- Residential (Typical Entire PA)</b>	<b>Column “B” 40% Reduction from Max. without/ PRD SF</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Commercial	245,038,943	199,486,417	45,552,527
Mixed Use	29,074,721	25,543,117	3,531,603
Public Fac./Institutional	34,574,209	103,722,626	-69,148,417
Specific Plan	26,150,675	26,179,385	-28,710
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>334,838,548</b>	<b>354,931,626</b>	<b>-20,092,997</b>

### **Environmental Effects Relative to Areas of Significant and Unavoidable Impacts Identified in the EIR**

#### *Traffic, Air Quality and Noise*

The 40 Percent Reduction Alternative includes approximately 15,556 dwelling units less than the proposed Project and approximately 90,092,997 square feet more of non-residential square footage. In some cases, a reduction by 40 percent from the Maximum projections is still larger than the Project Typical projections: thus the negative numbers which appear in Table 7-A.

With respect to residential development, this should result in reduced trips which would result in less noise and air pollution. Reduced maximum allowable densities and intensities could generate higher vehicle trips compared to the proposed Project, however, depending on how the alternative builds out. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 7<sup>th</sup> Edition, 2003, uses trip generation rates that are higher for single family residences versus multi-family attached uses. For example, single family detached units have a generation rate of 9.57 daily trips, whereas apartments have a rate of 6.72 daily trips, and condominium/townhomes have a rate of 5.86 daily trips. It is likely that in some land use categories, the product types for residential would more likely be single family instead of multi-family under the 40 Percent Reduction Alternative which might result in similar or greater traffic, since more trips would come from fewer units. The 40 Percent Reduction Alternative

along transportation corridors would counter-act the benefits of smart growth in reducing traffic, air, and noise impacts. Although this alternative would not result in a direct 40 percent reduction in trips, some level of trip reduction would likely occur. This reduction could reduce identified traffic impacts on internal roadways and intersections; and lead to commensurately lower air quality and noise impacts. However, given strong regional growth forecasts for Western Riverside County, the imposition by the City of Riverside of such strict growth limitations would most likely lead to increased development pressure in surrounding and nearby communities, including areas currently controlled by Riverside County outside the Project Sphere areas. With most regional freeways passing through or near the City, increased growth east and south of the City will still yield traffic, air quality and noise impacts within the Planning Area due to freeway and “cut-through” trips. The increased length of trips that would be required for people forced to live outside the Planning Area to get to jobs within or through Riverside would increase vehicle miles traveled and therefore GHG emissions.

With respect to non-residential traffic for this alternative, the increase in square footage results because the Square footages under the Maximum development scenario are larger than the those under the Typical scenario for some land uses so that even a 40 percent reduction from Maximum still results in larger square footages larger than the proposed Project under the Typical scenario.

Thus, traffic impacts associated with the 40 Percent Reduction Alternative would be in different locations than the proposed Project; however due to the longer trips for lower density residential and the increase in non-residential square footage, it is likely that traffic impacts would be worse than those of the proposed project. With the forced accommodation of future regional growth outside of the Planning Area, it is likely that all trips will end up in the air basin which would not represent a reduction in air quality impacts. Noise would be reduced in areas where localized trips are reduced, but could increase adjacent to freeways and cut-through routes where traffic would likely increase. Overall, air quality and noise impacts would be similar to the proposed Project.

### *Agriculture*

A major tenet of the proposed Project is to institute smart growth principles in which increased in-town densities and intensities will decrease demand for growth on the urban periphery. With as much as 1,414 acres of new residential development needed to accommodate growth that will no longer be allowed within the Planning Area, and additional land needed for non-residential development, more “green field” development will result in other communities. It is not possible to predict exactly where such growth would go, but according to the State Department of Conservation mapping, most undeveloped land left in Riverside County is designated Farmland. Even though the proposed Project designates some sites from designations which allow agriculture to designations which do not, the 40% Reduction Alternative would cause additional impacts to agriculture and designated farmland than the proposed Project.

### *Hydrology/Water Quality*

Potential impacts resulting from dam failure would be similar within both the 40% Reduction Alternative or the Project because significant unavoidable impacts result primarily in areas of the City which are already developed. Theoretically, however, less dense land uses would be allowed for new or redevelopment projects under this alternative some impacts would be lessened, but would still remain significant and unavoidable.

The 40% Reduction Alternative would institute the Project policies related to the elimination of pollutants and reduction of storm water runoff, improvements to the Santa Ana River watershed, and protection of groundwater supplies. Although the density of development would be less under this alternative, developed land would be similar to the Project. With as much as 1,414 acres of new residential development needed to accommodate growth that will no longer be allowed within the Planning Area, and additional land needed for non-residential development, more “green field” development will result in other communities. This “sprawl” ~~will~~ effect will cause more water quality impacts than intensifying development within the project area under the proposed Project. Therefore, more runoff could potentially result cumulatively; however, with the policies implemented to address these issues, potential impacts would be similar to the proposed Project.

### *Population and Housing*

Under the 40% Reduction Alternative, population growth within the Planning Area would continue at a slower pace than the proposed Project. Although it cannot be predicted at exactly what rate, population will increase to lower levels than for the proposed Project within the Planning Area, but would not reduce demand for housing and services in this rapidly growing region. This alternative would reduce the amount of housing provided which could cause the City not to achieve its Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) requirements, and also be inconsistent with SCAG’s regional planning.

### *Recreation*

Existing recreational facilities do not meet the needs of the community based on City standards. In 2003, the City adopted a Park and Recreation Master Plan. It is assumed that the goals and policies of the Master Plan will be implemented with or without adoption of the proposed Project. As such, a decrease in population of approximately 56,354 in the Planning Area as a result of this alternative would mean a decrease in demand for recreation facilities and programs. At the City’s desired rate of 3 developed park acres per 1,000 residents, this represents a reduction in needed parks of 169 acres. With a projected deficit in park acres of over 500 under the Typical Project, this alternative will reduce the deficit, but not to less than significant levels.

## **Environmental Effects Relative to Areas of Significant Impacts Identified in the EIR Which Can be Mitigated**

### *Aesthetics*

Under the 40% Reduction Alternative, it is assumed that both the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines, and the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan would be in effect. As such, the 40% Reduction Alternative would achieve similar aesthetic improvements as those associated with the proposed Project. It is also assumed that at least some of the expected regional growth would be pushed toward the south and east.

As shown on Figure 5.1-2, Mount Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area, Mt. Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area covers a portion of the Orangecrest Neighborhood and the Southern Sphere Area. This Policy Area represents a radius of 45 miles from the observatory and restricts nighttime lighting hours, types and techniques of lighting. The majority of the land uses designated within the proposed Project for this area are uses that will not generate significant light and glare (Agriculture, Agriculture/Rural Residential, Hillside Residential, Very Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Public Facilities, Open Space/Natural Resources, RAT-Kangaroo Rat Habitat, and C-Commercial). The commercial uses are limited to existing locations on Cajalco Road and Van Buren Boulevard, as shown on Figure 5.1-2. The portion of the Planning Area located within the Policy Area north of Mariposa Avenue, includes both existing and planned uses which are General Plan designated as Very Low Density Residential, Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Commercial, Public Facilities, and Public Parks. New sources of light within the Mount Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area that would contribute to light and glare and affect the nighttime sky include street lights, park lighting, commercial parking lots, and residential/other outdoor security lighting. The 40% Reduction Alternative assumes that less dense development would occur within the urban areas but land uses that are located within the Policy Area would remain similar with respect to the potential to create light and glare. It is assumed that MM Aes 1 which requires all new or modified sources of light to have shielding devices or other light pollution limiting characteristics such as hoods or lumen restrictions would apply to this alternative so potential impacts of additional light and glare would be controlled and would have similar potential impacts as those resulting from the Project.

Likewise, General Plan policies which require implementation of Proposition R and Measure C to protect hillsides would apply to this alternative and therefore potential impacts would be the same as the proposed Project.

### *Biological Resources*

The proposed Project has been designed to complement and implement the MSHCP. Under the 40% Reduction Alternative, it is assumed that all habitat-protective General Plan policies would be implemented to be consistent with the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Program (MSHCP). MM Bio 1 would also be implemented with respect to special species not covered under the MSHCP. The potential sprawl created cumulatively with this alternative could affect more previously undisturbed lands and therefore more habitat and/or

species. Therefore, the 40% Reduction Alternative would have similar or worse impacts to biological resources as the proposed Project.

### *Cultural Resources*

In 2002, the City adopted a Historic Preservation Element separate from the Project. The Project incorporates but does not significantly change the Historic Preservation Element. It is assumed that the 40% Reduction Alternative will be subject to the same policies with respect to historic preservation as the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts under the 40% Reduction Alternative would be similar to those of the Project.

### *Geology/Soils*

The Project includes an updated City-wide geotechnical study and identifies places within the Planning Area susceptible to seismic and geologic hazards. The 40% Reduction Alternative would be afforded this same updated information and would place fewer people and structures within the Planning Area; subjecting fewer people to seismic and geologic hazards than the Project. Therefore, impacts related to seismic hazards would be reduced.

In addition, potential impacts associated with new development that proposes the use of septic tanks would be reduced to less than significant levels with MM Geo 1 implemented. Since the 40% Reduction Alternative would be subject to this mitigation measure, potential impacts resulting from the installation of septic systems would be similar to the proposed Project.

### *Noise*

Existing noise conditions exceed standards in some locations throughout the Planning Area. The 40% Reduction Alternative will increase noise levels, albeit less than the proposed Project, which will result in noise standards being exceeded. Transportation generated noise may also be less than the proposed Project due to fewer local trips, but within the region growth will likely occur and traffic may still traverse the Planning Area resulting in similar noise impacts as those associated with the Project. Construction noise and vibration will be the same as the proposed project. All of these impacts will be mitigated with the implementation of MM Noise 1, 2 and 4. Therefore, the 40 % Reduction Alternative has similar noise impacts after mitigation as the proposed project.

### *Public Services*

Public Service impacts related to police, fire, schools, libraries and community centers, would be reduced under this alternative because demand would be less. However, it is not possible to estimate precisely how much demand would be reduced. Cumulatively, potential significant impacts might result to fire, police, libraries, and schools, as development pressure is forced on other communities or to the fringes of the Planning Area, where response times would be lengthened.

### *Utilities*

Population growth within the Planning Area would be less under the 40% Reduction Alternative than the Project while non-residential square footage would increase. The proposed Project Typical development levels can be accommodated by planned facilities, therefore, the 40% Reduced Density Alternative can likely be accommodated. MM UTL 1, 2 and 3, which cause ongoing review of service needs with respect to capacity would still be in place. Such reviews can cause significant impacts to be avoided by planning and implementing facilities ahead of identified need. Therefore, the impacts to Utilities would be similar to the proposed Project.

## **Other Issue Areas**

### *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*

The 40% Reduction Alternative would include the same careful land use planning within the impact zones of Riverside Municipal Airport and March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port as are proposed within the Project. However, because potentially fewer people would work and/or live in the Planning area, potential impacts relative to airport hazards would be less than those of the Project.

### *Land Use and Planning*

A major objective of proposed Project is to institute smart growth principles in which increased in-town densities and intensities will decrease demand for growth on the urban periphery. The proposed Project seeks to aggressively improve the City's jobs-housing balance so that residents will have greater options to work within the City of Riverside rather than endure long commutes west to Los Angeles and Orange counties. Proposed infill development will make more efficient use of land and infrastructure and will require comparatively fewer vehicle trips and vehicle miles than comparably sized development located on "greenfields" on the urban edge. These "smart growth" elements all require a certain level of density to be effective. There is, for example, a direct relationship between density and the viability of public transit. Similarly, there is an inverse relationship between density and the cost of infrastructure (i.e., higher density reduces infrastructure costs, and vice versa). The 40% Reduced Density Alternative, therefore, inhibits the realization of the City's "smart growth" efforts.

Moreover, this alternative would lead to potentially complex land use and planning conflicts. Many parcels in the City are currently developed at the maximum allowable density/intensity. An across-the-board 40 percent reduction in maximum allowable density would create parcels with non-conforming uses on any lot developed at or within 40 percent of the maximum allowable level.

The 40% Reduced Density Alternative would also lead to greater conflicts with such regional plans as the Riverside County General Plan (RCIP), the County's Community and Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process (CETAP) plan which assumes Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF) associated with projected growth, South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan, and SCAG's

Compass Growth Vision – 2% Strategy. The proposed Project includes measures to ensure greater consistency with these plans; reducing densities and not achieving projected levels of growth would limit funding for some programs/plans, dilute the ability of the City to concentrate density to reduce trips and take advantage of public transportation, the 40% Reduction Alternative would result in land use planning conflicts regionally between the City and other agencies.

### **Ability to Achieve Project Objectives**

The 40 Percent Reduction Alternative would achieve several of the Project Objectives, including all of those associated with the Subdivision Code update and the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines. However, this alternative would be unlikely to achieve some of the most critical objectives of the entire Project. Specifically, this alternative would make it more difficult to achieve the infill/Smart Growth objectives of the Project and would not meet the objective regarding consistency with SCAG’s growth policies. This would defeat the purpose of the MASP. The lowering of allowable intensities could slacken development interest in the community. Allowing for higher density development is understood to be a key factor associated with successfully achieving infill development. If allowable development capacity is reduced to a point where it is comparable with levels allowable on the urban fringe, development is more likely to occur on the urban fringe. As such, the alternative would likely lead to greater urban sprawl in western Riverside County.

### **Conclusion**

Development consistent with the 40 Percent Reduction Alternative would be unlikely to lessen the significant unavoidable impacts relative to traffic, air quality, and GHG emissions that are associated with the proposed Project. This alternative would have similar or reduced identified significant impacts to library services, utilities, recreation, geologic issues, and water quality. This alternative would also lead to reduced demands for public services and recreational facilities. However, this alternative would fail to meet the most critical Project Objectives related to increased infill development, reduction of urban sprawl and other related smart growth principles. This alternative would potentially cause worse significant impacts to agriculture through more “green fields” development within other communities. It would also result in a worse situation with respect to land use conflicts and inconsistencies by creating many new non-conforming uses. See Table 7.0-B, Alternatives Comparison, for a summary of the 40% Reduction Alternative’s impacts.

### ***Increased Mixed Use Along “L” Corridor (Increased Mixed Use)***

#### **Description of Alternative**

This alternative is analyzed within this EIR as a means of reducing environmental impacts associated with traffic and air quality of the proposed Project by seeking to increase allowable levels of mixed use development along the so-called “L” corridor of Magnolia Avenue and University Avenue. While the proposed Project itself seeks to place a significant amount of new development along this corridor by introducing enabling land use and zoning tools to do so, the

Increased Mixed Use Alternative would increase the allowable density/intensity of mixed use development along the corridor by a factor of 25 percent over the levels permitted by the proposed Project at Typical build-out levels. The alternative would permit comparable proportions of non-residential and residential development relative to the proposed Project. Although not a detailed parcel-by-parcel level analysis, for order of magnitude purposes and because most of these land uses are concentrated along the “L” Corridor, if the projected population of all Mixed Use categories of land use, Very High Density Residential, and the Downtown Specific Plan were increased by 25 percent, the increase would be approximately 12,066 people. (See tables below.) Non-residential square footage within the same land uses would increase by approximately 13,723,673 square feet. This alternative involves changes primarily to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan; the Noise Code, Subdivision Code, and the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines would not change under this alternative. See **Table 7.0-B, Increased Mixed Use Projections**.

<b>Table 7.0-B Increased Mixed Use Projections</b>			
<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Column “A” Proposed Project Population (Typical)</b>	<b>Column “B” Twenty-five Percent Increase</b>	<b>A + B = Increased Mixed Use Population</b>
All Mixed Use	32,569	8,142	40,711
Very High Density Residential	9,763	2,441	12,204
Downtown Specific Plan	5,933	1,483	7,416
<b>Total</b>	<b>48,265</b>	<b>12,066</b>	<b>60,331</b>

<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Column “A” Proposed Project Square Footage Non-Res.</b>	<b>Column “B” Twenty-five Percent Increase</b>	<b>A + B = Increased Mixed Use Square Footage Non-Res.</b>
All Mixed Use	29,074,720	7,268,680	36,343,400
Downtown Specific Plan	25,819,972	6,454,993	32,274,965
<b>Total</b>	<b>54,894,692</b>	<b>13,723,673</b>	<b>68,618,365</b>

**Environmental Effects Relative to Areas of Significant and Unavoidable Impacts Identified in this EIR**

*Traffic, Air and Noise*

Development consistent with the alternative would, at buildout, result in increased development along the “L” corridor relative to the proposed Project. In the short term, the significant environmental impacts of this alternative could be equal to or greater than those of the proposed Project. The alternative could result in greater residential and commercial development of the corridor, which could increase traffic levels relative to the proposed Project, as well as create additional air quality impacts and generate noise levels comparable to or greater than the proposed Project. This alternative would increase the total population of the Project by 12,066, as shown in the above table. This represents an approximate increase of 3.15 percent compared to the Project ( $12,066/382,077=0.0315$ ). However, when compared to SCAG’s population projections for 2025, utilized in the AQMP, provided in Section 5.12 this alternative results in a 3.41 percent increase ( $12,066/353,397=0.0341$ ). Although relative air emissions will likely increase with the population, the overall population projection is still relatively consistent with the regional projections used to develop the AQMP. Under this alternative additional roadway links and intersections could fail within the vicinity of the “L” Corridor due to the increase in both residential and non-residential trips.

In the longer term, however, the higher levels of allowable development could have the seemingly counterintuitive result of decreased levels of impact in several of those categories. More dense/intense mixed use developments would put more people closer to opportunities to

shop and work, potentially decreasing traffic volumes as more people walk or use readily available transit service such as BRT. More intensive development of the corridor would also strengthen the viability of transit along the corridor, as more users would live or work in close proximity to a bus line. Over time, increased demand and use of transit would lead to additional transit service, which could draw new users. Further, greater mixed use development would have stronger potential to increase bike and pedestrian usage as an alternative to vehicular trips.

These potentialities of higher intensity/density mixed use development cannot be modeled or predicted precisely. Traffic modeling techniques tend to assume traffic projections based on land use without great sensitivity to surrounding areas. Most modeling techniques assume that a project will consist of auto-oriented development, basing trip generation rates on averages of rates observed elsewhere. Adjustments can be made to a model to factor in greater usage of transit, walking, biking and other alternative transportation; such adjustments cannot be realistically effectuated, however, until development reaches a critical mass. Similarly, the characteristics of a particular project may result in reduced traffic impacts if, for example, it locates high turn-over restaurants along busy arterials or combines certain residential and commercial uses at one site. Such reductions could not be estimated until a specific project is actually proposed. For these reasons, one would have to assume that increased levels of mixed use development along the “L” corridor would lead to increased population, traffic, air quality and noise impacts relative to the proposed Project, at least in the short term.

#### *Agriculture*

Agricultural resources would be affected in the same way as the proposed project, in that the land area impacted by development would remain the same as the proposed Project.

#### *Hydrology/Water Quality*

Potential impacts resulting from dam failure would be similar within both the Increased Mixed Use Alternative and the Project because significant unavoidable impacts result primarily in areas of the City which are already developed. However, the MASP is impacted by the inundation area and the Increased Mixed Use Alternative would place more people within the inundation area, therefore this alternative has greater potential adverse environmental impacts than the proposed Project.

#### *Population and Housing*

Population would increase by approximately 12,066 above levels anticipated in the General Plan for the Project at Typical development intensity, thus exceeding SCAG’s projections. However, this alternative proposes to locate the increases in density, and therefore population, within the core of the City which could result in reduced vehicular trips and meet other smart growth objectives of the Project. These objectives are key to SCAG’s 2% Strategy and Regional Comprehensive Plan. This project will result in similar impacts as the proposed Project.

### *Recreation*

Existing recreational facilities do not meet the needs of the community based on City standards. In 2003, the City adopted a Park and Recreation Master Plan based on population projections that will be exceeded by this alternative. Since meeting recreation needs is based on per capita use, an increase in population of approximately 12,066 people would represent a worse impact to parks and recreation than the proposed Project.

## **Environmental Effects Relative to Areas of Significant Impacts Identified in this EIR Which Can be Mitigated**

### *Aesthetics*

The proposed Project includes Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines that are intended to improve the visual quality of all new development. Further, the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan will provide detailed site planning guidance for development along the Magnolia Avenue corridor; such guidance is intended in part to improve the visual quality of the corridor. Under the Increased Mixed Use Alternative, the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines, and the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan would be in effect. As such, this alternative would achieve the same aesthetic improvements as the proposed Project.

As shown on Figure 5.1-2, Mount Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area, Mt. Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area covers a portion of the Orangecrest Neighborhood and the Southern Sphere Area. This Policy Area represents a radius of 45 miles from the observatory and restricts nighttime lighting hours, types and techniques of lighting. The majority of the land uses designated within the proposed Project for this area are uses that will not generate significant light and glare (Agriculture, Agriculture/Rural Residential, Hillside Residential, Very Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Public Facilities, Open Space/Natural Resources, RAT-Kangaroo Rat Habitat, and C-Commercial). The commercial uses are limited to existing locations on Cajalco Road and Van Buren Boulevard, as shown on Figure 5.1-2. The portion of the Planning Area located within the Policy Area north of Mariposa Avenue, includes both existing and planned uses which are General Plan designated as Very Low Density Residential, Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Commercial, Public Facilities, and Public Parks. New sources of light within the Mount Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area that would contribute to light and glare and affect the nighttime sky include street lights, park lighting, commercial parking lots, and residential/other outdoor security lighting. This Alternative assumes similar land use designations as the proposed project for areas located within the Policy Area. Development under the Increased Mixed Use Alternative would be subject to existing City standards related to street lights, and MM Aes 1 would apply so potential impacts of additional light and glare would be controlled and would have similar potential impacts as those resulting from the Project.

### *Biological Resources*

The proposed Project has been designed to complement and implement the MSHCP. Under the Increased Mixed Use Alternative, it is assumed that all habitat-protective General Plan policies

would be implemented to be consistent with the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Program (MSHCP). MM Bio 1 which addresses direct and indirect impacts to Federal Species of Concern, California Species of Special Concern, California Species Animals, or plants on lists one through four of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory and not covered under the MSHCP would also be implemented under this alternative. Therefore, the Increased Mixed Use Alternative would have similar impacts to biological resources as the proposed Project.

#### *Cultural Resources*

In 2002, the City adopted a Historic Preservation Element separate from the Project. The Project incorporates but does not significantly change the Historic Preservation Element. Therefore, impacts under the Increased Mixed Use Alternative would be similar to those of the Project.

#### *Geology/Soils*

The Project includes an updated City-wide geotechnical study and identifies places within the Planning Area susceptible to seismic and geologic hazards. The Increased Mixed Use Alternative will utilize this updated information, but would place more people in the Planning Area. As updated information is available, and building codes and City standards will be followed under this alternative potential impacts would be similar to the proposed Project.

In addition, potential impacts associated with new development that proposes the use of septic tanks would be reduced to less than significant levels with MM Geo 1 implemented. Since the Increased Mixed Use Alternative would be subject to this mitigation measure, potential impacts resulting from the installation of septic systems would be similar to the proposed Project.

#### *Noise*

Existing noise conditions exceed standards in some locations throughout the Planning Area. The Increased Mixed Use Alternative will increase noise levels which will result in noise standards being exceeded. Transportation generated noise may increase more than the proposed Project due to more local trips in the short-term, resulting in greater traffic noise impacts than those associated with the Project. Construction noise and vibration will be the same as the proposed project. All of these impacts will be mitigated with the implementation of MM Noise 1, 2 and 4. Therefore, the Increased Mixed Use Alternative has similar noise impacts after mitigation as the proposed Project.

#### *Library Services*

Section 5.13 of the EIR indicates that existing library facilities and services do not meet City standards and that the addition of planned library facilities will not achieve City-established library standards. As such the Increased Mixed Use Alternative will be worse than the proposed Project at impacting the already limited library service system. Facilities funded through the parcel tax will be needed more rapidly, and lack of adequate funding may continue to be a problem. Therefore, because the deficits in library services would be felt faster under this

alternative, it is considered worse than the proposed Project. MM PS 2 regarding funding for libraries will address this issue, but it will be needed sooner than 2012 under this alternative.

#### *Public Services*

Public Service impacts related to police, fire, schools and community centers, generally would be increased under this alternative because demand would be greater. The exact impacts are difficult to predict, however. Fire and police services may be easier to provide in compact areas if designed properly. At the moment, payment of fees has been identified as mitigating for increased school demand; however, concentrating development in the core of the City would impact older schools which may be less able to accommodate the additional students than newer schools in outlying areas.

#### *Utilities*

Population growth would outpace the rate assumed under the Project Typical development scenario, resulting in greater impacts to utilities. The proposed Project includes mitigation measures (MM UTL 1, 2 and 3) which cause ongoing review of service needs with respect to capacity. Such reviews can cause significant impacts to be avoided by planning and implementing facilities ahead of identified need. Without such measures built into the updated General Plan, the Increased Mixed Use Alternative would result in significant impacts to one or more utilities before projected deficiencies were identified. Therefore, with the mitigation measures in place, the Increased Mixed Use Alternative impacts to utilities could be reduced to less than significant levels, but are more likely than the proposed Project to require additional utilities services which could result in a significant impact to utilities.

### **Other Issue Areas**

#### *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*

The Increased Mixed Use Alternative results in the same careful land use planning within the impact zones of Riverside Municipal Airport and March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port as are proposed within the Project. However, because the University Avenue/Magnolia Avenue Corridor traverses these airport safety zones and more people would live and work there under this alternative, the Increased Mixed Use Alternative have the potential to place more people within the airport hazard zones. As such, this alternative would have potentially greater impacts relative to airport hazards.

#### *Land Use and Planning*

The Increased Mixed Use Alternative would lead to some conflicts with such regional plans as the Riverside County General Plan (RCIP), The County's CETAP which assumes TUMF associated with projected growth, SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan, and SCAG's Compass Growth Vision – 2% Strategy. The increase of approximately 12,066 in population and the related increase in square footage are not reflected/assumed in these regional plans, even though this alternative generally meets the smart growth and infill intensification aspects of all these plans. For example, traffic assumed for the Planning Area in the RCIP is less than would be

generated by this alternative, therefore this would result in worse impacts to air quality and traffic than the proposed project.

### **Ability to Achieve Project Objectives**

This alternative would achieve many of the Project Objectives as well as, if not more effectively than, the proposed Project. The alternative is consistent with Smart Growth principles; increasing allowable development levels in the “L” corridor could be a strong incentive to the development community to undertake infill and mixed-use developments and to the viability of public transportation. Although it would not considerably exceed the growth projected by SCAG which would meet the project objective related to consistency with SCAG growth projections, this increase could result in additional environmental impacts to air quality, traffic, hydrology/water quality, noise, recreation, public services, utilities, hazards, and land use planning. Therefore, the Increased Mixed Use Alternative promotes the Smart Growth principles and is reasonably consistent with the SCAG projections outlined in the objectives, but is inconsistent with other regional plans in ways that may cause potential significant impacts.

### **Conclusion**

The Increased Mixed Use Alternative would most likely result in traffic, air quality and noise impacts similar to or greater than those of the proposed Project. Impacts to public services such as libraries, police, fire, and recreational resources would be equal to or greater than those related to the proposed Project. Utilities would be inadequate to serve the level of development proposed under this alternative. In addition, greater densities would be created within the MASP and the Downtown Specific Plans, which would be inconsistent with those plans and their objectives. Even with the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), traffic flows along the University Avenue/Magnolia Avenue Corridor could become so congested that public transit slows down and becomes less effective. See Table 7.0-B, Alternatives Comparison, for a summary of the Increased Mixed Use Alternative’s impacts.

### **Environmentally Preferred Alternative**

Based on the above analysis and as summarized in the following table, Table 7.0-B, the proposed Project is the Environmentally Preferred Alternative. The No Project Alternative would have several of the same significant unavoidable impacts as the proposed Project and would introduce several worse significant impacts related to aesthetics, agriculture, biological resources, public services and utilities. Impacts which are less than significant for hazards and land use/planning become significant under this alternative. Further, the No Project Alternative would fail to meet most of the Project Objectives.

The ability of the 40 Percent Reduction Alternative to address significant unavoidable traffic, air quality and noise impacts is uncertain. Growth pressure in western Riverside County is strong; a development curtailment in Riverside would likely lead to increased pressure for development south and east of the Planning Area, which would use roadways and freeways traversing the City. This alternative would, however, result in reduced environmental impacts in some areas such as geological impacts, utilities, and public services. Impacts which are less than significant

for land use/planning become significant under this alternative. This alternative would fail to meet many critical Project Objectives.

The Increased Mixed Use Alternative may have the potential for long-term reduction of some of the significant unavoidable impact areas, but these impact reductions cannot be reliably predicted. As such, comparable or increased traffic, air quality and noise impacts must be assumed. Hydrology/water quality, population/Housing, recreation, public services, and utilities would result in worse impacts than the Project. Impacts which are less than significant for hazards and land use/planning become significant under this alternative. However, this alternative would successfully achieve all Project Objectives.

The proposed Project is thus the Environmentally Preferred Alternative in that it results in the lowest level of significant unavoidable impacts and best achieves the Project Objectives.

<b>Table 7.0-C Alternatives Comparison</b>			
<b>Significant and Unavoidable Impacts of the Proposed Project</b>	<b>No Project Alternative</b>	<b>40% Reduction Alternative</b>	<b>Increased Mixed Use Alternative</b>
<b>Agricultural Resources</b>	Worse	Worse	Similar
<b>Air Quality</b>	Similar/Worse	Similar	Worse/Similar
<b>Hydrology/Water Qual.</b>	Similar/Worse	Better, but not less than significant.	Worse
<b>Noise</b>	Worse	Similar	Worse
<b>Population/Housing</b>	Worse	Worse	Worse/Similar
<b>Recreation</b>	Similar	Better, but not less than significant.	Worse
<b>Traffic</b>	Similar/Worse	Worse – Less local residential traffic, but more freeway and cut-through traffic, and no reduced trips for density located along transit corridor. More non-residential traffic	Worse/Similar
<b>Significant Impacts of the Proposed Project Which Can be Mitigated</b>	<b>No Project Alternative</b>	<b>40% Reduction Alternative</b>	<b>Increased Mixed Use Alternative</b>
<b>Aesthetics</b>	Worse	Similar	Similar
<b>Biological Resources</b>	Worse	Similar	Similar
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	Similar	Similar	Similar
<b>Geological Resources</b>	Worse/Similar	Better/Similar	Similar
<b>Noise</b>	Worse	Similar	Similar/Worse
<b>Public Services – Libraries, Police</b>	Worse	Better/Worse	Worse
<b>Utilities</b>	Worse	Similar/Better	Worse
<b>Other Issue Areas</b>	<b>No Project Alternative</b>	<b>40% Reduction Alternative</b>	<b>Increased Mixed Use Alternative</b>
<b>Hazards/Haz. Material</b>	Worse	Better	Worse
<b>Land Use/Planning</b>	Worse	Worse	Worse
<b>Does the Alternative Meet Project Objectives</b>	<b>No Project Alternative</b>	<b>40% Reduction Alternative</b>	<b>Increased Mixed Use Alternative</b>
	NO	NO	YES – but not to the degree of the Project

This page intentionally left blank.