# 6.0 ALTERNATIVES

## INTRODUCTION

CEQA Guidelines §15126.6 provides a framework for formulating and analyzing alternatives in an EIR. It states:

> "An EIR shall 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."

Selection and discussion of alternatives is intended to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making. The CEQA Guidelines also require the analysis of a "No Project" alternative, and the identification of the "environmental superior alternative"; "If the environmentally superior alternative is the 'no project alternative' alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives."[1]

Project objectives are listed in Chapter 2.0.

## Reasonable Range of Alternatives

The range of alternatives required within an EIR is governed by the "rule of reason," which requires an EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. While there is no rule for the number of alternatives that must be discussed, as mentioned above, the EIR must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation, but need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Furthermore, an EIR need not consider an alternative with an unlikely or speculative potential for implementation or an alternative that would result in effects that cannot be reasonably ascertained.

## Feasibility

An EIR is not required to include alternatives that are not feasible. The term "feasible" is defined in the CEQA Guidelines ~~(Section~~§ ~~–~~15364~~)~~, as "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors." CEQA Guidelines §~~sec Section~~ 15126.6(f)(1) provides additional factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives. These factors include site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to potential alternative sites.

## Level of Analysis

The analysis of environmental effects of project alternatives need not be as thorough or detailed as the analysis of the project itself. Rather, the CEQA Guidelines state that the EIR ~~shall~~ must include "sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project."

[1] ~~*State*~~ *CEQA Guidelines* §~~*Section*~~ *15126.6 (e)(2).*

## Alternatives to the Project

Four alternatives were selected for analysis:

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2: Redesign Commercial Alternative
- Alternative 3: Redesign and Reduced Density Residential Alternative

Each of these is described further below in Sections 6.1 through 6.3.

## Alternatives Considered but Rejected As Infeasible

The CEQA Guidelines require EIRs to identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. ~~Section~~ CEQA Guidelines §15126.6 (c) of the ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines states the following:

> *"The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. ... Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts."*

Several alternatives were considered, but ultimately rejected as infeasible based on the criteria established under CEQA. These alternatives are described below.

## Alternative Site

An alternative site location for the project was considered in accordance with CEQA Guidelines ~~Section~~ § 15126.6(f)(2), but ultimately rejected, as an alternative site that would not achieve the project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen the environmental impacts of the project. There are no vacant sites within the City that offer a surrounding land use environment that would be compatible with the project mixed-use development objectives. The two parcels selected offer an opportunity to redevelop the ~~deteriorating~~ aging buildings on Parcel A and expansive flat vacant land in Parcel B to accommodate new structures. In addition, the properties are surrounded by urban development with a mix of uses including residential, commercial, and research and development. The project design acts as a "fusion" of land uses, as it aligns the proposed residential and commercial components as feasible to accommodate the compatibility with the different abutting uses (e.g. multi-family residential buildings are located across from the Pacific Glen multi-family development, while commercial uses front the commercial corridor along Hollister Avenue). In addition to the physical constraints of not having a similar vacant land area in an urban infill-type setting, the project applicant does not own an alternative property in the City that could be considered for the project.

## Reduced Density and Scale for Traffic Impacts

A project was considered that would reduce the project traffic to avoid impacts to the local intersections and roadways. To determine the level of reduction to the project that would be needed in order to result in insignificant impacts at the analysis locations, this Alternatives analysis looked at the incremental change due to the project is at a particular impacted roadway location as a sample. In considering the ADT roadway segment impact at Storke Road north of

Hollister Avenue, according to the traffic study, the existing ADT on this street segment is 33,800 trips. The City defines a significant impact for roadways as project's increases in traffic volumes by more than 1.0 percent on roadways that are forecast to exceed the "Acceptable Capacity." In the case of Storke Road the acceptable capacity is 34,000; and as such, so long as the project would not cause the segment to exceed an Average Daily Trips (ADT) of 34,340 trips there would not be a significant impact (1 percent of 34,000 is 340). So a maximum project increase in ADT trips of 540 (i.e., 34,340 existing with project – 33,800 existing = 540) would be the limitation. Based on the traffic study, the project, as currently proposed, would add 2,450 trips to this roadway segment. In order to reduce the project to a less than significant impact at this Storke Road segment, it would need to be reduced by 78 percent (i.e., 540 / 2,450 = 22 percent). Assuming all the factors in the trip generation and the reduction in project development would be reduced on a proportional basis (i.e., same percentage of reduction for residential and for retail component) this approximation would be a significant reduction in the project. Such a reduction to achieve reduced traffic levels to less than significant would not achieve the project objectives and render the project infeasible.

## 6.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The No Project Alternative is defined in CEQA Guidelines ~~Section~~ §~~—~~15126.6(e) ~~of the CEQA Guidelines~~ as "the existing conditions at the time of the notice of preparation is published ….as well as what would be 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." In this case, if the project is not approved, the site could be constructed in the foreseeable future according to the existing General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan and Zoning designations.

The project site is comprised of two parcels, legally described as Parcels A and B. Parcel A is approximately 1.23 acres in size and is located in the southeast corner of the project site. Parcel B is 22.32 acres in size and comprises the majority of the project site.

The City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Land Use Map designates Parcel A as Office and Institutional (I-OI) and the parcel is zoned Industrial Research Park (M-RP). Parcel B is designated Medium-Density Residential (R-MD), which permits a minimum residential density of 15 dwelling units per acre and has a target residential density of 20 dwelling units per acre; however, Parcel B is currently zoned Mobile Home Subdivision with an Affordable Housing Overlay, permitting a residential density of up to 12.3 units per acre (MHS/AHO DR-12.3). The portion of the southern third of the site is covered by a Flight Approach Overlay (F(APR)), and is partially located within one mile from Runway 7-25.

Parcel A contains two structures that provide a total of 9,546 square feet (sf) of floor area. One structure is an office building housing a television studio company and the other is an ATM kiosk containing two drive-through ATMs. It is assumed that these structures would remain in place, as is, for the foreseeable future.

Parcel B, comprising the majority of the project site, is vacant and undeveloped. It is currently vegetated with non-native grasses. Using the R-MD designation and a maximum density of 20 units per acre, the site could be developed with up to 447 residential units[2]. At 2.6 persons per unit, this alternative would result in a maximum number of residents of 1,162~~1,161~~ persons.

[2] The General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan ~~g~~ Growth Scenario 7 assumes the project site contains up to 467 units, which at 2.6 persons per unit, would result in a maximum number of residents of 1,214 persons. However~~,~~, this No

## 6.1.1 Aesthetics

The existing R-MD land use designation would allow buildings of up to three-stories or a maximum of 35 feet in height. Therefore, no change to visual impacts should occur in terms of northerly views toward the Santa Ynez mountains from Hollister Avenue. Obstruction of views from Hollister Avenue ~~is assumed to be~~ would remain a significant and unavoidable impact similar to the project.

The two existing land use designations have a maximum lot coverage of 40 percent for Parcel A (Industrial-Office and Institutional) and 30 percent for Parcel B (Medium Density Residential). The building site coverage for the residential portion of the project is 22.3 percent, open space is 42.5 percent. The building site for the commercial portion of the project is 21 percent, open space is 25.3 percent. Therefore, under this alternative it is possible for both the industrial and residential development to encompass a greater footprint as the maximum lot coverage has not been reached. Design review, recreation amenities and open space would likely limit the building coverage similar to the level of the project. Therefore, impacts ~~are considered the same and the loss of open space~~ would remain significant and unavoidable as this alternative would also substantially degrade the existing visual character and quality from the public Local Scenic Corridor.

## 6.1.2 Air Quality

This alternative would not result in any increase in emissions associated with construction activities or long-term development within the project site. As such, under the No Project Alternative, the short-term significant but mitigable regional and local emissions impacts associated with construction of the project would be avoided. Additionally, the less than significant impacts associated with increased emissions from operation of the project would not occur.

This alternative would result in a greater number of residents on the site (up to ~~1,161~~1,162 vs. 726 persons within the project residential area); however, the commercial component would result in more vehicle trips from patrons of the retail center, employees and operational aspects such as deliveries. Under General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan build-out, the residential units on Parcel B plus the commercial Parcel A would generate approximately 3,338 vehicle trips per day. As compared to the project, this represents a reduction of approximately 1,897 vehicle trips (5,235 trips under the project). Related emissions are provided in **Table 6.1-1**.

**Table 6.1-1**
**Traffic Generated Emissions Comparison (lbs/day)**

| | ROG | NOx | CO | PM-10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Project** | ~~49.1~~<br>28.3 | ~~46.6~~<br>47.5 | ~~377.9~~<br>271.3 | ~~54.5~~<br>28.3 |
| **Alternative 1** | ~~51.0~~<br>23.0 | ~~35.6~~<br>43.5 | ~~289.~~<br>~~7~~236.7 | ~~40.7~~<br>30.7 |
| **Difference** | ~~-1.9~~<br>+5.3 | ~~+11.0~~<br>+4.0 | ~~+88.2~~<br>+34.6 | ~~+13.8~~<br>-2.4 |
| **APCD Threshold Guideline** | 25 | 25 | - | 80 |

Project Alternative uses the 447 residential unit project as the comparison project, except for the Transportation comparison, which utilized the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan traffic model forecasts based upon 467 residential units.

As shown in Table 6.1-1, the proposed Westar project would not increase any project related air pollution emissions by an increment exceeding APCD significance criteria. The future development of the site, either as currently accounted for in the 2010 CAP under the existing General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan assumptions, or as proposed for the project, would create significant air quality impacts for ozone precursor emissions (ROG and NOx) due to traffic. However, the emissions under this alternative would be less and air quality impacts would be reduced.

## 6.1.3 Biological Resources

Under this alternative, the project site would be developed within relatively the same footprint as the project. Therefore, potential impacts of the project to biological resources would not change under this alternative.

## 6.1.4 Cultural Resources

Development of up to 447 housing units and associated roads, and infrastructure would result in the same potential for disturbance to archaeological and paleontological resources with potentially significant impacts reduced to less than significant with mitigation. This alternative would result in the removal of an 1887 railroad cut, a locally significant, and CRHR and NRHP eligible, historical resource. Therefore, impacts to historical resources would be significant and unavoidable.

## 6.1.5 Geology and Soils

Under the No Project Alternative, site preparation activities such as grading and introduction of new development would not occur. As a result, this Alternative would not avoid the project's significant but mitigable impacts related to geologic hazards (seismic shaking, liquefaction, expansive soils, settlement, erosion, and subsidence).

## 6.1.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under the No Project alternative, 447 housing units and the remaining Parcel A would generate fewer, but longer trips than the proposed project. Energy consumption and associated GHG generation would be similarly higher. The net difference between the No Project and the Project alternatives in terms of GHG emissions and associated impacts is relatively small, seen as follows:

**Table 6.1-2**
**GHG Emissions Comparison (MT/year $CO_2$(e))[(a)]**

| Source | Existing G.P. | Project |
|---|---|---|
| Transportation ~~(a)~~ | ~~3,923~~ 3,537 | ~~4,695~~ 3,603 |
| Area Source | 6 | 4 |
| Electricity | | |
| Commercial | ~~55~~ 58 | ~~400~~ 323 |
| Residential | ~~864~~ 547 | ~~539~~ 284 |
| Solid Waste 9 ~~(b)~~ | | |
| Commercial | ~~11~~ 5 | ~~77~~ 43 |
| Residential | ~~320~~ 93 | ~~200~~ 58 |
| Water Consumption ~~(b)~~ | | |
| Commercial | ~~4~~ 6 | ~~29~~ 19 |
| Residential | ~~176~~ 83 | ~~110~~ 52 |
| Natural Gas ~~(a)~~ | | |
| ~~Combined~~ Commercial | 1,087 | ~~681~~ 9 |
| Residential | 534 | 160 |
| **Total GHG** | **~~6,440~~ 4,876** | **~~6,731~~ 4,554** |

(a) ~~URBEMIS2007~~ CalEEMod Computer Model
~~Table 4.6.2 weighted by the ratio of commercial square footage and residential dwelling units~~

Implementation of the No Project Alternative would ~~reduce~~result in higher levels of ~~–~~GHG emissions ~~by 4.3 percent~~ as compared to the proposed project. Both alternatives would exceed the adopted significance threshold of 1,100 MT/year of $CO_2$(e) by approximately ~~600~~400 percent. However, both the project and this alternative would be below the 4.6 MT $CO_2$e/SP/yr threshold: a project emissions value of 3.9 MT $CO_2$e and No Project Alternative emissions value of 4.18 MT $CO_2$e/SP/yr. The No Project Alternative is not considered environmentally superior in terms of GHG emissions and associated impacts.

## 6.1.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Since the existing structures located on Parcel A would not be demolished, the potential for exposure to hazardous materials during construction would be reduced. Impacts related to asbestos and lead paint would not occur.

The existing structure located on Parcel A is exposed to an EMF of 2mG and would continue to be exposed to the EMF of 2mG as the structure would not be demolished. Development of up to 447 housing units would be placed outside the 2mG contour, which would reduce the ~~impact to Hazards and Hazardous Materials (~~EMF exposure~~) from a significant and unavoidable impact to a~~, although this impact is less than significant impact for the project.

All other potential hazardous materials impacts as a result of hazards materials in the project vicinity, use storage and disposal, proximity to the high-pressured natural gas line and UPRR, and exposure to radon gas would remain unchanged.

## 6.1.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

Lot coverage for Parcel B would remain the same (30 percent) under this alternative as the project. This alternative would alter on-site drainage patterns and increase impermeable surfaces similar to the project and impacts would be less than significant for runoff volume

under either scenario. Construction and operational water quality impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

## 6.1.9 Land Use and Planning

This alternative would be consistent with the City of Goleta's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. The General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan would allow up to three-story residential structures, which could result in compatibility conflicts with adjacent research and development office to the west along Santa Felicia Drive and the existing buildings within Parcel A. However, it is expected that setbacks, landscaping and design review, and disclosure requirements, would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level similar to the project.

This alternative could result in consistency impacts with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan policies; however, the development would be less intensive and potential inconsistencies would be less than with the project. As with the project, impacts would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation.

Beneficial impacts of providing off-site parking would not be guaranteed under build-out pursuant to the existing Gg~~g~~eneral ~~p~~Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan designation.

This alternative would develop up to 447 units and ~~1,161~~1,162 residents. There would likely be an increase in development within Santa Barbara Municipal Airport Runway Approach Zone. Therefore, as with the project, impacts related to evaluation of final consistency with the ALUP under this alternative would also result in an impact considered significant and unavoidable ~~prior~~ before~~to~~ ALUC review.

## 6.1.10 Noise

Since vehicle traffic would be reduced under this alternative, project operational noise generation on local roads would be decreased; however, the level would be less than significant similar to the project.

This alternative would eliminate the significant potential on-site nuisance noise that commercial uses would generate under the project.

Residential exposure to noise (outdoor living space and interior) from existing sources as it relates to the UPRR/US101 corridor would remain unchanged, as reduced to less than significant with mitigation required.

There would be no commercial uses exposed to noise from existing noise sources (e.g. along Hollister Avenue); however, residential units would be constructed in the southern portion of the site and would be exposed to similar levels of noise. The residential units are more sensitive with more stringent interior and exterior noise standards; however it is expected that these impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level.

## 6.1.11 Public Services –Fire Protection

This alternative would result in a greater number of residents on-site, but would be an overall decrease in population at the site relative to the project commercial and residential uses combined. As such, this alternative would reduce the project less than significant fire service to

population ratio. Impacts related to design for fire protection would similarly be a potential impact requiring mitigation, and reduced to a less than significant level.

## 6.1.12 Recreation

This alternative would result in a greater number of residents on the site (up to 1,162 vs. 726 persons within the project residential area), which ~~The General Plan build-out of 467 residential units and a population of 1,235 residents~~ would be a significant increase in residents and associated demand for both open space and active recreation. Although this demand would be greater than the proposed project, it is expected that development would incorporate active recreation components within a development plan for the benefit of the on-site residents and be required to contribute development impact fees for public recreation facilities. Therefore, impacts would be greater under this alternative, but reduced to less than significant with mitigation or standard fee requirements.

## 6.1.13 Transportation and Traffic

Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE) has prepared a General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan build-out analysis, from which this section is based.

## Traffic Model Forecasts

Traffic model forecasts for the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan build-out scenario were taken from the City's General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.[3] The City's existing General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan traffic model assumed build-out of 467 residential units on Parcel B (+ 23.5 acres), using a density of 20 units per acre based on the R-MD designation. The updated General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan analysis completed for the project General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendment assumes a maximum build-out of 300 residential units on the northern portion of the site and that the southern portion would be rezoned to allow the maximum development of 100,000 square feet of retail uses, as worst-case scenario.

The traffic that would be generated by the 467 multi-family dwelling units on the project site was extracted for the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan traffic forecasts was compared to the maximum build-out under the proposed General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendment, assuming 300 residential units and the 100,000 square feet of retail uses to assess the turning movements for the key intersections within the vicinity of the project site.

Levels of service were calculated for the key intersections for comparison build-out under the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan and the project. The street network improvements assumed in the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan document for the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Growth ~~GP-7~~ ~~s~~Scenario 7 were used in the level of service analysis (e.g. new overcrossings, lane geometries, and traffic controls at intersections, etc.).

**Table 6.1-3** shows the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan build-out level of service forecasts assuming the 467 multi-family dwelling units on the project site. For comparison**,** Table 6.1-2 also shows the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan build-out level of service forecasts assuming development of the project with a General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendment to allow 300 multi-family units on the northern portion of the site and 100,000 square feet of retail on the southern portion of the site.

[3] City of Goleta Final General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan 2030 Forecast Report. Dowling Associates, April 2006.

**Table 6.1-3**
**P.M. Peak Hour Level of Service Comparisons**

| Intersection | GP Build-out with 467 MFDU on Project Site | | GP Build-out With Goleta Mixed-Use Village GPA | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ICU | LOS | ICU | LOS |
| US 101 NB Ramps/Storke Road | 0.72 | LOS C | 0.72 | LOS C |
| US 101 SB Ramps/Storke Road | 0.52 | LOS A | 0.53 | LOS A |
| Hollister Avenue/Pacific Oaks Drive | 0.74 | LOS C | 0.74 | LOS C |
| Hollister Avenue/Santa Felicia Drive (a) | 18.7 Sec | LOS C | 19.0 Sec | LOS C |
| Hollister Avenue/Marketplace Drive (b) | 0.52 | LOS A | 0.70 | LOS B |
| Hollister Avenue/Storke Road | 0.90 | LOS D | 0.92 | LOS E |
| Marketplace Drive/Storke Road | 0.70 | LOS B | 0.70 | LOS B |

(a) Unsignalized intersection. LOS based on average weighted control delay per vehicle in seconds
(b) General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan ~~GP~~ Build-out With Goleta Mixed- Use Village Project scenario assumed improvements planned by proposed project.

As shown, most of the key intersections in the vicinity of the project site are forecast to operate at LOS C or better assuming the project volumes, which meets City standards as found in the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Traffic Element Policy 4.1. The Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection is forecast to degrade to LOS E under General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan build-out conditions as a result of the project. The City's operating standard for ~~this~~ the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection is LOS D as found in the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Traffic Element Policy 4.2. With mitigation, in addition to the City's planned improvements, the project would meet the City's LOS D operating standard for the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection. As such, traffic impacts of the project would be greater under the project relative to this alternative; however, mitigation would reduce the project impacts to less than significant.

## 6.1.14 Utilities and Service Systems

### Water Supply

Residential development of 22.32 acres would result in a water demand of 128.34 acre-feet per year (AFY).[4] This would represent an increase of approximately 27.70 AFY relative to the project that incorporates commercial uses and less water demands. Impacts would remain potentially significant requiring mitigation for will-serve verification, drought tolerant landscaping, recycled water use, etc. Since the ~~general~~ General ~~plan~~ Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan includes a Water Service Agreement, it is assumed that this increase in demand would be accommodated by the existing purveyor water supply.

### Wastewater Treatment

Development of up to ~~467~~ 447 residential units as allowed under the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan would generate approximately ~~85,928~~82,248 gallons per day (gpd) of wastewater.[5] This is an increase of ~~25,587~~ 21,907 gpd from the project, which is an increase in impact relative to the project. However, as with the project, the remaining surplus treatment capacity of

[4] 22.32 x 5.75 AFY = 128.34 AFY, City of Goleta, *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, October 2002, Water Demand Rates for Residential DR 20. This amount includes landscape irrigation.
[5] Generation rate (184 gpd/unit) provided by GWSD email from Mark Nation to Envicom Corporation (2011).

1.41 million gallons per day at the Goleta West Sanitation District would accommodate this alternative's estimated wastewater flows, and impacts would be less than significant.

### Solid Waste

Construction of ~~467~~ 447 residential units would generate approximately 4,258,495 pounds of debris, assuming 22.3 percent site coverage of buildings (same ~~of~~ as the project residential area).[6] The amount sent to a landfill would be 1,065 tons (vs. project 895 tons); as such, construction waste debris impacts would be increased. However, with 50 percent reduction, mitigation would reduce construction impacts to less than significant. Operational solid waste generation would result in ~~586.63~~551.95 tons (vs. project 476.10 tons) of solid waste being sent to a landfill.[7] Therefore, this alternative would exacerbate the significant unavoidable operational solid waste impacts.

## 6.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: ~~REDESIGN~~ COMMERCIAL REDESIGN~~COMPONENT~~ ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would focus on the commercial section with a goal of recapturing some of the northerly ridgeline views from Hollister Avenue, and would retain more of a semblance of an open space feeling of the site (albeit developed rather than natural). ~~while avoiding~~This alternative would also reduce the placement of habitable areas of structural development ~~within the 2mG~~near the EMF ~~contour~~of the transmission lines. Conceptually, this alternative would involve:

- Relocation of Building A (which is anticipated to be a 7,000 square foot restaurant building) from the project design location along Hollister Avenue and the project entrance to be located within Buildings E and F, as a second story, to the retail uses.
- Relocation of Building I to the area between Buildings H and G, running north-south along the eastern portion of the commercial component. The parking that is currently designed at this location would be accommodated in the location where the building would be removed.

~~•To keep habitable areas of commercial structural development outside of the 2mG EMF contour, one or more of the various options would be utilized with a goal of maintaining the same project square footage:~~

- ~~Relocation of Southern California Edison Transmission poles eastward; and/or~~
- ~~Relocation of Southern California Edison Transmission lines upwards, downwards and/or eastward; and/or~~
- ~~Reconfigure Southern California Edison Transmission lines such that magnetic fields are reduced; and/or~~
- ~~Relocation and/or partial deletion of Buildings G; and/or~~
- ~~Revise floor plans for Buildings G; and~~
- ~~Avoid locating the relocated building's habitable areas of structural development inside the 2mG EMF contour.~~

[6] 972,259 square feet x .223 = 216,814 square feet of buildings x 4.38 lbs/sf = 4,258,495. 50% reduction = 1,065 tons

[7] ~~1,235~~1,162 residents x 0.95 tons/year = ~~1,173.25~~1,103.9 tons x .50 = ~~586.63~~551.95 tons to landfill

### 6.2.1 Aesthetics

The relocation of Buildings A and I would reduce the visual impacts of the project. These buildings represent two of the three most prominent view-blocking buildings, the third being Building B at the southwesterly portion of the site. This would represent a significant change in the aesthetic impacts of the project as it would improve northerly views from Hollister Avenue from westbound traffic and from the intersection of Marketplace Drive. The related visual simulations are provided in Figure 4.1-9. Impacts to eastbound views from Hollister Avenue as shown in Figure 4.1-7 would be improved, but not significantly as the most view-blocking building (Building B) from this location would remain the most prominent project feature blocking views of the Santa Ynez Mountains. Overall, this alternative would substantially reduce the project's significant unavoidable impacts to views from Hollister Avenue. However, this view blocking effect of Building B would still cause the impacts to scenic views to remain significant and unavoidable.

The increased heights of the Buildings E and F would increase the blocking effect of those structures to views of the Santa Ynez Mountains; however, given the increased setback, while the increase in height would block portions of the mountains, it would not be expected to extend into the skyline.

The less than significant impact of the project from altering northerly views of the Santa Ynez Mountains from the Marketplace Drive/Hollister Avenue Viewpoint would be reduced.

This alternative would reduce the project's significant unavoidable impact relative to the loss of an expansive open space and degrade or significantly interfere with the public's enjoyment of the site's existing visual resources from public scenic corridors.

This alternative would increase the less than significant impact to private views from residential units east of the site; however the impact would remain less than significant.

### 6.2.2 Air Quality

This alternative would result in the same level of construction activity, long-term operational air emissions from traffic and, and the same level of potential exposure of residents to emissions associated with the US101/UPRR corridor. Adding restaurant uses (Building A) in closer proximity to the adjacent residential units of the project internally would increase the impact related to odor, but would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

### 6.2.3 Biological Resources

The entire project site would continue to be development under this alternative; as such, no change to biological impacts would occur.

### 6.2.4 Cultural Resources

This alternative would not result in a change to impacts of the project related to the historical railroad cut, potential to degrade archaeological resources, or paleontological resources.

## 6.2.5 Geology and Soils

Potentially significant geologic impacts associated with the project and this alternative would be essentially the same. However, there would be a reduction in the number of persons and structures subject to potential geologic hazards including seismic-shaking, liquefaction, expansive soils, and settlement. Potential erosion and sedimentation impacts would still occur requiring drainage and stabilization related mitigation. Similar to the project, implementation of the mitigation measures would reduce geologic impacts to a less than significant level.

## 6.2.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Commercial Redesign Alternative would not reduce the project's greenhouse gas emissions from transportation and non-transportation sources, such as electricity and natural gas electricity use~~, and its associated significant unavoidable contribution to cumulative impacts~~. As with the project, the greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant.

## 6.2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Potential for exposure of construction workers to hazardous materials from demolition would remain potentially significant requiring mitigation to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

~~This alternative would avoid placement of habitable areas of commercial structural development within the 2mG EMF contour, which would reduce the impact to Hazards and Hazardous Materials (EMF exposure) from a significant and unavoidable impact to a less than significant impact.~~

The ~~remaining~~ less than significant impacts related to exposure to hazardous materials and EMF in the project vicinity would remain less than significant.

Relocation of Building A would reduce the project's development of commercial uses in close proximity to an existing high-pressure natural gas pipeline; however this impact would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

There would be no change to the potential to exposure to hazards from proximity to the UPRR/US101 corridor and naturally occurring radon gas would not change.

## 6.2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

This alternative would not reduce the areas of impermeable surfaces associated with the project in the form of building coverage, driveways, parking, and walkways. Impacts related to alteration of on-site drainage patterns and increase impermeable surfaces would remain less than significant. The potential to introduce water quality pollutants into the surface runoff would remain significant but mitigable.

## 6.2.9 Land Use and Planning

Project impacts from temporary, short-term demolition and construction activities associated with development of the project on short-term quality of life effects on occupants of existing surrounding uses would remain.

The placement of Building I along the east boundary would not increase the project's potentially significant compatibility conflict with surrounding land uses, as the Hollister Research Center opposite this location along Glen Annie Road is considered compatible.

This alternative would reduce the number of structures that would be developed within the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport Runway Approach Zone, the F(APR) overlay. As such, the ~~project significant unavoidable impact~~ less than significant impact related to ALUC review and compatibility with the ALUP would be marginally reduced~~. However, similar to the proposed project~~, as the remaining buildings within the Zone (Buildings B and H) would remain. ~~be subject to an evaluation of final consistency with the ALUP to be determined by the ALUC, and as such, would also result in an impact considered significant and unavoidable prior to ALUC review.~~

## 6.2.10 Noise

Construction noise (less than significant with mitigation) and traffic-generated noise (less than significant) of the project would not change as a result of this alternative.

The project's potentially significant commercial uses generate noise that may result in on-site noise nuisance impacts

The distance between commercial uses and Hollister Avenue would be increased, and as such, the exposure to noise from existing noise sources (e.g. traffic on Hollister Avenue) would be reduced, but remain less than significant as Building H and B locations would not change.

The less than significant project impacts related to exposure of residential units to vibration generated along the UPPR would remain unchanged.

## 6.2.11 Public Services –Fire Protection

The project's impacts to the fire service to population ratio for Fire Station 11 and design potentially resulting in fire hazards or inadequate protection features would remain unchanged.

## 6.2.12 Recreation

The project's residential population demand for recreational facilities in the City of Goleta would not change. Project specific and cumulative impacts would remain less than significant under this alternative.

## 6.2.13 Transportation and Traffic

The Redesigned Commercial Alternative would not result in changes to internal access and circulation and traffic generation. There would be no changes to impacts relative to roadway segments or intersections; these impacts would remain potentially significant prior to mitigation similar to the project.

## 6.2.14 Utilities and Service Systems

## Water Demand, Wastewater, Solid Waste

There would be no significant changes to the water demand, wastewater generation or solid waste generation under this alternative.

## 6.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: RESIDENTIAL REDESIGN AND REDUCED DENSITY ~~RESIDENTIAL~~ ALTERNATIVE

~~This alternative would focus on the preservation of the historical 1887 SPRR railroad cut with the goal of retaining the most defined portion of it onsite, with the area designated an open space park while avoiding placement of habitable areas of structural development within the 2mG EMF contour. This alternative would swap the location of Building 13 with the Residential Open Space located on the east side of the project midway along Glen Annie Road, rotate Building 12 in a north-south configuration, and eliminate Building 14 (Type 100). This alternative would eliminate roadways and parking in the Northeast corner that would surround Buildings 12 and 14 under the project. To keep habitable areas of residential structural development outside of the 2mG EMF contour, one or more of the various options would be utilized:~~

- ~~Relocation of Southern California Edison Transmission poles eastward; and/or~~
- ~~Relocation of Southern California Edison Transmission lines upwards, downwards and/or eastward; and/or~~
- ~~Reconfigure Southern California Edison Transmission lines such that magnetic fields are reduced; and/or~~
- ~~Relocation and/or partial deletion of Buildings 13, 15 and 17; and/or~~
- ~~Revise floor plans for Buildings 13, 15 and 17; and~~
- ~~Avoid locating the relocated building's habitable areas of structural development inside the 2mG EMF contour.~~

This alternative would reduce the overall density of the residential component by limiting the height of the structures to two-story (as opposed to three). The two-story structures as proposed under the project would remain unchanged. As two story structures, the Building Type 100s essentially become Building-type 300s, and Building-Type 200s would become Building-Type 400s. The mix of units and Buildings under this alternative is provided in **Table 6.3-1**.

**Table 6.3-1**
**Building Types and Unit/Garage Count**

| Building No. | Building Type | Apartment Units Per Building | Garages |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 400 | 7 | 8 |
| 2 | 300 | 11 | 13 |
| 3 | 300 | 11 | 13 |
| 4 | 300 | 11 | 13 |
| 5 | 300 | 11 | 13 |
| 6 | 400 | 7 | 8 |
| 7 | 300 | 11 | 13 |
| 8 | 400 | 7 | 8 |
| 9 | 400 | 7 | 8 |
| 10 | 400 | 7 | 8 |
| 11 | 400 | 7 | 8 |
| 12 | 400 | 7 | 8 |
| 13 | 300 | 11 | 13 |
| 14 | 300 | 11 | 13 |

| Building No. | Building Type | Apartment Units Per Building | Garages |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | 400 | 7 | 7 |
| 16 | 300 | 11 | 13 |
| 17 | 300 | 11 | 13 |
| 18 | 400 | 7 | 8 |
| **Total** | - | **162** | **188** |

## 6.3.1 Aesthetics

~~By resulting in a net change of removing one residential building,~~ In limiting the heights of the residential building to two-stories, this alternative would improve but not significantly alter the project's aesthetic impacts as currently proposed, including visual resources, visual character, scenic views, and views from other public or private viewpoints. The view from private locations within the adjacent Pacific Glen Village development to the east ~~would be reduced. Views~~ and from the US 101/Stork Road overpass would be improved slightly, as ~~more open space would be added to the foreground view~~ there would be reduced scale and building mass in the foreground views; however, the less than significant impact relative to distant skyline views would not appreciably change. As shown in Figures 4.1-7~~a~~ and 4.1-9, the commercial buildings obstruct views of the residential structures and mountains, including the mountain ridgeline. Without modifying the commercial buildings, the reduction of the project's three-story residential structures to two-story residential sturctures would minimally improve views of the Santa Ynez mountains from Hollister Avenue; therefore, limiting the structures to two-story would improved these views partially. However, ~~T~~the project's significant unavoidable impacts from Hollister Avenue would remain.

## 6.3.2 Air Quality

~~Under this alternative, there would be no appreciable change to construction levels and associated emissions. During operations, the reduction of 19 units would result in approximately 50 fewer residents and associated energy use onsite and for transportation. As this alternative would generate 6.8 percent fewer residents, it can be presumed that vehicle trips by residents would have a similar decrease. However, based on the project's significant air quality impacts, this reduction would not result in impacts being reduced to below significant levels. Therefore, while impacts would be slightly reduced, they would remain significant as with the proposed project.~~

In reducing the numbers of units, this alternative would reduce the construction activity and the project operations' mobile, area source, and energy emissions. While all of the criteria pollutants would be measurably reduced, this alternative would continue to result in significant and unavoidable impacts relative to mobile source emissions (Impact AQ 2).

## 6.3.3 Biological Resources

~~The proposed development under this alternative would not occur within the same footprint as the proposed project and some biological resources would be protected. Wetland 1, as identified on Figure 4.3-1 within the railroad cut would be avoided, reducing the project overall wetland impacts. Additional area could be used to provide on-site mitigation (in an area known to support such habitat) for the loss of Wetland 2 and southern tarplant should it be present on-site. Also, this alternative would avoid impacting the protected coast live oak at eastern~~

~~terminus of the railroad cut. The area of open space would be greater and would offer an opportunity to create bioswale areas for water quality. All impacts to biological resources would be reduced substantially under this alternative.~~

The footprint of development would remain unchanged, and as such, impacts to biological resources would remain substantially the same as with the project.

## 6.3.4 Cultural Resources

~~Alternative 3 is designed to reduce impacts to historical resources as it would reduce the number of permanent structures to be placed over the abandoned segment of an 1887 Southern Pacific Railroad (SPRR) "railroad cut." This railroad cut is currently identified as a local Place of Historic Merit and is identified as Historic Resource #45 per General Plan Table 6-1 (List of Historic Resources). It would still be necessary for construction access drives, and portions of residential buildings including parking spaces to impact portions of the railroad cut; however, these impacts would occur within the western portion, which is less defined than the eastern section that would be preserved under this alternative. Since the area where the proposed Building 13 and 14 would not be developed, under this alternative, the historical resource would be preserved and remain accessible to the public. Therefore, the significant unavoidable project and cumulative impacts to related to the loss of the railroad cut would be mostly avoided and reduced to less than significant.~~

The footprint of development would remain unchanged, and as such, impacts to cultural resources would remain substantially the same as with the project. Potential impacts related to historical, archaeological and paleontological resources would ~~be reduced marginally, and~~ remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

## 6.3.5 Geology and Soils

Potentially significant geologic impacts associated with the proposed project and this alternative would be essentially the same. It is assumed that the soils engineering requirements would be similar to that necessary for the proposed structures. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of the identified mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

## 6.3.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This alternative would ~~not significantly~~ reduce the project's greenhouse gas emissions from transportation or non-transportation sources, such as electricity and natural gas electricity use. Therefore, this alternative's contribution to cumulative impacts would be ~~reduced, but essentially the same as the proposed project's contribution~~ less than the project's, less than significant impact.

## 6.3.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative ~~would avoid placement of habitable areas of residential structural development within the 2mG EMF contour, which~~ would reduce the impact to Hazards and Hazardous Materials (EMF exposure), ~~from a significant and unavoidable impact to a~~ but remain a less than significant impact, as with the project.

The remaining less than significant impacts related to exposure to hazardous in the project vicinity would remain less than significant.

There would be no change to the potential to exposure to hazards from proximity to the UPRR/US101 corridor and naturally occurring radon gas would not change.

## 6.3.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

By eliminating ~~one~~ residential ~~building~~ units, this alternative would reduce the required number of parking spaces, which could in-turn, reduce the hardscape portion of the developed area and add open space area. ~~which~~This would decrease runoff volume and could potentially increase bio-filtration to further reduce surface water quality impacts. The potential hydrology and water quality impacts under this alternative would be reduced; however, as the development footprint would not change significantly, the potential impacts would likewise not change significantly. There would remain potential construction and long-term water quality impacts that would remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

## 6.3.9 Land Use and Planning

This project would provide a mix of housing and commercial space consistent with the land use designation and zoning with acceptance of minor zoning changes proposed. This alternative would still require the same General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Amendment. As with the proposed project, this alternative would be consistent with the ~~City of Goleta~~ General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan with the incorporation of mitigation measures. This alternative would, like the proposed project, be subject to an evaluation of final consistency with the ALUP to be determined by the ALUC~~, and as such, would also result in an impact considered significant and unavoidable prior to ALUC review~~. Based on ALUC's review of the project, it is assumed their review for this alternative would similarly result in a less than significant impact as with the project.

## 6.3.10 Noise

This alternative's elimination of ~~one~~the third floor of the residential buildings ~~and relocating of other buildings~~ would not result in a substantial change to off-site noise exposure due to construction or operations of the project's residential or commercial components. However, a reduction in residential traffic would be expected to marginally decrease traffic-generated noise. ~~On-site residential units' outdoor living spaces, particularly balconies or patios of the reconfigured Building 12, could experience increased exposure to noise levels above 65 dBA CNEL from traffic on US 101, as such areas would experience less shielding from that noise source. However, mitigation measures N-4-1 and 5-1 would apply to this alternative as well to reduce these impacts.~~ Also there would be less outdoor living space (e.g. balconies) along the north boundary with direct line-of-sight to the US 101/UPRR traffic noise. Mitigation for the potential for commercial noise impacts would remain the same, and the project's traffic noise generation would not change significantly ~~as there would be no significant change~~ with the reduction in the number of residents or associated vehicle trips. Therefore, impacts related to noise generation and exposure would be ~~potentially marginally greater due to the reconfiguring of Building 12~~, but would be reduced to less than significant as with the proposed project.

## 6.3.11 Public Services ~~– Fire Protection~~

~~Although t~~This alternative would result in ~~50~~273 fewer residents and 105 residential units, ~~the~~which would reduce the ~~-~~project impacts regarding fire protection, and would reduce demand on police, library, and school services. ~~service population ratios would remain the same~~. Mitigation measures that provide fire protection design features such as access and hydrants would remain the same, contingent on Fire Department review. Therefore, this alternative's fire protection residual impacts would be reduce and also ~~be~~ considered less than significant.

## 6.3.12 Recreation

This alternative would reduce the number of units and residents that would require on-site recreation facilities. ~~It would also require the elimination of the proposed open space park that would have public access on the east side of the site, as well as the private park space and tot lot located between Buildings 12 and 14. However, it would create a new, slightly larger open space area, encompassing the preserved historical railroad cut and the area between the cut and the northerly property boundary, which would provide recreation opportunities to serve the project's residents and the public (albeit at a slightly reduced level of accessibility).~~ Therefore, impacts regarding passive and active recreation areas under this alternative would be reduced from those of the proposed project. ~~However, with the elimination of the proposed tot lot, active recreation areas provided on site would be diminished, which could result in a potential impact.~~

## 6.3.13 Transportation and Traffic

Under this alternative, site access and circulation would remain the same as proposed. Parking requirements would be reduced, and the number of garages would be reduced according to Building-type. With the reduction of 105 residential units, the traffic generation for the residential portion would be reduced. However, it is expected that the impacts related to traffic congestion on surrounding roadways and intersections from the project would be remain significant, but reduced to less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

~~, with the exception of the elimination of roadways and parking in the northeast corner surrounding the originally proposed Building 13 site. Parking requirements would be reduced, and it is assumed that a portion of the area that would not be developed with Building 14 would be used to ensure an adequate supply of parking spaces. There would be no changes in project impacts regarding traffic congestion on surrounding intersections and roadways, or area parking.~~

## 6.3.14 Utilities and Service Systems

The following addresses the change in impacts associated with this Alternative regarding Water Supply, Wastewater Treatment and Solid Waste.

## Water Supply

With the reduction in the number of residential units proposed, there would be a ~~potentially slight~~ decrease in the amount of water demand of the project. As such, the project's impacts would remain less than significant with implementation of mitigation identified for the proposed project.

## Wastewater Treatment

Alternative 3 would ~~slightly~~ reduce the amount of wastewater generated by the project. As such, the project's impacts which would remain less than significant.

## Solid Waste

Alternative 3 would result in a reduction is square footage of construction waste, with a total of 729 tons being sent to a landfill. As with the project, Impact SW-1 would be significant and reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation incorporated. A breakdown of the construction waste is provided in **Table 6.3-3**.

The reduction in households under this alternative would reduce the operational solid waste. As provided in **Table 6.3-4**, operational solid waste generation that would be sent to a landfill would be approximately 346 tons per year, which is

**Table 6.3-3**
**Construction Waste**

| Type | Size (sf) | Generation Factor[a] (lbs/sf) | Waste Generated (lbs) | Recycling Percentage | Waste Sent To Landfill (lbs) | Waste Sent To Landfill (tons) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Construction** | | | | | | |
| Residential[b] | 247,379 | 4.38 | 1,083,520 | 50% | 541,760 | 271 |
| Commercial[c] | 90,054 | 3.89 | 350,310 | 50% | 175,155 | 88 |
| Total Construction Waste | | | **1,571,051** | **50%** | **785,526** | **359** |
| **Demolition** | | | | | | |
| Commercial | 9,546 | 155 | 1,479,630 | 50% | 739,815 | 370 |
| **Total Construction and Demolition Wastes** | | | **3,050,681** | **50%** | **1,525,341** | **729** |

[a] US Environmental Protection Agency, *Characterization of Building-Related Construction and Demolition Debris in the United States*, June 1998.
[b] Includes gross residential square footage for 162 units with garages and common building areas (232,375 sf), clubhouse building (3,276 sf), ¼ (roof only) of carport square footage (2,700 sf), maintenance building and car wash (602 sf), and total residential area of the live/work area (8,426 sf).
[c] Includes total commercial area of the live/work area.

**Table 6.3-4**
**Operational Solid Waste**

| Land Use Type | Residents or Sq. Ft. | Rate[b] (tons/year) | Total Waste Generated (tons) | Recycling Diversion | Total Solid Waste Sent to Landfill (tons/year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Residential** | 421[a] | 0.95 | 400.14 | 50% | 200.07 |
| **Commercial** | | | | | |
| Eating/Drinking Establishment | 17,000 | 0.0115 | 195.50 | 50% | 97.75 |
| Neighborhood Center | 69,954 | 0.0009 | 62.96 | 50% | 31.48 |
| Office (Live/Work Areas) | 3,100 | 0.0013 | 4.03 | 50% | 2.02 |
| **Total** | | | **691.89** | **50%** | **331.32** |

[a] City of Goleta, General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Housing Element, Technical Appendix, November 2010, Page 10A-20. 2.6 persons per household x 162 households
[b] City of Goleta, *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, 2002.

~~Alternative 3 would not significantly change the amount of building materials and construction-related waste generation of the project (approximately one ton less of debris following recycling[8]). The long-term solid waste generation would also not significantly change. Operational impacts related to solid waste would also be slightly less than those identified for the proposed project (7.6 tons less annually following 50 percent recycling reduction[9]), but would remain significant.~~

## 6.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

In addition to the discussion and comparison of impacts of a proposed project and the alternatives, CEQA Guidelines requires that an "environmentally superior" alternative be selected and the reasons for such a selection disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the least amount of adverse impacts. In this case, the Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative) would result in the fewest amount of impacts.

Based on the alternative analysis provided above, it has been determined that Alternative 3 (Residential Redesign and Reduced Density ~~Residential~~ Alternative) would result in the fewest number and lesser significance of adverse impacts. It is, therefore, ~~; and thus, has been chosen as~~ the environmentally superior alternative. Alternative 3 would result in fewer total impacts, fewer significant and unavoidable impacts, and a reduction in significance of impacts in the issue areas of Aesthetics, Air Quality, ~~Biological Resources, Cultural Resources,~~ Greenhouse Gas, ~~Hazards and Hazardous Materials,~~ Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems.

Alternative 1, build-out of the site under the existing General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan designation would generate fewer vehicle trips, and would reduce Transportation and Traffic impacts at the Hollister Avenue/Storke Road intersection, and would reduce related air quality and greenhouse gas emissions. Operational noise impacts would also be reduced under Alternative 1. However, impacts to water service, wastewater service, and solid waste generation (significant unavoidable) would be increased.

Alternative 2 (Commercial Redesign ~~Commercial~~ Component) would significantly reduce the aesthetic impacts in regards to views from Hollister Avenue. ~~and remove commercial structural development from the 2mG EMF contour; however~~However, other impacts would remain ~~predominantly~~ mainly unchanged. Also, there may be unforeseen economic consequences of Alternative 2 if the changes to the design would limit the accessibility or marketing model of the shopping center making it unfeasible; and therefore, may not meet the project objectives. If it is determined that Alternative 2 is able to meet project objectives, a hybrid Alternative 2-Alternative 3 could also be considered. A Hybrid Alternative 2/3 would redesign the residential and commercial components as described in the above text. Essentially this Hybrid Alternative 2/3 would reorient the commercial buildings on the outparcels fronting Hollister Avenue, pushing them further back into the project site, and it would ~~reorient~~ reduce the scale of the residential buildings to ~~conserve the historic resource~~ reduce air emissions, solid waste, noise, and traffic~~, and collectively Hybrid Alternative 2/3 would pull all habitable structural components out of the EMF contour of concern~~. This Hybrid Alternative has the potential to result in the fewest total impacts, fewest significant and unavoidable impacts and the largest reduction in significance of impacts but may result in an unforeseen economic consequence.

~~[8] 397,963 sq. ft. residential development x 4.38 pounds/sq. ft. x 50% recycled x 0.0005 tons/pound = 436 tons.~~
~~[9] 710 residential units x 0.95 tons/unit/year x 50% recycling = 337 tons/year.~~