

Overview and Approach to Analysis

As required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, this chapter evaluates the impacts of a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, including a no-project option. EIRs need not evaluate every conceivable alternative or infeasible alternative, but must instead consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that enhance informed decision-making and public participation.

The lead agency must disclose its reasoning in selecting alternatives, and disclose why other alternatives, considered during preliminary public consultation (scoping), were rejected.

The level of analysis of alternatives should provide enough information to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. Based on the comparative analysis, EIRs are required to identify the “environmentally superior” alternative among these alternatives. Among the alternatives to be addressed, CEQA also requires that an EIR evaluate a no-project alternative, to “allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the project” (Guidelines, Section 15126.6[e][1]). Although the no-project alternative may be identified as the environmentally superior alternative, the State CEQA Guidelines require identification of the environmentally superior alternative among the build alternatives as well.

This chapter first discusses the reasons certain alternatives suggested during the public scoping process were rejected and why specific alternatives for detailed analysis were selected. This discussion is followed by a comparative analysis of the No-Project, Primarily Residential Mixed-Use, Primarily Office Mixed-Use, and Lower Height and Mass Alternatives, including identification of the environmentally superior alternative. The methodology and procedures used to address the transportation and traffic impacts of the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative was followed to the same level of detail as considered for the proposed project (see Appendix C1, Transportation and Traffic: Alternative Analysis).

Selection of Alternatives and Alternatives Considered but Rejected

During the public scoping process, which included a public meeting, notification of adjacent property owners and neighborhood organizations within 300 feet of the project site, and circulation of the NOP, a number of alternatives to the project were suggested for consideration. Representatives of the JLNA submitted public comments suggesting that the EIR analyze the following three specific alternatives:

- A commercial building (office and ground-floor retail) with a FAR of 7:1 that includes a freestanding parking garage at another location in the Jack London Square District constructed with funding from the City of Oakland, the Port of Oakland, and the Project Applicant.
- A smaller commercial building (commercial and ground-floor retail, dining or entertainment) with onsite parking that does not exceed a FAR of 7:1 when FAR is calculated to include gsf of parking.
- A smaller, historic integrity alternative that preserves the historic integrity of the produce district and other nearby historic properties on Broadway.

As required by CEQA, the alternatives that are fully evaluated must be consistent with the basic project objectives, be generally feasible, and be able to avoid or lessen significant environmental impacts. As stated in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” the project’s primary objective is to construct a high-density, transit-oriented, urban infill, mixed-use residential and commercial development in the Estuary Plan district of Oakland. The secondary objectives of the project are to:

- expand residential opportunities and enhance the attractiveness of the lower Broadway area as a desirable place to live;
- provide for a broad mixture of activities within the Estuary area;
- reinforce RD&E uses along the waterfront, and extend these uses along Broadway to create a regional entertainment destination;
- develop the Estuary area in a way that enhances the City’s long-term economic development;
- create greater land use continuity and more consistent scale and form along the Broadway corridor above and below I-880;
- encourage the use of upper building levels throughout the entire day and evening to stimulate the surrounding commercial area;
- recognize, acknowledge, and preserve the historical importance of the produce district and encourage activities that create a viable urban mixed-use district surrounding this area; and

- create for-sale residential opportunities in the lower Broadway area in a manner consistent with the General Plan's goals and objectives, including the creation of a 24-hour community.

Drawing on the project objectives, the conceptual alternatives suggested during the public comment period are discussed below, and reasons for rejecting them from further analysis are provided.

Commercial Building with Off-Site Parking Structure

This alternative would result in a slighter shorter building (about 2 stories shorter) because construction of a new parking structure on an as-yet-unidentified site would occur thereby reducing the amount of parking, and the height, to be built on the project site. The project would not include residential development, but rather would be an office building with ground-floor retail along Broadway. The alternative does not meet several of the basic project objectives: to “create a transit-oriented” and “mixed-use commercial and residential” project. Construction of an off-site parking structure may have been suggested to reduce the total height and bulk of the building and to provide the fully anticipated demand for parking resulting from the project. The provision of onsite parking adds less than two stories to the height of the building. An analysis of a shorter building is presented in the analysis of the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative. The City has a “transit first” policy that emphasizes the use of transit in lieu of developing parking to meet all identified demand. In addition, the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative reduces the parking impacts to less-than-significant levels. Because the height of the building plus parking garage is addressed under the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative, the City has a “transit first” policy, and the alternative does not meet the objective of providing high-quality housing, then consideration of this alternative would not meet the primary objectives of the project or reduce identified significant impacts (i.e., it would relocate the impacts to a new location). Moreover, if the same size parking garage was built off-site, this alternative's impacts on traffic would be the same as the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative. Office parking demand is greater than residential parking demand.

Development of an off-site parking structure would likely result in separate impacts.

In addition, there is no readily available building or site for the parking structure within a reasonable walking distance from project site. Moreover, possible parking sites southeast of the project site contain several older buildings and their demolition would be likely to have adverse effects on the culturally significant produce district. Finally, such a site is not under the control of the project applicant. Thus, this alternative has been rejected from further analysis.

Smaller Commercial Building with Onsite Parking Included in FAR

This alternative would result in a shorter building (about 4 stories shorter) containing about 120,000 sf of commercial development, 125,000 sf of parking structure and no residential development. The alternative may have been suggested to reduce the overall height and bulk of the building, provide entertainment uses, and meet the estimated demand for parking. The public comment requested that this alternative include the area of the parking structure within the FAR calculation. By doing so, the project would contain less gross habitable floor area. The FAR for the project site (7:1) allows a total of 245,000 gsf, excluding parking; under this scenario, parking would consume about 125,000 gsf, and about 120,000 gsf would be available for commercial development.

The EIR evaluates a Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative, which includes a total of 210,750 gsf of office use, 8,000 gsf of street-level retail, and 315 onsite parking spaces. The lot area for the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative (31,250 sf) is slightly smaller than for the site of the proposed project because the existing building at 200 Broadway would not be included in the project site for this alternative. The Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative, however, does not include the area of the parking structure in calculating the FAR because the City's zoning ordinance does not include parking within the definition of floor area (Zoning Code Section 17.09.040). The Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative reduces the parking impacts by providing a larger number of onsite parking. Thus, the alternative of a commercial building with onsite parking, included in the FAR, has been rejected from further analysis because it does not meet the basic project objectives of residential and mixed-use development; it is inconsistent with City policy regarding not including structured parking in the calculation of FAR; it only reduces one of the identified impacts of the proposed project (i.e., parking demands); and it is similar to the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative that is analyzed herein.

Smaller Historic Integrity Alternative

This alternative was suggested by JLNA in order to preserve the historic integrity of the produce district and the historic properties on lower Broadway. However, this EIR does not identify a significant impact related to historical resources, as described below. CEQA defines a substantial adverse change in the significance of a cultural resource as the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historic resource would be materially impaired. Actions that would materially impair the significance of an historic resource are any actions that would demolish or adversely alter those physical characteristics of an historic resource that convey its historical significance and qualify it for inclusion in the CRHR or in a local register or survey that meet the requirements of Sections 5020.1(k) and 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code.

The two buildings that exist on the project site, located at 200 Broadway and 228 Broadway, fall within the Lower Broadway District (ASI), and have been given ratings of D and C, respectively, by the City's CHS. These buildings are not considered historical resources for purposes of CEQA. Therefore, their demolition would not cause a significant impact on an historic resource.

Based on the thresholds for determining significant impacts to cultural resources established by the City and the State CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project would not cause the Produce District API to be disqualified for listing in the City's register, the NRHP or the CRHR. Therefore, the effects of the proposed construction adjacent to the API would be a less-than-significant impact because the API would not be disqualified for listing in the City's register, the NRHP or the CRHR. Therefore, the effects of the proposed construction adjacent to the Produce District API would be a less-than-significant impact. Thus, because there would be no significant impacts on these historic districts, this alternative, which does not meet the project objectives, does not need further analysis.

Impact Analysis of Project Alternatives

Four alternatives are analyzed in the following section: the No-Project, Primarily Office Mixed-Use, Primarily Residential Mixed-Use, and Lower Height and Mass Alternatives. These alternatives are described in detail following Tables 5-1, "Comparison of the Alternatives to the Proposed Project," and 5-2, "Impact Assessment for the Alternatives." These tables summarize the differences in potential impacts of the various alternatives compared to the proposed project and to the existing conditions. An impact that is greater than that under the proposed project is identified by a greater than symbol ">" while a lesser impact is indicated by a less than "<" symbol. Impacts that are the same as the proposed project are shown by the equal sign "=".

In Table 5-2, the alternatives are assessed using the same significance threshold as the proposed project, with resulting less-than-significant, significant and mitigated to less-than-significant, and significant and unavoidable impacts.

No-Project Alternative

The No-Project Alternative would entail no change at the project site. The proposed project would not be built. The two existing buildings and parking lot would remain. Current uses could continue indefinitely or other uses could be established at the site.

Impacts

If the No-Project Alternative were implemented, none of the potential impacts associated with the proposed project would occur. The existing buildings would not be demolished and the parking lot would not be removed. Ten existing trees would remain; excavation for the building would not occur; and the site would not be altered. The environmental characteristics of this alternative would be

generally as described in the environmental setting sections of Chapters 3A–3I. Land use, site views, and shadow and wind conditions would not change. Future transportation conditions described as baseline conditions with cumulative development would occur (see Chapter 3C), but without the additional traffic generated by the proposed project.

This alternative would not meet the project objectives. Under existing zoning, another development could be considered for this location in the future. As presently zoned (C-45/S-4) and with the EPP land-use classification of R&DE-2, the site could be developed to include 125 residential units per gross acre or with commercial uses for a maximum FAR of 7:1.

Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative

For the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative, the project would include a total of 210,750 gsf of office use and 8,000 gsf of street-level retail. In addition, a total of 315 onsite parking spaces are proposed in a building that would be 209 feet tall. The site area of the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative is slightly smaller than for the proposed project because the existing building at 200 Broadway is not included in the site of this alternative.

Impacts

The Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative was compared to the proposed project and to existing conditions in each of the impact categories identified in the EIR.

With regard to land use and planning issues, compatibility with existing uses was a significant identified impact for the project. The Primarily Office Mixed-Use alternative would have an increased significant effect on adjacent uses because the building would be taller, the office uses would not contribute to a vibrant 24-hour community, and the parking shortfall would be the largest resulting in increased congestion in the project vicinity. The degree of impact related to consistency with the General Plan and EPP would be slightly higher for the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative because single use office uses are not entirely consistent with those plans calling for a vibrant 24-hour community. This could be a potentially significant impact for this alternative.

Cultural resources impacts related to demolition of the existing buildings were identified as less than significant. These impacts would be less than the proposed project's impacts because one of the buildings would be retained. The project's less-than-significant impact on the produce district API would be the same as for Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative. Impacts on archaeology would be the same as for the proposed project because the building would require excavation.

The proposed project identifies a significant and unavoidable parking impact. The Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative would result in an even greater

significant and unavoidable impact because the parking shortfall would be 261 spaces (compared to the project's 114 spaces). Impacts related to construction traffic and parking would be similar to those impacts identified for the proposed project. Effects of the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative on BART and AC Transit would be less than significant because, like the proposed project, the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative would include a TDM program. With regard to traffic and circulation impacts, the significant and unavoidable impact identified for SR 260 would also occur during implementation of the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative. The less-than-significant impact identified for the proposed project related to congestion at Franklin and 2nd and 3rd Streets would be potentially significant for the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative as well because office uses generate more commute-hour traffic than do mixed uses and would therefore conflict more with existing produce district congestion. The Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative would have the same significant impact for 2005 conditions at Jackson and 5th Streets. The less-than-significant impact identified for the proposed project at Atlantic and Webster Streets in 2020 would be similar for the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative. A shortfall of bicycle parking is identified as significant for the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative as well as for the proposed project. Impacts to CMP-designated roadway segments and transit service would be less than significant for the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative and for the proposed project.

Police, fire, and water impacts are identified as less than significant for the project. These impacts would be similar for the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative since the size of the building would be similar, with resulting similar demands on police and fire services. In addition, water supply needs would not be that substantially greater for the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative. The less-than-significant impacts identified for schools and parks would be less for the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative because the primarily office uses would not result in demand for parks or generate increased school enrollments. Solid waste, wastewater, electricity, and natural gas impacts would be significant for the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative and the proposed project since both alternatives are development projects that would result in demand for solid waste disposal and energy, and both would generate wastewater.

Air quality impacts were generally identified as less than significant for the proposed project. The Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative would result in similar ROG, NO_x , and PM10 emissions; similar carbon-monoxide emissions at intersections; and similar generation of odors in structured parking garages. Thus, these less-than-significant impacts would be the same as identified for the proposed project. The construction dust impact identified for the proposed project would be similar for this primarily office alternative since the level of development is similar.

Effects of construction noise on the 200 Broadway restaurant would represent a new effect of retaining that building while the project is under construction. However, similar to the proposed project, implementation of noise-reducing measures would be applied with regard to 200 Broadway. Because construction effects would be temporary and mitigation measures imposed, these significant impacts from construction noise would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Effects on scenic vistas and resources would be less than significant for the project and would be substantially similar for the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative because the building envelope is substantially the same. Visual effects related to the massing of the building would be different and potentially less significant under the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative because the 200 Broadway building would be retained, thus providing visual relief on Broadway and 2nd Streets. The height difference of this alternative, about one floor taller than the proposed project, would not be a noticeable difference. Light and glare impacts would be the same as for the proposed project and could be addressed with the identified mitigation.

Shading effects from the proposed project were identified as less than significant. The primarily office alternative could result in a taller building and could generate longer shadows but not to a significant level. The Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative's impact would be slightly greater than the project's impact. Similar to shading effects, wind effects could be affected by the increased height of this building. However, the increased wind would not result in a significant impact, although the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative's impact would be slightly higher than the project.

Less-than-significant impacts were identified for hazards due to historic uses and emergency access during implementation of the project. These impacts would be the same for the Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative.

Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative

For the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative, the project would include a total of 120 residential condominiums (160,150 sf), 11,000 gsf of street-level retail, 229 onsite parking spaces (92,200 sf), of which 30 are tandem, within a building that would be 175 feet tall. The footprint for the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative is slightly smaller than that of the proposed project because the existing building at 200 Broadway is not included within the project site of this alternative. Figures 5-1 through 5-6 present the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative's site plan, section and elevations.

The project sponsor is giving serious consideration to the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative described and analyzed herein. The project sponsor has submitted an application for a Conditional Use Permit and Design Review that would allow either the mixed-use project, analyzed as the "project," or the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative. Therefore, this alternative has been reviewed and compared with existing conditions and the proposed project at a greater level of specificity than for the other alternatives.

Impacts

The Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative was compared to the proposed project and existing conditions in each of the impact categories identified in the EIR.

With regard to land use and planning issues, compatibility with existing uses was a potentially significant, but mitigable, identified impact for the proposed project. The Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative would have a similar significant effect on adjacent uses because although the building would be shorter and there would be a parking surplus of 70 spaces. The same potential conflicts between residential uses and the produce market may occur. In addition, while the plans for the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative do not currently reflect sufficient open space, as required by the City's open space requirements, the applicant has committed to providing sufficient open space during the design review process if this alternative is pursued further. Lastly, as currently configured, the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative seeks 120 residential units. This development scheme exceeds the maximum allowable number of units under the existing C-45/R-80 zoning by five and thus will require an Interim Conditional Use Permit.

Cultural resources impacts related to demolition of the existing buildings were identified as less than significant. These impacts would be less than the proposed project's impact because one of the buildings would be retained. The project's less-than-significant impact on the produce district API would be slightly less for Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative because the building would be shorter. Impacts on archaeology would be the same as for the proposed project because the excavation of the site would be needed to construct the building.

Transportation and circulation impacts were quantified for the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative (see discussion in Appendix C1). The proposed project identifies a significant and unavoidable parking impact; the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative would result in a benefit because there would be a parking surplus of 72 spaces (compared to the project's shortfall of 114 spaces). Impacts related to construction traffic and parking would be similar to those impacts identified for the proposed project. Effects of the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative on BART and AC Transit would be similar to the proposed project. With regard to traffic and circulation impacts, the significant and unavoidable impact identified for SR 260 would also occur with the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative. The less-than-significant impact identified for the proposed project related to congestion at Franklin and 2nd and 3rd Streets would be less than significant for the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative as well because residential uses generate less commute-hour traffic than do mixed uses or all-office uses and would therefore not conflict with existing produce district congestion. The Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative would have the same significant impact for 2005 conditions at Jackson and 5th Street. The less-than-significant impact identified for the proposed project at Atlantic and Webster in 2020 would be similar for the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative. A shortfall of bicycle parking is identified as significant for the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative, as

well as for the proposed project. Impacts to CMP-designated roadway segments and transit service would be less than significant for the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative and for the proposed project.

Police, fire, and water impacts are identified as less than significant for the project. These impacts would be similar for the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative since the size of the building would be similar (although this building would be one floor shorter), with resulting similar demands on police and fire services. In addition, water supply needs would be about the same for the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative. The less-than-significant impacts identified for schools and parks would be similar for the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative because, although the primarily residential uses would result in demand for parks and generate increased school enrollments, the same identified mitigation would apply. Solid waste, wastewater, electricity, and natural gas impacts would be significant for both the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative and the proposed project since both alternatives are development projects that would result in demand for solid-waste disposal and energy; and both would generate wastewater.

Air quality impacts were generally identified as less than significant for the proposed project. The Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative would result in slightly less ROG, NO_x , and PM10 emissions; slightly less carbon-monoxide emissions at intersections; and slightly less generation of odors in structured parking garages because there would be about 100,000 sf (or about 30%) less of developed space, and there would be fewer cars and less traffic. Thus, these less-than-significant impacts would be smaller than those identified for the proposed project. The construction dust impact identified for the proposed project would be similar for this primarily residential alternative since the level of development (greater than 100,000 gsf building) is similar.

Effects of construction noise on the 200 Broadway restaurant would represent a new effect of retaining that building while the project is under construction. However, similar to the proposed project, implementation of noise-reducing measures would be applied with regard to 200 Broadway. Because construction effects would be temporary and mitigation measures imposed, these significant impacts from construction noise would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Effects on scenic vistas and resources would be less than significant for the project and would be substantially similar for the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative because the building envelope is substantially the same (this alternative is one floor shorter). Visual effects related to the massing of the building would be different and potentially less significant under the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative because the 200 Broadway building would be retained, thus providing visual relief on Broadway and 2nd Street. The height difference of this alternative, about one floor shorter than the proposed project, would not be a noticeable difference. Light and glare impacts would be the same as for the proposed project and could be addressed with the identified mitigation.

Shading effects from the proposed project were identified as less than significant. This primarily residential alternative would result in a shorter building (about one

floor) and could generate shorter shadows; the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative's impact would be slightly less than the project's impact. Similar to shading effects, wind effects could be affected by the decreased height of this building. However, the decreased wind would not likely be noticeable.

Less-than-significant impacts were identified for hazards due to historic uses and emergency access during implementation of the project. These impacts would be the same for the Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative.

Lower Height and Mass Alternative

For the Lower Height and Mass Alternative, a building envelope that includes setbacks at the ground level from Broadway and 2nd Street, on the mezzanine level from 2nd and 3rd Street, on floors 3 through 5 from the entire building perimeter, and on floors 6 through 10 from Broadway and 2nd Street, and from the rest of the block. The entire building envelope is 155,980 gsf (a FAR of 4.8:1), with 30 residential units (33,000 gsf), 8,000 gsf of ground-floor retail, 80,000 gsf of office space, and 106 parking spaces (40,280 gsf) in a building that would be about 147 feet tall. The site area of the Lower Height and Mass Alternative is slightly smaller than for the proposed project because the existing building at 200 Broadway is not included in the project site of this alternative.

Impacts

The Lower Height and Mass Alternative was compared to the proposed project and existing conditions in each of the impact categories identified in the EIR.

With regard to land use and planning issues, compatibility with existing uses was a significant identified impact for the project. The Lower Height and Mass Alternative would have a less-than-significant effect on adjacent uses because the building would be shorter, there would not be a parking shortfall (supply would equal demand), and the employees and residents would contribute to a vibrant 24-hour community. This alternative would be consistent with the General Plan and EPP, although it would not reflect the intensity of uses called for in those plans (i.e., a FAR of 7:1).

Cultural resources impacts related to demolition of the existing buildings were identified as less than significant. These impacts would be less than the proposed project's impacts because one of the buildings would be retained. The project's less-than-significant impact on the produce district API would be less for the Lower Height and Mass Alternative because the building would be shorter and the project applicant would have more flexibility to alter the design. Impacts on archaeology would be the same as for the proposed project because the building would require excavation.

The proposed project identifies a significant and unavoidable parking impact; the Lower Height and Mass Alternative would result in a benefit because there

parking supply and demand would be in balance. Impacts related to construction traffic and parking would be similar to those impacts identified for the proposed project, although they would be of a shorter duration. Effects of the Lower Height and Mass Alternative on BART and AC Transit would be less than significant because there would be a balance of parking demand and supply, and thus residents and visitors would not increase loads on transit service substantially. With regard to traffic and circulation impacts, the significant and unavoidable impact identified for SR 260 would also occur during implementation of the Lower Height and Mass Alternative because any development would exacerbate the unacceptable conditions that exist at this location. The less-than-significant impact identified for the proposed project related to congestion at Franklin and 2nd and 3rd Streets would be less than significant for the Lower Height and Mass Alternative as well because mixed uses generate less commute-hour traffic than do all-office uses, and there would be fewer vehicles to conflict with existing produce district congestion. The Lower Height and Mass Alternative would likely have the same significant impact for 2005 conditions at Jackson and 5th Streets because any development on this project site would exacerbate already unacceptable conditions at this location. The less-than significant-impact identified for the proposed project at Atlantic and Webster Streets in 2020 would be similar for the Lower Height and Mass Alternative. A shortfall of bicycle parking would likely be less than significant for the Lower Height and Mass Alternative due to the reduced levels of residents and employees compared to the proposed project. Impacts to CMP-designated roadway segments and transit service would be less than significant for the Lower Height and Mass Alternative and for the proposed project.

Police, fire, and water impacts are identified as less than significant for the project. These impacts would be reduced for the Lower Height and Mass Alternative since the size of the building is smaller, with resulting smaller demands on police and fire services. In addition, water supply needs would be less for the Lower Height and Mass Alternative than for the proposed project. The less-than-significant impacts identified for schools and parks would be similar for the Lower Height and Mass Alternative because the mixed uses would result in some demand for parks and would generate increased school enrollments. Therefore, the same identified mitigation would apply. Solid waste, wastewater, electricity, and natural gas impacts would be significant for the Lower Height and Mass Alternative similar to the proposed project since both alternatives are development projects that would result in demand for solid waste disposal and energy; and both would generate wastewater.

Air quality impacts were generally identified as less than significant for the proposed project. The Lower Height and Mass Alternative would result in reduced ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions; reduced carbon-monoxide emissions at intersections; and reduced generation of odors in structured parking garages because there would be about 195,000 sf less (about 55%) of developed area, as well as fewer cars and less traffic. Thus, these less-than-significant impacts would be smaller than those identified for the proposed project. The construction dust impact identified for the proposed project would be similar for this Lower Height and Mass Alternative since the level of development (greater than 100,000 gsf building) is similar.

Effects of construction noise on the 200 Broadway restaurant would represent a new effect of retaining that building while the project is under construction. However, similar to the proposed project, implementation of noise-reducing measures would be applied with regard to 200 Broadway. Because construction effects would be temporary and mitigation measures imposed, these significant impacts from construction noise would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Effects on scenic vistas and resources would be less than significant for the project and would be substantially reduced for the Lower Height and Mass Alternative because the building envelope is substantially smaller (this alternative is about four floors shorter). Visual effects related to the massing of the building would be different and potentially less significant under the Lower Height and Mass Alternative because the 200 Broadway building would be retained, thus providing visual relief on Broadway and 2nd Street. The height difference of this alternative, about four floors shorter than the proposed project, would be noticeable particularly as the design of the building would include setbacks at Broadway, 2nd and 3rd Street as the height of the building increases. Light and glare impacts would be the same as for the proposed project and could be addressed with the identified mitigation. Visual effects related to the massing of the building would be different and less than significant under the Lower Height and Mass Alternative because the building would be stepped back from shading effects from the proposed project that were identified as less than significant. This alternative would result in a shorter building (about four floors) and would generate shorter shadows; the Lower Height and Mass Alternative's impact would be substantially less than the project. Similar to shading effects, less-than-significant wind effects could be affected by the decreased height of this building.

Less-than-significant impacts were identified for hazards due to historic uses and emergency access during implementation of the project. These impacts would be the same for the Lower Height and Mass Alternative.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

Based on the evaluation of the range of potential impacts summarized above, the Lower Height and Mass Alternative is the “environmentally superior alternative.” This alternative would result in a balance of parking demand and supply, a building of 147 feet (four stories less than the proposed project), 55% less development, and reduced impacts in most resource topics (e.g., those related to the intensity and scale of development). However, this alternative does not eliminate the following significant and unavoidable traffic impacts, which result irrespective of what is proposed for the project site:

- 3C-6: Unacceptable LOS along the SR 260 Corridor between the intersection of 7th and Harrison Streets and the 6th and Jackson northbound on-ramp to I-880; and

- 3C-7: Addition of project-related traffic to the projected 2005 baseline conditions at Jackson Street and 5th Streets, which could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels (with approval by Caltrans of traffic signal timing).

Alternatives Analysis.....1

 Overview and Approach to Analysis.....1

 Selection of Alternatives and Alternatives Considered
but Rejected2

 Commercial Building with Off-Site Parking Structure.....3

 Smaller Commercial Building with Onsite Parking
Included in FAR.....4

 Smaller Historic Integrity Alternative.....4

 Impact Analysis of Project Alternatives5

 No-Project Alternative5

 Primarily Office Mixed-Use Alternative6

 Primarily Residential Mixed-Use Alternative.....8

 Lower Height and Mass Alternative.....11

 Environmentally Superior Alternative.....13

Error! No table of contents entries found.

Acronyms
Error! No table of figures entries found.

Citations
Error! No table of figures entries found.

Figures
. Figures 5-1 through 5-6.....8

Tables
Tables 5-1, “Comparison of the Alternatives to the Proposed Project5

5-2, “Impact Assessment for the Alternatives5

Table 5-2.....5

Miscellaneous
Appendix C.....1