

## 7. *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*

---

### 7.1 INTRODUCTION

#### 7.1.1 Purpose and Scope

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an EIR include a discussion of reasonable project alternatives that would “feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6). This chapter identifies potential alternatives to the Proposed Project and evaluates them, as required by CEQA.

Key provisions of the CEQA Guidelines on alternatives (Section 15126.6(a) through (f)) are summarized below to explain the foundation and legal requirements for the alternatives analysis in the EIR.

- *The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly” (15126.6(b)).*
- *“The specific alternative of ‘no project’ shall also be evaluated along with its impact” 15126.6(e)(1). “The no project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation is published, and at the time the environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. If the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives” (15126.6(e)(2)).*
- *“The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a ‘rule of reason’ that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project” (15126.6(f)).*
- *“Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent)” (15126.6(f)(1)).*
- *For alternative locations, “only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR” (15126.6(f)(2)(A)).*
- *“An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative” (15126.6(f)(3)).*

For each alternative, this analysis:

- Describes the alternative.**
- Analyzes the impact of the alternative as compared to the Proposed Project.**
- Identifies the impacts of the project which would be avoided or lessened by the alternative.**



## 7. *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*

---

iv. **Assesses whether the alternative would meet most of the basic project objectives.**

v. **Evaluates the comparative merits of the alternative and the project.**

Per the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), additional significant effects of the alternatives are discussed in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.

### **7.1.2 Project Objectives**

As described in Section 3.2, the following objectives have been established for the Proposed Project and will aid decision makers in the review of the project and associated environmental impacts:

- Provide for the development of the Project Area in accordance with City's General Plan and The Platinum Triangle Master Land Use Plan.
- Provide for a wide range of housing opportunities in close proximity to jobs and a regional transportation center, consistent with regional growth management policies.
- Provide a mix of quality, high-density urban housing that is integrated into the area through carefully maintained pedestrian streets, transit connections, and arterial access.
- Provide for additional commercial uses in close proximity to existing and future residential development.
- Provide appropriate infrastructure to serve the level of development envisioned by The Platinum Triangle Master Land Use Plan.
- Encourage extensive office development along the highly visible periphery of the area to provide a quality employment center.
- Identify and pursue opportunities for open space areas that serve the recreational needs of The Platinum Triangle residents and employees.

### **7.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED DURING THE SCOPING/PROJECT PLANNING PROCESS**

The following is a discussion of the alternatives considered during the scoping and planning process and the reasons why they were not selected for detailed analysis in this EIR. The feasibility of developing the project on an alternative site was the only alternative reviewed and rejected during the scoping/project planning process.

#### **7.2.1 Alternative Sites**

CEQA requires that the discussion of alternatives focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project. The key question and first step in the analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR. (Guidelines Sec. 15126(5)(B)(1)) In general, any development of the size and type proposed by the project would have substantially the same impacts on aesthetics, air quality, land use/planning, noise, population/ housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic and utilities/service systems. Without a site specific analysis,

## 7. *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*

---

impacts on aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality and mineral resources cannot be evaluated.

Where a previous document has sufficiently analyzed a range of reasonable alternative locations and environmental impacts for projects with the same basic purpose, the lead agency should review the previous document. The EIR may rely on the previous document to help it assess the feasibility of potential project alternatives to the extent the circumstances remain substantially the same as they relate to the alternative. (Guidelines Sec. 15126(5)(B)(3))

On May 25, 2004, the Anaheim City Council adopted the General Plan and Zoning Code Update for the City of Anaheim. Through this comprehensive General Plan Update, the City reduced allowable densities in the Hill and Canyon Area of the City which contained significant biological resources, and created a mixed use overlay zone in The Platinum Triangle, which allows the introduction of residential units in this area through redevelopment of this predominantly industrial area. Therefore, through preparation of the General Plan, the City identified the most environmentally sensitive areas for permanent protection as open space. Less environmentally sensitive areas were designated for development. As a result, the Project Area is designated for a mix of residential, office, and commercial uses in accordance with the City's General Plan.

As the California Supreme Court indicated in its decisions in *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors*, 52 Cal. 3d 553 (1990):

*The general plan has been aptly described as the "constitution for all future developments" within the city or county... "The propriety of virtually any local decision affecting land use and development depends upon consistency with the applicable general plan and its elements."... To be sure, the general plan is not immutable, far from it. But it may not be trifled with lightly, as the limitation on the number of amendments to the general plan in any calendar year attests." (Goleta, at 570-571)*

*...in some circumstances, an EIR may consider alternatives requiring a site-specific amendment of the general plan. However, an EIR is not ordinarily an occasion for the reconsideration or overhaul of fundamental land use policy. (Goleta, at 573)*

Consistent with the Supreme Court's interpretation of the role of the General Plan in framing CEQA alternatives analysis, and in consideration of the General Plan Update, no alternative sites within the jurisdiction of the City are considered to be feasible alternatives to the Proposed Project, since they would not reduce the environmental impacts associated with the project. In addition, the mixed use opportunities within The Platinum Triangle are directly related to its location adjacent to major transportation facilities and activity centers, including the SR-57 and I-5 Freeways, Angel Stadium of Anaheim, and Arrowhead Pond of Anaheim. Therefore, there are no available alternative sites which could accommodate the Proposed Project.

### **7.2.2 Modified PTMU Overlay Zone**

During the NOP comment period, Lennar requested that the PTMU Overlay Zone boundary be expanded to include the Betmor site, located just east of the existing boundary within the Katella District. This request is currently being reviewed as a separate action and is therefore not included in this EIR or alternatives analysis.



## 7. *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*

### 7.3 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

Based on the criteria listed above, the following three alternatives have been determined to represent a reasonable range of alternatives which have the potential to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but which may avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. These alternatives are analyzed in detail below:

1. No-Project/Existing MLUP Alternative
2. Reduced Intensity Alternative
3. Increased Residential Intensity Alternative

Table 7-1 provides a summary of the relative impacts and feasibility of each alternative. A complete discussion of each alternative is provided below.

**Table 7-1  
Summary of Development Alternatives**

<i>Alternative</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Basis for Selection and Summary of Analysis</i>
<b>PROPOSED PROJECT</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9,500 units</li> <li>• 3,265,000 square feet of office</li> <li>• 2,254,400 square feet of commercial</li> </ul>	
<b>PROJECT ALTERNATIVES</b>		
(1) No Project/Existing MLUP Alternative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing general plan and zoning designations would remain</li> <li>• 9,175 units</li> <li>• 3,265,000 square feet of office</li> <li>• 2,044,300 square feet of commercial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Required by CEQA</li> <li>• Avoids need for general plan amendment and zone change</li> <li>• Does not avoid significant environmental impacts</li> <li>• Meets all of the project objectives but not to the degree of the Proposed Project.</li> </ul>
(2) Reduced Density Alternative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduces residential units by 20%</li> <li>• 7,600 units</li> <li>• 2,612,000 square feet of office</li> <li>• 1,803,520 square feet of commercial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May lessen some impacts</li> <li>• Does not avoid significant environmental impacts</li> <li>• Meets most of the project objectives but not to the degree of the Proposed Project</li> </ul>
(3) Increased Residential Intensity Alternative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Converts some office uses to residential intensity</li> <li>• Commercial square footage would remain</li> <li>• 15,000 residential units</li> <li>• 2,265,000 square feet of office</li> <li>• 1,873,400 square feet of commercial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not avoid significant environmental impacts</li> <li>• Meets most of the project objectives but not to the degree of the Proposed Project.</li> </ul>

## 7. *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*

---

### **7.3.1 No-Project/Existing MLUP Alternative**

This alternative, which is also required by CEQA, assumes that the Adopted Platinum Triangle Master Land Use Plan would remain unchanged. The 3.21-acre North Net Fire Training Center would retain its current designation of Office-High instead of the proposed Mixed-Use land use designation. This alternative would also preclude the proposed General Plan Amendment to provide for an additional 325 dwelling units and up to 210,100 square feet of additional commercial square footage in The Platinum Triangle Mixed-Use land use designation. As a result, the No-Project/Existing MLUP Alternative assumes a total of 9,175 dwelling units and a maximum overall commercial density of 2,044,300 square feet. The impacts of the No-Project/Existing MLUP Alternative as compared to those of the Proposed Project are discussed below:

#### **Aesthetics**

Under this alternative, the aesthetic impacts would be similar to the Proposed Project. All development within the Project Area would be guided by extensive design guidelines to provide a comprehensive and visually attractive urban environment. An addition of 321 units at the Fire Training Site does not significantly alter the overall density of the Project Area. Moreover, since the development area would remain the same, light and glare impacts would be comparable to the Proposed Project. Construction activities would be staged over approximately 20 years and only short-term views would be impacted during construction. No unavoidable and adverse impacts have been identified by the Proposed Project and this alternative would result in relatively similar impacts as the Proposed Project.

#### **Air Quality**

Implementation of this alternative would result in air quality impacts less than, but similar to those associated with the Proposed Project. As with the Proposed Project, short-term construction impacts and long-term operational emissions associated with the project are anticipated to occur. However, both the Proposed Project and this alternative would be consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan. Mitigation measures similar to the Proposed Project would be implemented under this alternative. While the emissions would slightly decrease under this alternative, significant unavoidable air quality impact would occur under this alternative as well as the Proposed Project.



#### **Geology/Soils**

Since the development area would remain the same, soils and geology impacts would be equivalent to those identified for the Proposed Project, including seismic activity, soil erosion, and soil conditions. The same existing regulations and mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Project would be applicable to this alternative.

#### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Since the Project Area would remain the same under this alternative, hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be equivalent to those associated with the proposed project. The proposed project would not introduce inherently more hazardous land uses within the Project Area or locate residential uses in closer proximity to hazardous materials release sites when compared to the reduced intensity alternative. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would be included in this alternative, thus ensuring that the impacts would be less than significant.

#### **Hydrology/Water Quality**

The Project Area and the amount of impervious surfaces would remain the same. Implementation of this alternative as well as the proposed project would result in the redevelopment of existing industrial land uses.

## 7. *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*

---

Since the Project Area is primarily developed already, project implementation will not result in substantial increases in the amount of impervious surfaces, and is not expected to result in a significant increase in water quality impacts. Therefore, runoff volumes would be generally the same as compared to the proposed project.

### **Land Use**

This alternative would not require any General Plan or Zoning Code Amendments. Therefore, the impacts would be less than the proposed project.

### **Noise**

Under this alternative, noise from vehicle trips would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project. The reduction in the intensity of traffic generating and uses would and incrementally reduce project related traffic, and the associated traffic noise. However, as with the proposed project, long-term noise levels would not be significant. Mitigation measures similar to the proposed project would be applied to ensure short-term construction impacts remain less than significant.

### **Population and Housing**

Under this alternative, a total of 9,175 dwelling units, 3,265,000 square feet of office use, 2,044,300 square feet of commercial uses, industrial square footage (up to 0.50 FAR), and institutional square footage (up to 3.0 FAR) would be constructed in the Project Area. The direct and indirect population growth resulting from this alternative would be comparable to the proposed project and both would result in the same jobs/housing ratio. As shown in Table 5.8-2, *Build-out Statistical Summary*, the No Project/Existing MLUP Alternative (i.e., Adopted General Plan) and the proposed project would provide development opportunities to match housing to job opportunities and the population and housing impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures have been identified in the proposed project and no mitigation measures would be necessary for this alternative.

### **Public Services**

Under the No Project/Existing MULP Alternative, the demand for public services would be less than the Proposed Project. However, all standard and additional mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Project would still be applicable under this alternative in order to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

### **Traffic and Circulation**

Under this alternative, the vehicle trips would be reduced by 9,932 trips and the traffic impacts would be less than the Proposed Project. However, all planned improvements and additional mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Project would still be applicable under this alternative in order to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

### **Utilities and Service Systems**

Under No Project/Existing MULP Alternative, the project's impact on utilities and service systems would be less than the Proposed Project. However, all planned improvement and mitigation measures identified under the Proposed Project would be required in order to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

## 7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

### Conclusion

#### **Avoid or Substantially Lessen Project Impacts**

This alternative would not avoid or substantially lessen any of the Proposed Projects impacts.

#### **Attainment of Project Objectives**

This alternative would meet all of the project objectives identified in Section 3.2, but not to the extent attained by the implementation of the Proposed Project.

#### **Comparative Merits**

This alternative would reduce impacts compared to the Proposed Project in the categories of air quality, land use, noise, public services, traffic and circulation, and utilities and service systems; and would have equivalent impacts in the categories of aesthetics, geology/soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, and population and housing. This alternative would also satisfy all of the project objectives. However, although this alternative would attain all of the project objectives to a certain degree it would not be to the extent which can be achieved by implementing the Proposed Project. This is especially the case considering that this project alternative would require relatively the same infrastructure improvements and other mitigation measures in order to reduce some of the potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

#### **7.3.2 Reduced Density Alternative**

This alternative would reduce overall residential intensity within the project by 20 percent. Implementation of this alternative would result in a total of 7,600 residential units, 2,612,000 square feet of office uses, and 1,803,520 square feet of commercial uses, as shown in Table 7-2. Other aspects of the Master Land Use Plan including Market Street, landscaping, and other improvements would remain similar to the Proposed Project. The intent of this alternative is to reduce the impacts associated with implementation of The Platinum Triangle Master Land Use Plan while achieving the goals and objectives established in the City's General Plan.



**Table 7-2  
Reduced Intensity Alternative  
Development Intensities\***

<b>District</b>	<b>Housing Units</b>	<b>Office Square Feet</b>	<b>Commercial Square Feet</b>
Stadium	1,400	1,408,000	1,040,000
Arena	340	80,000	80,000
Katella	3,400	620,000	504,240
Gene Autry	800	80,000	139,280
Gateway	1,660	424,000	40,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,600</b>	<b>2,612,000</b>	<b>1,803,520</b>

The impacts of the Reduced Density Alternative as compared to the Proposed Project are discussed below:

## 7. *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*

---

### **Aesthetics**

Under this alternative, the aesthetic impacts would be less than the Proposed Project. While implementation of this alternative would involve the development of uses similar to that of the Proposed Project, the overall decrease in development intensity would potentially result in slightly less impacts from shade, shadow, and illumination. However, all development would be guided by extensive design standards to provide a comprehensive and visually attractive urban environment throughout the Project Area. It is anticipated that as implementation of the master land use plan occurs over an extended period of time, various urban design attributes incorporated in the master land use plan would ensure that individual projects are designed to enhance the overall visual quality. While short-term construction impacts would occur under this alternative, such impacts would be considered less than significant.

### **Air Quality**

The Reduced Density Alternative would reduce local air quality impacts by approximately 20 percent since the traffic would be reduced by approximately 20 percent. This Alternative would reduce the projected exceedance of the SCAQMD Threshold Criteria for project generated CO, ROG, NOX, and PM10 emissions. It should be noted, however, that any reductions to air pollutant emissions from a reduction in vehicle trips from residential units would be specific to the Project Area, and not necessarily a regional reduction. Regionally, implementation of this alternative would result in air quality impacts slightly greater than the Proposed Project, because of the unique mixed use nature of The Platinum Triangle that integrates pedestrian oriented development and an intermodal transportation system to reduce reliance on traditional automobiles, thereby having the effect of reducing auto-related emissions. As with the Proposed Project, short-term construction impacts from ROG and NOx are anticipated. Both the Proposed Project and this alternative would be consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan. Mitigation measures similar to the Proposed Project would be implemented under this alternative. The Reduced Density Alternative would have less air quality impacts locally and slightly greater air quality impacts regionally compared with the Proposed Project. Significant unavoidable air quality impacts would occur under this alternative as well as with the Proposed Project.

### **Geology and Soils**

Since the Project Area would remain the same, soils and geology impacts would be equivalent to those identified for the Proposed Project, including seismic activity, soil erosion, and soil conditions. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would have the equivalent impacts as the Proposed Project and the same existing regulations and mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Project would be applicable to this alternative.

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Since the Project Area would remain the same under this alternative, hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be equivalent to those associated with the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would not introduce inherently more hazardous land uses within the Project Area or locate residential uses in closer proximity to hazardous materials release sites compared to the reduced residential intensity alternative. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Project would be applicable under this alternative to ensure less than significant impacts.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

The Project Area and the amount of impervious surfaces would remain the same. Implementation of this alternative as well as the Proposed Project would result in the redevelopment of existing industrial land uses. Since the Project Area is primarily developed already, project implementation will not result in substantial increases in the amount of impervious surface, and is not expected to result in a significant increase in water

## 7. *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*

---

quality impacts. Therefore, runoff volumes would be generally the same as compared to the Proposed Project.

### **Land Use**

This alternative would require a General Plan and Zoning Code amendment to reduce the allowable intensities within the PTMU Overlay Zone. However, the impacts would be less than the Proposed Project due to the reduction in density and the reduced potential for land use conflicts.

### **Noise**

Under this alternative, noise from vehicle trips would be reduced in comparison to the Proposed Project. The reduction in the intensity of traffic generating land uses would incrementally reduce project related traffic, and the associated traffic noise. However, as with the Proposed Project, long-term noise levels would not be significant. Mitigation measures similar to the Proposed Project would be applied to ensure short-term construction impacts remain less than significant.

### **Population and Housing**

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the direct and indirect population growth impacts would be reduced by approximately 20 percent. However, the jobs/housing ratio would stay the same as the Proposed Project. No mitigation measures have been identified in the Proposed Project and no mitigation measures would be necessary for this alternative.

### **Public Services**

The demand for public services generated at the project site would be reduced by approximately 20 percent, including the project's impact on police, fire, schools, and libraries. However, all standard and additional mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Project would still be applicable under this alternative in order to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

### **Transportation/Traffic**

The Reduced Density Alternative would reduce project-generated ADT by approximately 20 percent (approximately 215,902 trips per day). As a result, this alternative would generate slightly fewer vehicle trips and would have fewer traffic-related impacts than the Proposed Project. However, all planned improvement and additional mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Project would still be applicable under this alternative in order to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

### **Utilities and Service Systems**

Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the project's impact on sewer, water, electricity, natural gas, and solid waste would be reduced by approximately 20 percent. However, all planned improvement and mitigation measures identified under the Proposed Project would be required in order to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

### **Conclusion**

#### ***Avoid or Substantially Lessen Project Impacts***

This alternative would lessen impacts associated with air quality, noise, public services, transportation/traffic, and utilities/service systems by approximately 20 percent.



## 7. *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*

---

### **Attainment of Project Objectives**

This alternative would meet most of the project objectives as described in Section 3.2.

### **Comparative Merits**

This alternative would reduce impacts compared to the Proposed Project in the categories of aesthetics, air quality, land use, noise, public services, traffic and circulation, and utilities and service systems; and would have equivalent impacts in the categories of geology/soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, and population and housing. This alternative would satisfy most of the project objectives, but not to the extent of which can be achieved by implementing the Proposed Project. This is especially the case considering that this project alternative would require relatively the same infrastructure improvement and other mitigation measures in order to reduce some of the potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

### **7.3.3 Increased Residential Intensity Alternative**

The Increased Residential Intensity Alternative would include 15,000 residential units, but would reduce office square footage by approximately 1 million square feet and commercial square footage by 381,000 square feet. The resulting intensities would maintain overall traffic volumes at the same level as with the Proposed Project. This alternative would increase residential development by 5,500 units, although the proposed land use designations and boundaries would remain unchanged. However, increased residential development could require increases in parkland dedication and increased school demands. This alternative is not currently allowed by the General Plan, the adopted Master Land Use Plan or the PTMU Overlay Zone, and would require amendments to said documents.

### **Aesthetics**

While implementation of this alternative would involve the development of uses similar to that of the Proposed Project, the substantial increase in land use intensity would potentially result in greater impacts resulting from shade, shadow, and illumination. However, enhancements to the aesthetic character of the Project Area, such as the comprehensive landscaping scheme included as part of the Proposed Project, would also occur under this alternative. As with the Proposed Project, short-term views would be impacted during construction, though these activities will be staged over approximately 20 years and would not result in significant effects.

### **Air Quality**

This alternative would result in similar short-term construction impacts since the increased residential construction would be offset by reduced office and commercial square footage. Similar to the Proposed Project, significant unavoidable impacts would occur. Significant, unavoidable long-term regional air quality impacts are anticipated to be similar under this alternative, since overall traffic volumes would remain the same as with the Proposed Project. As with the Proposed Project, significant unavoidable impacts would occur.

### **Geology and Soils**

Impacts associated with geology and soils would be comparable to those identified for the Proposed Project, including groundshaking and seismic activity. As with the Proposed Project, no significant impacts on earth resources are expected. However, mitigation measures comparable to those recommended for the Proposed Project would be incorporated into this alternative to minimize any impacts that might occur.

## 7. *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*

---

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Impacts would be equivalent to those associated with the Proposed Project regardless of the density and/or intensity of development activity, because the study area for hazardous materials is the same in which a search was conducted for potential and/or known hazardous contamination sites within a quarter-mile radius of the project. No hazardous substances or petroleum products have been discovered at the site or in the surrounding vicinity that would present a material risk to human health or the environment at the site. Therefore, this alternative would not result in a reduction in potential impacts associated with environmental hazards as compared to the Proposed Project. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified for the Proposed Project would be included in this alternative.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

The Project Area is already developed with urban uses. Boundaries of the project would not change under this alternative. Therefore, implementation of this alternative would have impacts similar to those identified for the Proposed Project. Although no significant hydrology and water quality impacts are expected, mitigation measures similar to those identified for the Proposed Project would be incorporated into this alternative to minimize any impacts that may occur.

### **Land Use**

The Platinum Triangle MLUP is an approved document that implements the City's General Plan. The Increased Residential Intensity Alternative would require amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code, and The Platinum Triangle MULP. This alternative would be consistent with most of the relevant General Plan policies as the Proposed Project. However, while 321 units of the total 325 units to be added by the Proposed Project would be constructed on the Fire Training Site in the PTMU Overlay Zone Gateway District, an increase of 5,500 dwelling units and corresponding decrease in office square footage would likely require additional amendment actions to accommodate this substantial increase. Furthermore, increased residential development could require increases in parkland dedication and increased school demands. Implementation of this alternative would result in impacts greater than those anticipated from the Proposed Project, but is not expected to result in a significant impact.



### **Noise**

Short-term construction impacts would be similar to the Proposed Project. Implementation of the mitigation measures would ensure that these impacts are less than significant. Long-term traffic noise under this alternative would be similar to the Proposed Project due to the similar increases in ADT.

### **Population and Housing**

Construction of additional housing and less office square footage would result in a decrease in jobs to housing ratio. This alternative would provide substantially more housing units than the Proposed Project, thus resulting in greater direct and indirect growth impacts in the area.

### **Public Services**

Under the Increased Residential Intensity Alternative, the demand for public services generated at the project site would be increased, including the project's impact on schools, police, fire, and libraries. Additional mitigation measures may be required to accommodate the increased demand.

## 7. *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*

---

### **Transportation/Traffic**

The Increased Residential Intensity Alternative would generate the same traffic levels as the Proposed Project. Therefore, transportation/traffic impacts would remain the same.

### **Utilities and Service Systems**

Under the Increased Residential Intensity Alternative, the project's impact on sewer, water, electricity, natural gas, and solid waste would be increased. Additional mitigation measures may be required to those of the Proposed Project resulting in reduced for public services which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

### **Conclusion**

#### ***Avoid or Substantially Lessen Project Impacts***

This alternative would slightly increase impacts associated with public services and utilities/service systems. The primary advantage of this alternative would be to benefit housing availability.

#### ***Attainment of Project Objectives***

This alternative would meet most of the project objectives as described in Section 3.2.

#### ***Comparative Merits***

This alternative would not reduce any impacts associated with the Proposed Project. It would increase the level of impacts on categories including aesthetics, land use/planning, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems. Therefore, the Increased Residential Intensity Alternative is inferior to the Proposed Project.

### **7.4 ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY COMPARISON**

CEQA requires that the analysis of project alternatives include a comparison of the Proposed Project and the alternatives. The following section includes an analysis of the comparative merits of the Proposed Project and each alternative. Table 7-2 provides an analysis of each of the three alternatives in relation to the project objectives. Table 7-3 provides a summary of the comparative impacts of each alternative in relation to the Proposed Project.

### **7.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

CEQA requires a lead agency to identify the "environmentally superior alternative" and, in cases where the "No-Project" Alternative is environmentally superior to the Proposed Project, the environmentally superior development alternative must be identified. Three alternatives have been identified as "environmentally superior" to the Proposed Project:

1. No-Project/Existing Master Land Use Plan (MULP) Alternative
2. Reduced Density Alternative
3. Increased Residential Intensity Alternative

## 7. *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*

---

The Reduced Density Alternative has the least impact to the environment because it would reduce impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, land use, noise, public services, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems by approximately 20 percent. While the No Project/Existing MUDP Alternative would also reduce impacts in all of these categories, levels reduced would be less than the Reduced Density Alternative. The Reduced Density Alternative would have impacts similar to the Proposed Project with respect to geology/soils, hazards and hazardous materials, and hydrology.

The Reduced Density Alternative, while having the least amount of environmental impacts, is not capable of eliminating any significant adverse effects associated with the development nor will it reduce the level of significance of any of the identified environmental impacts without incorporating the equivalent mitigation measures that are proposed as part of the Proposed Project. Reducing the project density by 20 percent would not result in avoidance of significant environmental impacts. While meeting most of the project objectives, degrees attained by the Reduced Density Alternative would not match to the extent possible by the Proposed Project. For example, the Reduced Density Alternative would meet the project objective to provide for a wide-range of housing opportunities in close proximity to regional transportation centers consistent with regional growth management policies, however, the benefit of providing such housing and employment opportunities afforded by this alternative would be lessened by approximately 20 percent. Reducing the project density by 20 percent would not be the best possible utilization of the Project Area.

The No Project/Existing MUDP Alternative has been identified as environmentally superior alternative with regard to air quality, land use/planning, noise, public services, traffic circulation and utilities and service systems. However, air quality impacts would remain a significant unavoidable adverse impact. Other impacts, including aesthetics, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, and recreation, would remain the same as the Proposed Project.

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." [Guidelines Sec. 15126.6(c)] These are factors which will be considered by the City of Anaheim decision-makers in determining whether to approve the Proposed Project or one of the alternatives identified above.



## 7. *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*

---

*This page intentionally left blank.*