

CHAPTER 5

Alternatives

5.1 Criteria for Selecting Alternatives

CEQA requires that the EIR compare the effects of a “reasonable range of alternatives” to the effects of the Project. The alternatives selected for comparison should be potentially feasible, and avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant effects of the Project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6). The “range of alternatives” is governed by the “rule of reason” which requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit an informed and reasoned choice by the decision-making body and informed public participation (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f]). CEQA generally defines “feasible” to mean an alternative that is capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, technological, and legal factors.

5.2 Alternatives Selected for Consideration

Consistent with the selection criteria identified above, the City developed three CEQA alternatives. The following three CEQA alternatives are discussed and analyzed compared to the Project throughout Section 5.4 in this chapter:

- **Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative—No Macy’s:** Eliminates from the Project all development and redevelopment on Parcel 7A (Macy’s Women’s department store, the Goodyear tire store, and the Macy’s Garage, all owned by Macy’s West Stores, Inc).
- **Alternative 2: Reduced Development Alternative—96,000 square-foot Expansion:** Reduces the amount of demolition, development and redevelopment, and leaves Broadway Plaza street in its current configuration. This alternative would allow only commercial development and no residential development.
- **Alternative 3: No Project Alternative:** Assumes existing conditions plus 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.

The set of selected alternatives above are considered to reflect a “reasonable range” of feasible alternatives in that they include reduced scenarios that lessen and/or avoid significant and

unavoidable, as well as less-than-significant effects of the Project. The Project is specific to the location of Broadway Plaza, therefore this analysis does not consider an off-site alternative.

Table 5-1 below shows the proposed developed under each of the CEQA alternatives compared to the Project.

**TABLE 5-1
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED UNDER THE PROJECT AND CEQA ALTERNATIVES**

	Project		Alternative 1 – No Macy’s		Alternative 2 – 96,000 s.f. Expansion	Alternative 3 – No Project
	Maximum Commercial	Maximum Mixed-Use	Maximum Commercial	Maximum Mixed-Use		
Existing	796,421	796,421	796,421	796,421	796,421	796,421
Total Demolition	200,016	200,016	194,016	194,016	86,000	0
Net New Commercial	299,984	199,984	242,984	142,984	96,000	51,762
Residential (dwelling units)	0	200 units	0	200 units	0	0
Total Commercial Gross Square Footage	1,096,405	1,196,405	1,039,405	1,139,405	892,421	848,183
Total Residential Gross Square Footage	-	200,000	-	200,000	-	-

Table 5-2 presents the vehicle trip generation estimates for each CEQA alternative compared to the Project.

Tables comparing the development program of each alternative to the Project are presented with the detailed description of each alternative and the alternative analyses, in Section 5.4.

Additionally, the following two Non-CEQA Alternatives are discussed and analyzed compared to the Project in Subsection 5.4.4 in this chapter:

- Relocated Parking Alternative
- Extra Parking Alternative.

**TABLE 5-2
PROJECT ALTERNATIVES – TRIP GENERATION ESTIMATES**

Trip Generation Land Use Category	Amount		Source	Weekday	Trips Generated					
					AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
					In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Preferred Project & Relocated Parking Alternative										
<i>Maximum Commercial Scenario</i>										
Commercial (Shopping Center)	300	ksf	ITE (820)	9,100	110	70	180	437	455	893
<i>Maximum Mixed Use Scenario</i>										
Commercial (Shopping Center)	200	ksf	ITE (820)	6,067	73	47	120	292	304	595
Multi-Family Residential	200	du	ITE (220)	1,330	20	82	102	83	45	128
Total Project Trips				7,397	93	129	222	375	349	723
Internal Trips				-1,889	-7	-7	-14	-38	-38	-76
New External Trips				5,508	86	122	208	337	311	647
Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's										
<i>Maximum Commercial Scenario</i>										
Commercial (Shopping Center)	244	ksf	ITE (820)	7,401	89	57	146	356	370	726
<i>Maximum Mixed Use Scenario</i>										
Commercial (Shopping Center)	144	ksf	ITE (820)	4,368	53	34	86	210	219	429
Multi-Family Residential	200	du	ITE (220)	1,330	20	82	102	83	45	128
Total Project Trips				5,698	73	116	188	293	264	557
Internal Trips				-1,664	-5	-5	-10	-33	-33	-66
New External Trips				4,034	68	111	178	260	231	491
Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 square feet Expansion										
<i>Commercial Scenario</i>										
Commercial (Shopping Center)	96	ksf	ITE (820)	2,912	35	22	58	140	146	286
No Project Alternative										
<i>Commercial Scenario</i>										
Commercial (Shopping Center)	51.8	ksf	ITE (820)	1,570	19	12	31	75	79	154

SOURCE: Kittelson/Dowling Associates, 2012.

5.3 Significant Impacts

To determine alternatives that would avoid or lessen any of the identified significant environmental effects of the Project, the significant impacts must be considered. Impacts that are not mitigated to less-than-significant levels are considered “significant and unavoidable” (“SU”). The SU impacts identified for the Project are listed below.

Maximum Commercial Scenario

Significant and Potentially Unavoidable Air Quality Impact

- **Impact AIR-3:** The Project would expose persons to substantial levels of TACs, during short-term construction activities, which may lead to adverse health effects

Significant and Unavoidable Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change Impact

- **Impact GHG-1:** Construction and operation of the Project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution towards global climate change

Significant and Potentially Unavoidable Noise Impact

- **Impact NOI-2:** Traffic generated by the Project, in combination with traffic from past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future projects, *if constructed simultaneously with the Project*, could substantially increase traffic noise levels in the Project Area; and construction and operational noise levels in combination with traffic from past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could increase ambient noise levels

Significant and Unavoidable Noise Impact

- **Impact NOI-1:** Construction activities for the Project would expose people to a substantial increase in the ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project

Maximum Mixed-Use Scenario

Significant and Potentially Unavoidable Air Quality Impact

- **Impact AIR-3:** The Project would expose persons to substantial levels of TACs, during short-term construction activities, which may lead to adverse health effects

Significant and Unavoidable Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change Impact

- **Impact GHG-1:** Construction and operation of the Project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution towards global climate change

Significant and Potentially Unavoidable Noise Impact

- **Impact NOI-2:** Traffic generated by the Project, in combination with traffic from past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future projects, *if constructed simultaneously with the Project*, could substantially increase traffic noise levels in the Project Area; and construction and operational noise levels in combination with traffic from past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could increase ambient noise levels

Significant and Unavoidable Noise Impact

- **Impact NOI-1:** Construction activities for the Project would expose people to a substantial increase in the ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project

Table 5-18 at the end of this chapter compares all the impacts of the Project, including those that are potentially significant and reduced to less than significant with mitigation measures (thus not SU)—to each of the alternatives and indicates whether the impacts would have the same, lesser, or greater effect on the environment.

5.4 Alternatives Analysis

This section describes each alternative followed by a discussion of the impacts of the alternative compared to those identified with the Project. Impact comparisons to the Project’s SU impacts are highlighted in *bold italic* text for convenience.

The impacts associated with the Project and each alternative are for buildout conditions. Impacts are stated as levels of significance *after* implementation of mitigation measures identified in Chapter 4. As also discussed throughout Chapter 4 where applicable, the impact analysis presented in this chapter regarding the alternatives includes significance criteria that address non-CEQA issues – those that pertain to the potential effect of the existing environment on the Project. In such instances, “impacts” are regulatory issues, and “mitigation measures” is used to refer to recommended conditions of approval.

As permitted by CEQA, the effects of the alternatives are discussed in less detail than the impact discussions for the Project in Chapter 4 (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[d]). However, the alternatives analysis is conducted at a sufficient level of detail to provide the public, other public agencies, and City decision-makers adequate information to evaluate the alternatives and for the City to approve any of the alternatives without further environmental review.

5.4.1 Alternative 1: Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy’s

Description

This reduced development alternative would eliminate from the Project all development and redevelopment on Parcel 7A (Macy’s Women’s department store, the Goodyear Tire store, and the Macy’s Garage, all owned by Macy’s West Stores, Inc). This alternative would eliminate the 57,000 square-foot expansion of Macy’s, the demolition of the 6,000 square-foot Goodyear store, and the redevelopment of 6,000 square feet of replacement space. Garage D would not be built. The net new expansion space under this alternative would be reduced to approximately 243,000 square feet. This alternative would include vacation of a portion of Broadway Plaza street, and would provide the same flexibility in mixed uses as would the Project. This alternative, like the Project, would include cosmetic upgrades, internal tenant improvements and façade improvements in buildings that will not be demolished.

This alternative would also reduce the amount of demolition compared to the Project. The 6,000 square feet of commercial space that currently houses the Goodyear Tire store, and the portion of the Macy's garage that occupies Parcel 7A would not be demolished.

The construction schedule and activity (including excavation) is expected to be about the same as for the Project.

The General Plan Amendment to apply the MU-C land use designation to most of the Project site, increase the commercial FAR to 0.95, create and apply a new mixed use FAR of 1.05, the new mixed use PD zoning district that would allow commercial uses or a mix of residential and commercial uses, and the new design guidelines, would be applied only to Parcels 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9, but not to Parcel 7A, which is owned by Macy's West Stores, Inc. As is the case with the Project, the General Plan Amendment would not be applied to Parcel 2 under this alternative. Like the Project, Garages A, B, and C under this alternative would have sufficient self-parking spaces to meet standard City parking requirements for the development on the Macerich Northwestern owned parcels. Under existing circumstances, the Macy's Garage is sufficient to provide self-parking spaces to meet standard City requirements for the Macy's store without counting the portion of the Macy's parking deck that occupies Macerich Northwestern's Parcel 8.

Comparison of Alternative 1 (Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's) Impacts to the Project's Impacts¹

Resource Areas with Less-than-Significant Impacts

Aesthetic Resources

Although the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's would not include any development on Parcel 7A, development on other parcels within the Project Site would proceed as for the Project. Like the Project, development under this alternative would be required to conform to the design review guidelines proposed for the Project, which are proposed to generally adhere to the City's guidelines for providing a high quality, pedestrian scale, walkable experience. Included in the guidelines are aesthetically pleasing architecture, landscaping, lighting, screening and signage in keeping with the rest of the City's downtown area. This alternative would have visual impacts similar to those illustrated for the Project, with the exception of development on Parcel 7A. Like the Project, this alternative would have a less-than-significant impact, but the Macy's parcel would not be redeveloped or aesthetically improved.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Under this alternative, development would still occur on the Project Site and the construction activities and operation of development could expose residents to geologic hazards including strong ground shaking during a seismic event, as under the Project. However, as discussed above, there would be less new development without the Macy's component compared to the Project, and the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's would therefore result in fewer new

¹ Comparative discussion of SU impacts are shown in ***bold italic*** text.

workers on the Project Site. The number of residents under the Maximum Mixed-Use scenario would remain the same as under the Project. Development of this alternative would require the same engineering practices and building code standards as with the Project to reduce potential damage and personal injury from geologic hazards. However, the existing structures on the Macy's parcels would not be updated to current code standards.

Generally, this Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's would result in similar less-than-significant impacts to geology, soils and seismicity as identified with the Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's, slightly less development would occur on the Project Site compared to the Project, and the construction activities could still lead to increased contaminants being washed into surrounding creeks. Any development would be required to implement best management practices and comply with all applicable regulations and requirements referenced in Section 4.8. During operational phases, this alternative would, for the portions of the Project Site that would be redeveloped under the Project but not under this alternative, eliminate the Project's benefit of improving water quality treatment. Therefore, like the Project, this alternative would have a less-than-significant impact on hydrology and water quality. Like the Project, this alternative would have a less-than-significant impact on flooding, groundwater supplies and drainage, except that the beneficial aspects of redevelopment would not occur on the portions of the Project Site for which redevelopment is eliminated in this alternative.

Land Use and Planning

Under the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's, although development would be less than for the Project, the proposed land uses under both the Maximum Commercial and the Maximum Mixed-Use scenarios would be the same as for the Project and would be compatible with the existing larger development context and would not divide the established community. Under this alternative, the Project Applicants would seek an amendment to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance to change the land use designation, FAR restrictions and zoning classification on the Project Site. Like the Project, this alternative would have a less-than-significant impact with regard to land use and planning.

Population, Housing and Employment

Maximum Commercial Scenario: Under the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's, there would be less commercial development for this scenario compared to the Project. Applying an employment generation rate for commercial uses of 450 square feet per employee, this alternative under the Maximum Commercial Scenario would result in approximately 545 net new jobs, which equates to about 125 fewer net new jobs compared to the Project. In addition, no residential units would be constructed and this alternative would not directly generate any additional residents. Alternative 1 would result in an indirect growth in population, as new commercial development would create additional jobs; and therefore, result in an additional demand for housing.

According to ABAG projections, between 2010 and 2020, the number of jobs in the City of Walnut Creek would increase approximately 6.3 percent and the number of jobs would increase approximately 26.4 percent, between 2010 and 2035. The estimated increase in jobs associated with this alternative would represent approximately 14 percent of the anticipated employment growth in Walnut Creek over the next 10 years and represent approximately three percent of employment growth over the next 25 years. Furthermore, the housing impact fee associated with this alternative would equate to approximately \$1,226,670, which would offset potential indirect impacts of this alternative on housing needs and jobs-housing balance.

Based on these findings, potential growth inducement impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. Although this alternative would result in fewer net new jobs to the Downtown Core Area compared to the Project, the estimated number of new jobs would coincide with the planned growth policies established in the General Plan, and the anticipated increase in employment opportunities associated with this alternative under this scenario would be considered a beneficial impact to the City's growth.

Like the Project, there would be no displacement of housing units or businesses. The Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's would have a less-than-significant impact on population, housing and employment as the Project.

Maximum Mixed-Use Scenario: Under the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's, there would be less commercial development for this scenario, but the residential development would be the same as for the Project. This alternative would include approximately 142,984 gross square feet of commercial uses and approximately 200,000 gross square feet of residential uses. Similar to the Project, the amount of space dedicated to residential use would be limited to 200 units; however, as discussed, the overall amount of commercial development would be reduced by approximately 57,000 square feet, compared to the Project.

This alternative would directly and indirectly generate growth in population, as this alternative would introduce new residential development to Broadway Plaza and new commercial development that would create additional jobs and a demand for housing. Because the commercial development capacity for this alternative, under the Maximum Mixed-Use Scenario, would be less than the Project, this alternative would generate up to 324 net new jobs; whereas the Project, under this scenario would generate up to 670 jobs; an estimated reduction in 346 new jobs to the area. Furthermore, because this alternative would develop additional commercial uses, the housing impact fees associated with this alternative would equate to approximately \$728,920 which would offset any potential indirect impacts of this alternative on housing needs and jobs-housing balance.

Because this alternative under the Maximum Mixed-Use Scenario would provide the same amount of residential space (approximately 200,000 square feet) and same number of residential units as the Project, the expected direct population growth to the area would not differ from the Project. Therefore, as discussed for the Project, Alternative 1 under the Maximum Mixed-Use Scenario would create approximately 418 net new residents (assuming full-occupancy), and such an increase would represent nine percent of the anticipated population growth in Walnut Creek over the next 10 years, and this increase would represent about four percent of growth over the next 25 years.

Based on these findings, potential growth inducement impacts under the Maximum Mixed-Use Scenario for this alternative would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. Although this alternative would provide 346 fewer jobs than the Project, it would continue to propose the same amount of housing development in the area, and the estimated number of new jobs and residents associated with this alternative reinforce the goals and policies established in the General Plan and Housing Element and the anticipated increases in employment and housing would be considered a beneficial impact to the City's growth.

There would be slightly less total potential population and jobs compared to the Project, resulting in a similar effect on the jobs/housing balance. Like the Project, there would be no displacement of housing units or businesses. The Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's would have a less-than-significant level of impact for population, housing and employment.

Public Services and Recreation

Maximum Commercial Scenario: Under Alternative 1, Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's, under the Maximum Commercial scenario, similar to the Project under this scenario, there would be no increase in residential population on the Project Site. Implementation of this alternative would result in approximately 545 net new jobs compared with existing conditions. This equates to about 125 fewer net new jobs compared to the Project scenario. The new additional commercial uses would also increase the number of people coming in to the Project Site when compared with existing conditions.

Compared with the Project, this alternative would result in a smaller increase to the daytime population in the Project Site and vicinity. Although this increase in daytime population could generate additional calls for police, fire, and emergency services, this increase is also anticipated to be smaller when compared with the Project scenario. As noted in Chapter 4, the Project would not have a significant impact on response times or need for facilities for either the Walnut Creek Police Department or the Costa County Fire Protection District. Like the Project, the Maximum Commercial scenario under this alternative would have a less-than-significant impact on police protection and fire and emergency services.

Like the Project, the additional employees also would be expected to use the parks, open space, and recreational facilities available in the Project Site and surroundings, however, the increase in daytime population would not be large enough to cause accelerated physical deterioration within these facilities. Like the Project, the Maximum Commercial Scenario under this alternative would have a less-than-significant impact with respect to recreational resources and facilities.

This alternative could result in additional school age children because of the additional employees generated at the Project Site. Similar to the Project, the increase in students would be small and too speculative for impact assessment under CEQA. Under this alternative the project applicant would be required to pay school impact fees. As mandated under SB 50, these fees shall be the exclusive method of considering and mitigating the impacts on school facilities. Like the Project, the Maximum Commercial Scenario under this alternative would have a less-than-significant impact with respect to schools.

Therefore, like the Project, the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy’s under the Maximum Commercial scenario, would have a less-than-significant impact on community services.

Maximum Mixed-Use Scenario: Under Alternative 1, Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy’s, under the Maximum Mixed-Use scenario, there would be an increase in population on the Project Site. Implementation of this alternative under this scenario would result in approximately 324 net new jobs, which equates to about 346 fewer net new jobs compared to the Project; as well as the same amount of residential population as under the Project.

Compared with the Project, this alternative would result in a slightly reduced increase to the daytime population in the Project Site and vicinity. Therefore, like the Project, the Maximum Mixed-Use Scenario under this alternative would have a less-than-significant impact on police protection and fire and emergency services.

Like the Project, this alternative would be required to comply with the City’s Municipal Code requirements as to park land dedication, which imposes either a dedication of parkland or parkland in-lieu fees on residential development. The City currently exceeds the goal of five acres development parkland per 1,000 persons and the potential residential and/or daytime population added under this scenario for Alternative 1 would not be expected to reduce this ratio. Therefore, like the Project, the Maximum Mixed-Use Scenario under this alternative would have a less-than-significant impact with respect to recreational resources and facilities.

The combined student generation from new on site residents and employees, would be slightly reduced when compared with the Project scenario. Therefore, like the Project, this scenario under Alternative 1 would have a less-than-significant impact on public schools.

Under this alternative the Project Applicant would be required to pay school impact fees. As mandated under SB 50, these fees shall be the exclusive method of considering and mitigating the impacts on school facilities. There would be no significant impacts on public schools.

Therefore, like the Project, the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy’s under the Maximum Mixed-Use scenario, would have a less-than-significant community services impact.

Utilities and Service Systems

Maximum Commercial Scenario: Under the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy’s, there would be less commercial development for this scenario compared to the Project. Projected water and wastewater flows generated under Alternative 1 have been determined using the same methodology as was done for the Project (Psomas, 2011). The Maximum Commercial Scenario, under this alternative, would generate wastewater flows of approximately 32,525 gpd which would be less than the approximately 35,930 gpd generated for the Project and therefore would comprise less than 0.2 percent of the CCCSD wastewater treatment plant’s remaining capacity.

This alternative would generate an additional demand for water of approximately 34,960 gpd, which is less than the approximately 37,260 gpd generated for the Project. The existing capacity

of the Walnut Creek water treatment plant is adequate to meet existing demand as well as the additional demand under this scenario of Alternative 1. Because the water demand under this alternative for this scenario is less than for the Project, EBMUD's water supply is adequate to meet existing and projected demand through 2030 under normal conditions and up to two years of drought.

Under the Maximum Commercial Scenario of Alternative 1, because there would be less demolition and excavation compared to the Project less solid waste would be generated during construction activities. Like the Project, Mitigation Measure UTIL-1, which requires preparation of a Waste Management Plan, would ensure that potential impacts to the Acme Landfill are reduced to less than significant.

Similar to the Project, under the maximum commercial scenario for Alternative 1, the level of impacts on utilities and service systems would be less than significant.

Maximum Mixed-Use Scenario: Under the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's Maximum Mixed-Use Scenario, there would be less commercial development for this scenario compared to the Project, but the residential development would remain the same as for the Project. This alternative would generate wastewater flows of approximately 34,308 gpd which would be less than the approximately 35,930 gpd generated for the Project and therefore would comprise less than 0.2 percent of the CCCSD wastewater treatment plant's remaining capacity.

This alternative would generate an additional demand for water of approximately 37,010 gpd, which is less than the approximately 38,870 gpd generated for the Project. The existing capacity of the Walnut Creek water treatment plant is adequate to meet existing demand as well as the additional demand under this scenario of Alternative 1. Because the water demand under this alternative for this scenario is less than for the Project, EBMUD's water supply is adequate to meet existing and projected demand through 2030 under normal conditions and up to two years of drought.

Under this scenario of Alternative 1, because there would be less demolition and excavation compared to the Project, less solid waste would be generated during construction activities. Like the Project, Mitigation Measure UTIL-1, which requires preparation of a Waste Management Plan, would ensure that potential impacts to the Acme Landfill are reduced to a less than significant level.

Similar to the Project, under the maximum mixed-use scenario for Alternative 1, the level of impacts on utilities and service systems would be less than significant.

Resource Areas with Potentially Significant Impacts

Air Quality

The Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's (Alternative 1) assumes that the parcel owned by Macy's would not be included as a part of the Master Plan.

Maximum Commercial Scenario: Under the Maximum Commercial scenario for this alternative, 437,000 square feet of new commercial uses would be constructed (net development of approximately 238,000 square feet of commercial space). It was also estimated that 760,000 square feet of new garages would be constructed.

Construction related pollutant emissions for the Maximum Commercial scenario for this alternative are depicted below in **Table 5-3** and follow the same modeling methodology as described for the Project.

**TABLE 5-3
MAXIMUM COMMERCIAL SCENARIO
ANNUAL AVERAGE DAILY CONSTRUCTION-RELATED POLLUTANT EMISSIONS (pounds/day)^a**

Year	ROG	NOx	Exhaust PM10 ^b	Exhaust PM2.5 ^b
Unmitigated Emissions				
2014	10	84	4	4
2015	4	29	2	2
2016	18	48	3	3
<i>BAAQMD Construction Threshold</i>	54	54	82	54
Significant Impact?	No	Yes	No	No
Mitigated Emissions^c				
2014	7	50	1	1
2015	4	21	<1	<1
2016	17	33	1	1
<i>BAAQMD Construction Threshold</i>	54	54	82	54
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No

^a Emissions include results modeled with CalEEMod. The same daily vendor trips (100 trips) and workers and the same duration were assumed for this alternative versus the Project. Additional data and assumptions are described Chapter 3, *Project Description*, and Appendix C.

^b BAAQMD's proposed construction-related significance thresholds for PM10 and PM2.5 apply to exhaust emissions only and not to fugitive dust.

^c Mitigation measures were incorporated into the CalEEMod model to reflect the Basic Control Measures described under Mitigation Measure AIR-1a for the Project, per the BAAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*.

As can be seen from the data in Table 5-3, unmitigated construction-related emissions (Impact AIR-1) would exceed the BAAQMD threshold for NOx for this scenario. The main contributors of NOx during construction are on road haul trucks to export excavated materials and off-road diesel equipment used in demolition and excavation. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1a, 1b, and AIR-1c described for the Project would reduce emissions for this alternative. Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) cancer risk associated with construction (Impact AIR-3) of the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's could also be potentially significant after mitigation. This alternative would also implement Mitigation Measures AIR-3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, and 3e. In the absence of a construction plan, as required under Mitigation Measure AIR-3e, it is unknown whether the impact can be reduced to a level of less than significant. However, like the Project, chronic and acute health risk, as well as PM2.5 concentrations, would be less than significant. Although TAC

cancer risk is considered potentially significant for this alternative, overall emissions would be less than the Project during construction. Therefore, similar to the Project, Impact AIR-1 would be less than significant with mitigation and Impact AIR-3 would remain significant and potentially unavoidable for the Maximum Commercial scenario under Alternative 1.

In regard to operations (Impact AIR-2), the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy’s would result in fewer number of weekday trips than the Project. Operational emissions of the Maximum Commercial scenario under this alternative are depicted below in **Table 5-4** and follow the same modeling methodology as described for the Project.

As indicated in Table 5-4, operational emissions for the Maximum Commercial scenario would be less than significant for criteria air pollutants and no mitigation would be required. *Therefore, unlike the Project, Impact AIR-2 would be less than significant and require no mitigation for the Maximum Commercial scenario for Alternative 1.*

**TABLE 5-4
MAXIMUM COMMERCIAL SCENARIO
DAILY OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS FOR THE REDUCED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE – NO
MACY’S**

Emissions Source	Alternative Emissions - Year 2017 (pounds/day) ^a			
	ROG	NOx	PM10	PM 2.5
Unmitigated Emissions				
Area Source	6	<1	<1	<1
Vehicular Source	26	44	45	3
Total	33	45	45	3
<i>BAAQMD Operations Thresholds</i>				
Significant (Yes or No)?	No	No	No	No

^a Emissions were generated using the CalEEMod model with a default vehicle mix. Daily estimates are for summertime or wintertime conditions, whichever are greater. Additional data and assumptions are described Chapter 3, *Project Description*, and Appendix C.

^b Mitigation Measure AIR-2 as described for the Project was incorporated into CalEEMod using default model reductions. Additional assumptions are included in Appendix C.

Maximum Mixed-Use Scenario. Under the Maximum Mixed-Use scenario for this alternative, 337,000 square feet of new commercial and 200 residential dwelling units would be constructed (net development of approximately 144,000 square feet of commercial space and 200 dwelling units). It was also estimated that 760,000 square feet of new garages would be constructed.

Construction related pollutant emissions (Impact AIR-1) for the Maximum Mixed-Use scenario for this alternative is depicted below in **Table 5-5** and follows the same modeling methodology as described for the Project.

TABLE 5-5
MAXIMUM MIXED-USE SCENARIO
AVERAGE ANNUAL DAILY CONSTRUCTION-RELATED POLLUTANT EMISSIONS (pounds/day)^a

Year	ROG	NOx	Exhaust PM10 ^b	Exhaust PM2.5 ^b
Unmitigated Emissions				
2014	10	84	4	4
2015	10	30	2	2
2016	27	49	3	3
<i>BAAQMD Construction Threshold</i>	54	54	82	54
Significant Impact?	No	Yes	No	No
Mitigated Emissions				
2014	7	50	1	1
2015	4	22	<1	<1
2016	25	34	1	1
<i>BAAQMD Construction Threshold</i>	54	54	82	54
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No

^a Emissions include results modeled with CalEEMod. The same daily vendor trips (100 trips) and workers and the same duration were assumed for this alternative versus the Project. Additional data and assumptions are described Chapter 3, *Project Description*, and Appendix C.

^b BAAQMD's proposed construction-related significance thresholds for PM10 and PM2.5 apply to exhaust emissions only and not to fugitive dust.

^c Mitigation measures were incorporated into the CalEEMod model to reflect the Basic Control Measures described under Mitigation Measure AIR-1a for the Project, per the BAAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*.

As can be seen from the data in Table 5-5, unmitigated construction-related emissions would exceed the BAAQMD threshold for NOx for this scenario. The main contributors of NOx during construction are on-road haul trucks to export excavated materials and off-road diesel equipment used in demolition and excavation. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1a, AIR-1b, and AIR-1c described for the Project would reduce emissions for this alternative. TAC cancer risk associated with construction (Impact AIR-3) of the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's is anticipated to be potentially significant after implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-3a, AIR-3b, AIR-3c, AIR-3d, and AIR-3e. In the absence of a construction plan, as required under Mitigation Measure AIR-3e, it is unknown whether the impact can be reduced to a level of less than significant. However, like the Project, chronic and acute health risk, as well as PM2.5 concentrations, would be less than significant. Therefore, like the Project, Impact AIR-1 would be less than significant with mitigation and Impact AIR-3 would remain significant and potentially unavoidable for the Maximum Mixed-Use scenario under Alternative 1.

In regard to operations (Impact AIR-2), the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy's would result in fewer number of weekday trips than the Project. Operational emissions of the Maximum Mixed-Use scenario under this alternative are depicted below in **Table 5-6** and follow the same modeling methodology as described for the Project.

**TABLE 5-6
MAXIMUM MIXED-USE SCENARIO
DAILY OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS FOR THE REDUCED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE – NO
MACY’S**

Emissions Source	Alternative Emissions - Year 2017 (pounds/day) ^a			
	ROG	NOx	PM10	PM 2.5
Unmitigated Emissions				
Area Source	57	2	17	17
Energy	<1	1	<1	<1
Vehicular Source	15	25	25	2
Total	72	28	42	19
<hr/>				
<i>BAAQMD Operations Thresholds</i>	54	54	82	54
Significant (Yes or No)?	Yes	No	No	No
<hr/>				
Mitigated Emissions^b				
Area Source	10	<1	<1	<1
Energy	<1	1	<1	<1
Vehicular Source	15	26	25	2
Total	25	26	26	2
<hr/>				
<i>BAAQMD Operations Thresholds</i>	54	54	82	54
Significant (Yes or No)?	No	No	No	No

^a Emissions were generated using the CalEEMod model with a default vehicle mix. Daily estimates are for summertime or wintertime conditions, whichever are greater. Additional data and assumptions are described Chapter 3, *Project Description*, and Appendix C.

^b The residential hearth percentage was adjusted to 100 percent natural gas. The other Mitigation Measure AIR-2 controls as described for the Project were incorporated into CalEEMod using default model reductions. Additional assumptions are included in Appendix C.

As indicated in Table 5-6, operational emissions for the Maximum Mixed-Use scenario of ROG would exceed the BAAQMD significance threshold, but would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. Like the Project, TAC impacts and PM2.5 concentrations would be less than significant for existing receptors and residences to be developed under Maximum Mixed Use scenario. Overall emissions for the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy’s would be less than the Project during operations. Therefore, like the Project, Impact AIR-2 for the Mixed-Use scenario under Alternative 1 would be less than significant with mitigation.

Biological Resources

Under this alternative, for either the Maximum Commercial scenario or the Maximum Mixed-Use scenario, less development would occur compared to the Project. The construction and location of the development that would occur would not substantially differ from that of the Project, except that no development would occur on parcel 7A. This alternative would implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1, and adherence to the City’s tree ordinance would be required. Like the Project, this alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact on biological resources.

Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, for either the Maximum Commercial scenario or the Maximum Mixed-Use scenario, less development would occur compared to the Project. The construction and location of the development that would occur would not substantially differ from that of the Project, except that no development would occur on parcel 7A. Because Parcel 7A has been previously disturbed, likelihood of sensitive archaeological resources being found on that parcel are minimal. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3, and CUL-4 would be required. Like the Project, this alternative would have a less-than-significant impact on cultural resources.

Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change

Construction and operational emissions associated with this alternative were modeled following the same methodology as described for the Project. GHG emissions associated with the construction phase of either the Maximum Commercial scenario or Maximum Mixed-Use scenario for the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy’s would result in a maximum annual generation of approximately 1,901 metric tons of CO₂e, as shown in Appendix E. **Tables 5-7** and **5-8** present a gross estimate of each scenario’s unmitigated and mitigated operational CO₂e emissions resulting from the increases in motor vehicle trips resulting from each scenario, grid electricity usage, solid waste, as well as from other sources (including area sources, natural gas combustion, and water/wastewater conveyance).

Data in Tables 5-7 and 5-8 indicate that GHG emissions that would result from both scenarios would exceed the 1,100 metric tons per year and 4.6 metric tons of CO₂e annually per service population thresholds established by BAAQMD and would be significant, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1 described for the Project. However, GHG emissions for this alternative would be less than the Project. Therefore, like the Project, Alternative 1 would have significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas emissions impacts.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy’s, although there would be slightly less development compared to the Project, there would still be the potential for construction activities involving demolition, soil disturbance, excavation, and trenching to potentially expose construction workers, residents and the environment to hazards and hazardous materials, as identified with the Project. These hazardous materials include asbestos, PCBs, lead-based paint, contents of underground and aboveground storage tanks, and potentially contaminated soil and water. Like the Project, any new construction would incorporate the latest engineering guidelines and best management practices, and the same mitigation measures identified for the Project would apply to this alternative. Like the Project, the Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy’s would result in a less-than-significant impact associated with hazardous materials and hazards, even though the extent of exposure would be less given the reduced development that would occur.

**TABLE 5-7
ESTIMATED EMISSIONS OF GREENHOUSE GASES
FROM THE MAXIMUM COMMERCIAL SCENARIO OPERATIONS**

Source	Emissions (metric tons CO ₂ e per year)
Unmitigated Emissions	
Motor Vehicle Trips	5,619
Energy	868
Solid Waste	117
Other Sources (i.e., Area Sources, Water/Wastewater)	56
Total Unmitigated Operational GHG Emissions	6,659
<hr/>	
<i>BAAQMD GHG Brightline Threshold^a</i>	1,100
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes
Operational GHG Emissions per Service Population (545 jobs)	12.2
<i>BAAQMD Efficiency Threshold</i>	4.6
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes
<hr/>	
Mitigated Emissions^b	
Motor Vehicle Trips	5,619
Energy	813
Solid Waste	117
Other Sources (i.e., Area Sources, Water/Wastewater)	50
Total Mitigated Operational GHG Emissions	6,598
<hr/>	
<i>BAAQMD GHG Brightline Threshold^a</i>	1,100
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes
Operational GHG Emissions per Service Population (545 jobs)	12.1
<i>BAAQMD Efficiency Threshold</i>	4.6
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes
<hr/>	
<p>^a GHG emissions from vehicles and area sources (including natural gas combustion) associated with the alternative scenarios were calculated using the CalEEMod model Version 2011.1.1 and trip generation data from the traffic analysis. The number of jobs (for the service population criterion) was estimated based on the approximate 2.23 jobs per net ksf for the Project. Additional data and assumptions are included in Appendix E.</p> <p>^b Mitigation Measure GHG-1 described for the Project was incorporated into CalEEMod using default model reductions. Additional assumptions are included in Appendix E.</p>	

Noise and Vibration

The Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy’s would result in less construction activity and development compared to the Project for the Maximum Mixed-Use or Maximum Commercial scenarios. Sensitive receptor distances would remain the same and the work schedule is expected to be approximately the same. This Alternative would generate less construction noise and groundborne vibration and cause a smaller increase in ambient noise levels than the Project. This alternative would implement Mitigation Measures NOI-1a and NOI-1b. Like the Project, this alternative would have a significant and unavoidable impact on ambient noise levels during construction.

**TABLE 5-8
ESTIMATED EMISSIONS OF GREENHOUSE GASES
FROM THE MAXIMUM MIXED USE SCENARIO OPERATIONS**

Source	Emissions (metric tons CO ₂ e per year)
Unmitigated Emissions	
Motor Vehicle Trips	3,161
Energy	1,015
Solid Waste	111
Other Sources (i.e., Area Sources, Water/Wastewater)	117
Total Unmitigated Operational GHG Emissions	4,404
<hr/>	
<i>BAAQMD GHG Brightline Threshold^a</i>	1,100
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes
Operational GHG Emissions per Service Population (740 service population (322 jobs + 418 residents))	6.0
<i>BAAQMD Efficiency Threshold</i>	4.6
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes
<hr/>	
Mitigated Emissions^b	
Motor Vehicle Trips	3,161
Energy	927
Solid Waste	117
Other Sources (i.e., Area Sources, Water/Wastewater)	101
Total Mitigated Operational GHG Emissions	4,300
<hr/>	
<i>BAAQMD GHG Brightline Threshold^a</i>	1,100
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes
Operational GHG Emissions per Service Population (740 service population (322 jobs + 418 residents))	5.8
<i>BAAQMD Efficiency Threshold</i>	4.6
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes

^a GHG emissions from vehicles and area sources (including natural gas combustion) associated with the alternative scenarios were calculated using the CalEEMod model Version 2011.1.1 and trip generation data from the traffic analysis. The number of jobs (for the service population criterion) was estimated based on the approximate 2.23 jobs per net ksf for the Project. Additional data and assumptions are included in Appendix E.

^b Mitigation Measure GHG-1 described for the Project was incorporated into CalEEMod using default model reductions. Additional assumptions are included in Appendix E.

Transportation and Circulation

As shown in Table 5-2, Alternative 1 would result in fewer number of weekday and peak hour trips than the Project. Construction impacts associated with this alternative would require the same mitigation identified for the Project.

Maximum Commercial Scenario: Under Alternative 1, Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy’s, under the Maximum Commercial Scenario, the number of weekday trips would be

reduced by 1,699 trips to 7,401 trips and the number of a.m. and p.m. peak hour trips would be reduced by 34 trips to 178 trips and by 166 trips to 726 trips.

Maximum Mixed-Use Scenario: Under Alternative 1, Reduced Development Alternative – No Macy’s, under the Maximum Mixed-Use scenario, the number of weekday trips would be reduced by 1,474 trips to 4,304 trips and the number of a.m. and p.m. peak hour trips would be reduced by 30 trips to 178 trips and by 157 trips to 491 trips.

Because Alternative 1 would result in fewer trips than the Project, the traffic volumes at the study locations would also be lower, resulting in fewer impacts than those identified for the Project. As presented in Section 4.13, *Transportation and Circulation*, no significant impact has been identified for the Project; hence, this alternative would not result in a significant impact at the study locations.

5.4.2 Alternative 2: Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 Square-foot Expansion

Description

This alternative would further reduce the amount of demolition, development and redevelopment, and leave Broadway Plaza street in its current configuration. This alternative would allow only commercial development and no residential development.

Under this alternative, on Parcels 4, 5, 6 and 7 (owned by Macerich Northwestern), approximately 80,000 square feet of commercial space would be demolished and approximately 120,000 square feet of new commercial space buildings would be constructed, for a net expansion on Macerich Northwestern’s parcels of approximately 40,000 square feet. The new buildings would be up to two stories tall. Garage B would be eliminated. Garage C would be expanded to accommodate sufficient self-parking spaces to meet standard City requirements. This means that Garage C would have approximately 200 more spaces than proposed for the Project, for a total of approximately 1300 parking spaces in Garage C. Garage C would extend closer to South Broadway than would the Garage C proposed for the Project.

Development and redevelopment on Parcel 7A (owned by Macy’s) would be the same as for the Project. Macy’s would expand by approximately 57,000 square feet, and the Goodyear Tire store (approximately 6,000 square feet) may be demolished and the space redeveloped. Parking on Parcel 7A would remain the same as for the Project. Macy’s would demolish the Macy’s garage and rebuild it as Garage D on Parcel 7A, and would no longer have parking on Macerich Northwestern’s Parcel 8.

The total net expansion at the Project Site under this alternative would be approximately 96,000 square feet. The total amount of demolition would be approximately 86,000 square feet of space, and new construction would be approximately 182,000 square feet. This alternative, like the Project, would include cosmetic upgrades, internal tenant improvements and façade improvements in buildings that will not be demolished.

The construction schedule and activity (including excavation) is expected to last approximately the same timeframe as the Project.

This alternative would require a General Plan Amendment applicable to all parcels except Parcel 2 to increase the FAR to 0.80. No change in land use category would be required, as this alternative does not contemplate allowing residential uses. This alternative would include a new PD zoning district to establish a shared FAR and long term development and design criteria for all parcels.

Comparison of Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 Square-foot Expansion) Impacts to the Project Impacts²

Resource Areas with Less-than-Significant Impacts

Aesthetic Resources

The Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 Square-foot Expansion would have much less development than for the Project. Like the Project, development under this alternative would be required to conform to the design review guidelines proposed for the Project, which are proposed to generally adhere to the City's guidelines for providing a high quality, pedestrian scale, walkable experience. Included in the guidelines are aesthetically pleasing architecture, landscaping, lighting, screening and signage in keeping with the rest of the City's downtown area. Therefore, like the Project, this alternative would have a less-than-significant impact, but less of Broadway Plaza would be redeveloped or aesthetically improved.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Under this alternative, development would still occur on the Project Site and the construction activities and operation of development could expose residents to geologic hazards including strong ground shaking during a seismic event, as under the Project. However, as discussed above, there would be less new development compared to the Project, and the Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 Square-foot Expansion would therefore result in fewer new workers on the Project Site. The number of residents under the Maximum Mixed-Use scenario would remain the same as under the Project. Development of this alternative would require the same engineering practices and building code standards as the Project to reduce potential damage and personal injury from geologic hazards. However, fewer structures in the Project Site would be updated to current code standards.

Generally, this Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 Square-foot Expansion would result in a similar less-than-significant level of impacts to geology, soils and seismicity as identified with the Project.

² Comparative discussion of SU impacts are shown in ***bold italic*** text.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 Square-foot Expansion, less development would occur on the Project Site compared to the Project, but the construction activities could still lead to increased contaminants being washed into surrounding creeks. Any development would be required to implement best management practices and comply with all applicable regulations and requirements referenced in Section 4.8. During operational phases, this alternative would, for the portions of the Project Site that would be redeveloped under the Project but not under this alternative, eliminate the Project's benefit of improving water quality treatment. Like the Project, this alternative would have a less-than-significant level of impact to hydrology and water quality.

Land Use and Planning

Under the Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 Square-foot Expansion, development would be less than for the Project. Like the Project, the proposed development would be compatible with the existing larger development context and would not divide the established community. Under this alternative the Project Applicants would seek an amendment to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance to change the land use designation, FAR restrictions and zoning classification on the Project Site. Like the Project, this alternative will have a less-than-significant impact on land use and planning.

Population, Housing and Employment

Under the Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 Square-foot Expansion, there would be less commercial development for this scenario compared to the Project. No residential development is considered under this alternative. This alternative would reduce the amount of demolition, development, and redevelopment associated with the Project. This alternative would only allow commercial development and would not permit any residential development; therefore analysis of the Maximum Mixed-Use Scenario under this alternative would not be applicable. The total net expansion at the Project Site under this alternative would be approximately 96,000 square feet, as the total amount of demolition would be approximately 86,000 square feet of space and new construction would be approximately 182,000 square feet. Compared to the Project under the Maximum Commercial Scenario, the amount of commercial development allowed under this alternative would be reduced by approximately 205,334 square feet (from 301,334 to 96,000).

Based on the commercial development capacity of this alternative, and applying an employment generation rate for commercial uses of 450 square feet per employee, Alternative 2 would result in approximately 213 net new jobs. In comparison to the Project under the Maximum Commercial Scenario, this alternative would create approximately 457 fewer jobs to the area. In addition, as stated above, no residential units would be constructed under this alternative and would not directly generate any additional residents; therefore this alternative would result in an indirect growth in population, as new commercial development would create additional jobs; therefore resulting in an additional demand for housing.

According to ABAG projections, between 2010 and 2020, the number of jobs in the City of Walnut Creek would increase approximately 6.3 percent and the number of jobs would increase

approximately 26.4 percent, between 2010 and 2035. The estimated increase in jobs associated with this alternative would represent approximately five percent of the anticipated employment growth in Walnut Creek over the next ten years and represent approximately one percent of employment growth over the next 25 years. Furthermore, the housing impact fee associated for this alternative would equate to approximately \$480,000, which would offset potential indirect impacts of this alternative on housing needs and jobs-housing balance.

Although this alternative would result in fewer net new jobs than the Project, the estimated number of new jobs associated with this alternative would comply with established goals and policies in the General Plan and this anticipated direct increase in employment would be considered a beneficial impact to the City's growth.

Like the Project, there would be no displacement of housing units or businesses. The Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 Square-foot Expansion would have a less-than-significant impact on population, housing and employment as the Project.

Public Services and Recreation

Under Alternative 2, Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 Square-foot Expansion, there would be no residential population on the Project Site. Implementation of this alternative under this scenario would result in approximately 213 net new jobs, which equates to about 457 fewer net new jobs compared to the Project. The new additional commercial uses would also increase the number of people coming into the Project Site.

Compared with the Project, this alternative would result in a smaller increase to the daytime population in the Project Site and vicinity. Although this increase in daytime population could generate additional calls for police, fire, and emergency services, this increase is also anticipated to be smaller when compared with the Project scenario. As noted in Chapter 4, the Project would not have a significant impact on response times or need for facilities for either the Walnut Creek Police Department or the Costa County Fire Protection District. Like the Project, Alternative 2 would have a less-than-significant impact on police protection and fire and emergency services.

These additional employees would also be expected to use the parks, open space, and recreational facilities available in the Project Site and surroundings, however, the increase in daytime population would not be large enough to cause accelerated physical deterioration within these facilities. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have a less-than-significant impact with respect to recreational resources and facilities.

This alternative could result in additional school age children because of the additional employees generated at the Project Site. Like the Project, the increase in students would be small and too speculative for impact assessment under CEQA. Under this alternative the project applicant would be required to pay school impact fees. As mandated under SB 50, these fees shall be the exclusive method of considering and mitigating the impacts on school facilities. Like the project, Alternative 2 would have a less-than-significant impact with respect to schools.

Therefore, like the Project, the Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 Square-foot Expansion would have a less-than-significant impact on community services.

Utilities and Service Systems

Under this alternative, there would be much less development and demolition compared to the Project, and Broadway Plaza street would remain in its current configuration. This alternative would allow only commercial development and no residential development. Projected water and wastewater flows generated under Alternative 2 have been determined using the same methodology as was done for the Project (Psomas, 2011).

This alternative would generate wastewater flows of approximately 27,181 gpd which would be less than the approximately 35,930 gpd generated for the Project and therefore would comprise less than 0.2 percent of the CCCSD wastewater treatment plant's remaining capacity.

This alternative would generate an additional demand for water of approximately 28,814 gpd, which is less than the approximately 37,260 gpd generated for the Project. The existing capacity of the Walnut Creek water treatment plant is adequate to meet existing demand as well as the additional demand for Alternative 1. Because the water demand under this alternative is less than for the Project, like the Project, EBMUD's water supply is adequate to meet existing and projected demand through 2030 under normal conditions and up to two years of drought.

Under this alternative, because there would be much less demolition and excavation compared to the Project, less solid waste would be generated during construction activities. Like the Project, Mitigation Measure UTIL-1, which requires preparation of a Waste Management Plan, would ensure that potential impacts to the Acme Landfill are reduced to less than significant.

Like the Project, Alternative 2 would have a less than significant impact on utilities and service systems.

Resource Areas with Potentially Significant Impacts

Air Quality

This alternative would further reduce the amount of demolition, development and redevelopment, and leave Broadway Plaza street in its current configuration. This alternative would allow only commercial development and no residential development. Under this alternative, 182,000 square feet of new commercial space would be constructed (net development of approximately 96,000 square feet of commercial space). It was also estimated that 860,000 square feet of new garages would be constructed. Construction of this alternative is depicted below in **Table 5-9**, and follows the same modeling methodology as described for the Project.

**TABLE 5-9
ALTERNATIVE 2
ANNUAL AVERAGE DAILY CONSTRUCTION-RELATED POLLUTANT EMISSIONS (pounds/day)^a**

Year	ROG	NOx	Exhaust PM10 ^b	Exhaust PM2.5 ^b
Unmitigated Emissions				
2014	7	58	3	2
2015	4	27	2	2
2016	12	46	3	3
<i>BAAQMD Construction Threshold</i>	54	54	82	54
Significant Impact?	No	Yes	No	No
Mitigated Emissions^c				
2014	4	26	<1	<1
2015	3	19	<1	<1
2016	10	31	<1	<1
<i>BAAQMD Construction Threshold</i>	54	54	82	54
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No

^a Emissions include results modeled with CalEEMod. The same daily vendor trips (100 trips) and fewer workers) and the same duration were assumed for this alternative versus the Project. Additional data and assumptions are described Chapter 3, *Project Description*, and Appendix C.

^b BAAQMD's proposed construction-related significance thresholds for PM10 and PM2.5 apply to exhaust emissions only and not to fugitive dust.

^c Mitigation measures were incorporated into the CalEEMod model to effect the Basic Control Measures described under Mitigation Measure AIR-1a for the Project, per the BAAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*.

As can be seen from the data in Table 5-9, unmitigated construction-related emissions (Impact AIR-1) would exceed the BAAQMD threshold for NOx. The main contributors of NOx during construction are on-road truck trip to haul excavated materials and off-road diesel equipment used for demolition and grading activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1a, AIR-1b, and AIR-1c described for the Project would reduce emissions for this alternative. Diesel particulate matter emissions associated with construction of this alternative would be substantially lower than those estimated for the Project and would have a proportionate reduction in increased cancer risk. Consequently, TAC cancer risk associated with construction (Impact AIR-3) of this alternative is anticipated to be less than significant after mitigation. Like the Project, chronic and acute health risk, as well as PM2.5 concentrations would be less than significant. Like the Project, Impact AIR-1 for Alternative 2 would be less than significant with mitigation. ***Unlike the Project, Impact AIR-3 under Alternative 2 would be less than significant with mitigation.***

In regards to operations (Impact AIR-2), this alternative would result in fewer number of weekday trips than the Project. Operation of the alternative are depicted below in **Table 5-10**, and follows the same modeling methodology as described for the Project.

As indicated in Table 5-10, operational emissions for this alternative would not exceed the respective BAAQMD thresholds. Like the Project, TAC impacts and PM2.5 concentrations would be less than significant for existing receptors. Overall emissions for this alternative

**TABLE 5-10
ALTERNATIVE 2 DAILY OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS**

Emissions Source	Alternative Emissions - Year 2017 (pounds/day) ^a			
	ROG	NOx	PM10	PM 2.5
Unmitigated Emissions				
Area Source	3	<1	<1	<1
Vehicular Source	10	18	18	1
Total	13	18	18	1
<i>BAAQMD Operations Thresholds</i>	54	54	82	54
Significant (Yes or No)?	No	No	No	No

^a Emissions were generated using the CalEEMod model with a default vehicle mix. Daily estimates are for summertime or wintertime conditions, which ever are greater. Additional data and assumptions are described Chapter 3, *Project Description*, and Appendix C.

would be less than the Project during operations. Therefore, like the Project, Impact AIR-2 under Alternative 2 would be less-than-significant.

Biological Resources

Under Alternative 2, there would be less demolition and less new construction than the Project. This alternative would implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1, and adherence to the City's tree ordinance would be required. Like the Project, this alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact on biological resources.

Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, there would be less development than the Project. The construction and location of the development that would occur would not substantially differ from that of the Project. Because Parcel 7A has been previously disturbed, the likelihood of sensitive

archaeological resources being found on that parcel are minimal. This alternative would implement Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3, and CUL-4. Like the Project, this alternative would have a less-than-significant impact on cultural resources.

Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change

Construction and operational emissions associated with this alternative were modeled following the same methodology as described for the Project. This alternative would allow only commercial development and no residential development. GHG emissions associated with the construction phase would result in a maximum annual generation of approximately 1,160 metric tons of CO₂e, as shown in Appendix E. **Table 5-11** presents a gross estimate of unmitigated and mitigated operational CO₂e emissions resulting from the increases in motor vehicle trips resulting from each scenario, grid electricity usage, solid waste, as well as from other sources (including area sources, natural gas combustion, and water/wastewater conveyance).

**TABLE 5-11
ESTIMATED EMISSIONS OF GREENHOUSE GASES FROM
OPERATIONS OF ALTERNATIVE 2**

Source	Emissions (metric tons CO ₂ e per year)
Unmitigated Emissions	
Motor Vehicle Trips	2,211
Energy	341
Solid Waste	46
Other Sources (i.e., Area Sources, Water/Wastewater)	22
Total Unmitigated Operational GHG Emissions	2,620
<hr/>	
<i>BAAQMD GHG Brightline Threshold^a</i>	1,100
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes
Operational GHG Emissions per Service Population (214 jobs)	12.2
<i>BAAQMD Efficiency Threshold</i>	4.6
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes
<hr/>	
Mitigated Emissions^b	
Motor Vehicle Trips	2,211
Energy	320
Solid Waste	22
Other Sources (i.e., Area Sources, Natural Gas, Water/Wastewater)	20
Total Mitigated Operational GHG Emissions	2,596
<hr/>	
<i>BAAQMD GHG Brightline Threshold^a</i>	1,100
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes
Operational GHG Emissions per Service Population (214 jobs)	12.1
<i>BAAQMD Efficiency Threshold</i>	4.6
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes
<hr/>	
^a GHG emissions from vehicles and area sources (including natural gas combustion) associated with the alternative was calculated using the CalEEMod Version 2011.1.1 model and trip generation data from the traffic analysis. The number of jobs (for the service population criterion) was estimated based on the approximate 2.23 jobs per net ksf for the Project. Additional data and assumptions are included in Appendix E.	
^b Mitigation Measure GHG-1 described for the Project was incorporated into CalEEMod using default model reductions. Additional assumptions are included in Appendix E.	

Data in Table 5-11 indicate that GHG emissions that would result from this alternative would exceed the 1,100 metric tons per year and 4.6 metric tons of CO₂e annually per service population thresholds established by BAAQMD and would be significant, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1 described for the Project. However, GHG emissions for this alternative would be substantially less than the Project. ***Therefore, like the Project, Alternative 2 would have a significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas emission impact.***

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 Square-foot Expansion, although there would be less development than the Project, there would still be the potential for construction activities involving demolition, soil disturbance, excavation, and trenching to potentially expose construction workers and residents to potential hazards and hazardous materials, as identified with the Project. These potential hazardous materials include asbestos, PCBs, lead-based paint, contents of underground and aboveground storage tanks, and potentially contaminated soil and groundwater. Any new construction would incorporate the latest engineering guidelines and best management practices, and the same mitigation measures identified for the Project would apply to this alternative, as well. Therefore, like the Project, the Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 Square-foot Expansion would have a less-than-significant impact associated with hazardous materials and hazards.

Noise and Vibration

The Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 Square foot Expansion would result in less construction activity and development than the Project. Sensitive receptor distances would remain the same and the work schedule is expected to be approximately the same. Therefore, this Alternative would generate less construction noise and groundborne vibration and result in a smaller increase to ambient noise levels than the Project. This alternative would implement Mitigation Measures NOI-1a and NOI-1b. Like the Project, this alternative would have a significant and unavoidable impact on ambient noise levels.

	Construction Schedule	Distance to closest Sensitive Receptor	Worst-case Hourly noise level (dBA)
Proposed Project (Maximum Commercial)	2.5 – 3 years	250 feet	75
Alternative 1	2.5 – 3 years	250 feet	75

Transportation and Circulation

Alternative 2 (Reduced Development Alternative – 96,000 square-foot Expansion) assumes that net new commercial construction would be reduced to 96,000 square feet. The proposed central underground garage (Garage B) would not be constructed, while the Nordstrom Garage would be expanded to provide 200 additional spaces. The alternative would not include vacation of Broadway Plaza street or any residential land use. In addition, Alternative 2 would only allow commercial development (i.e., would not permit any residential development), and therefore, analysis of the Maximum Mixed-Use Scenario would not be applicable under this alternative.

Alternative 2 would result in much fewer weekday and peak hour trips than the Project. As shown in Table 5-2, the number of weekday trips would be reduced by 6,188 trips to 2,912 trips and the number of a.m. and p.m. peak hour trips would be reduced by 150 trips to 58 trips and by 607 trips to 286 trips, respectively. Since Alternative 2 would result in fewer trips than the Project, the traffic volumes at the study locations would also be lower, thus resulting in less

adverse impacts than those identified for the Project. As presented in Section 4.13, *Transportation and Circulation*, no significant impact has been identified for the Project; therefore, Alternative 2 would not result in a significant impact at the study locations.

5.4.3 Alternative 3: No Project Alternative

Description

CEQA requires that an EIR address a No Project Alternative, which it defines as existing conditions plus 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. The existing General Plan applies an FAR limitation to Broadway Plaza of 0.75, that would allow a maximum expansion of 15,195 square feet on Parcels 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 (owned by Macerich Northwestern) and approximately 36,567 square feet on Parcel 7A (owned by Macy's). If the Project were denied, it is likely that Macerich Northwestern and Macy's would at best pursue these expansions, and provide enough self-parking spaces on each of their sites to meet standard City requirements.

The 15,195 square-foot expansion on Macerich Northwestern property would likely occur on Parcels 1, 4 and/or 9, and would result in some existing one-story buildings extending to two stories. The Nordstrom garage would stay essentially in its current state north of the signalized driveway entrance on South Broadway, but the portion of the Macy's garage south of that signalized driveway that sits on Macerich Northwestern's Parcel 8 would be torn down and rebuilt to accommodate approximately 400 additional parking spaces. The Macy's garage would no longer occupy part of Macerich Northwestern's Parcel 8, and Macerich Northwestern would no longer rely on Macy's Parcel 7A to satisfy its parking requirements via a shared use agreement.

The 36,567 square-foot expansion on Macy's property would be located in the same general area as the Macy's expansion proposed for the Project and would extend up to two stories. That expansion area is currently occupied by part of the Macy's garage. That part of the Macy's garage would be demolished, and portions of the garage would be rebuilt to accommodate that demolition. The entire garage would be restriped to meet standard City parking requirements. Macy's would no longer have garage space on Macerich Northwestern's Parcel 8.

This alternative, like the Project, would include cosmetic upgrades, internal tenant improvements and façade improvements in buildings that will not be demolished.

The construction schedule and activity (including excavation) is expected to last approximately 12 months.

Comparison of Alternative 3 (No Project) Impacts to the Project Impacts³

Resource Areas with Less-than-Significant Impacts

Aesthetic Resources

Under Alternative 3, the No Project Alternative, the Project would not happen and reasonably foreseeable development would take place under current plans. There would be less development than for the Project. Development under this alternative would be required to conform to the City's existing guidelines for providing a high quality, pedestrian scale, walkable experience. Included in the guidelines are aesthetically pleasing architecture, landscaping, lighting, screening and signage in keeping with the rest of the City's downtown area. Therefore, like the Project, this alternative would have a less-than-significant impact, but Broadway Plaza would not be redeveloped or significantly aesthetically improved.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Under Alternative 3, the No Project Alternative, the Project would not happen and there would be no new buildings and less people on the Project Site would be exposed to seismic and geologic hazards. However, because some of the existing buildings on the Project Site are older buildings, it is likely that they do not meet the new seismic safety standards that would be required of new buildings. Therefore, this alternative would have similar less-than-significant impacts related to geology, soils, and seismicity as identified with the Project, but existing structures would not be updated to current code standards.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under Alternative 3, the No Project Alternative, the Project would not happen and reasonably foreseeable development would take place under current plans. Any new construction activities could lead to increased contaminants being washed into the two creeks on the Project Site. Like the Project, any new construction would be required to have similar mitigation and maintain best management practices, and therefore would result in similar less-than-significant impacts as the Project, except that the beneficial aspects of redevelopment would not occur on the Project Site.

Land Use and Planning

Under Alternative 3, the No Project Alternative, the Project would not happen and reasonably foreseeable development would take place under current plans. All new development would be required to be consistent with the General Plan and current Zoning designations. The FAR for the Project Site would remain as is, and a General Plan Amendment would not be required as it would under the Project. Therefore, like the Project, the No Project Alternative would have a less-than-significant impact on land use and planning.

³ Comparative discussion of SU impacts are shown in ***bold italic*** text.

Population, Housing and Employment

Under Alternative 3, the No Project Alternative, the Project would not happen and reasonably foreseeable development would take place under current plans. There would be less commercial development under this alternative than the Project and no residential development. This alternative includes existing conditions with the addition of reasonably expected development to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project were not approved. As such, development at the Project site would continue to occur based on current plans and in compliance with available infrastructure and community services. Under this alternative, the maximum allowable development expansion at Broadway Plaza would be approximately 51,762 net new gross square feet of commercial use and no residential use would be planned.

In applying an employment generation rate for commercial uses of 450 square feet per employee, This alternative would result in approximately 115 net new jobs. In addition, no residential units would be constructed under this alternative and would not directly generate any additional residents; therefore this alternative would result in an indirect growth in population, as new commercial development would create additional jobs; therefore resulting in an additional demand for housing.

According to ABAG projections, between 2010 and 2020, the number of jobs in the City of Walnut Creek would increase approximately 6.3 percent and the number of jobs would increase approximately 26.4 percent, between 2010 and 2035. The estimated increase in jobs associated with this alternative would represent approximately three percent of the anticipated employment growth in Walnut Creek over the next ten years and represent approximately one percent of employment growth over the next 25 years. Furthermore, the housing impact fee associated with the no project alternative would equate to approximately \$258,810, which would offset potential indirect impacts of this alternative on housing needs and jobs-housing balance.

Although this alternative would result in fewer net new jobs than the Project, the estimated number of new jobs associated with this alternative would comply with established the goals and policies in the General Plan and this anticipated direct increase in employment would be considered a beneficial impact to the City's growth.

Thus, there would be less total potential population compared to either scenario of the Project. Like the Project, there would be no displacement of housing units or businesses. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have a less-than-significant impact for population, housing, and employment.

Public Services and Recreation

Alternative 3, the No Project Alternative, assumes existing conditions and 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. The maximum amount of new development allowed in the Project Site would be 51,762 square feet, approximately 18 percent of the development under the Project resulting in a much smaller additional population

and reduced need for public services. Like the Project, the No Project Alternative would have a less-than-significant impact on community services.

Utilities and Service Systems

The no project alternative assumes existing conditions and 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. Thus, only commercial uses would be permitted and no residential use would be planned. The net new commercial development allowed would be 51,762 square feet. Projected water and wastewater flows generated under Alternative 1 have been determined using the same methodology as was done for the Project (Psomas, 2011). This alternative would generate additional wastewater flows of approximately 2,070 gpd, which would be substantially less than the approximately 35,930 gpd generated for the Project and therefore would comprise less than 0.2 percent of the CCCSD wastewater treatment plant's remaining capacity.

This alternative would generate an additional demand for water of approximately 2,381 gpd, which is less than the approximately 37,260 gpd generated for the Project. The existing capacity of the Walnut Creek water treatment plant is adequate to meet existing demand as well as the additional demand for Alternative 1. Because the water demand under this alternative is less than for the Project, EBMUD's water supply is adequate to meet existing and projected demand through 2030 under normal conditions and up to two years of drought.

Under this alternative, because there would be much less demolition and excavation compared to the Project, less solid waste would be generated during construction activities. Like the Project, Mitigation Measure UTIL-1, which requires preparation of a Waste Management Plan, would ensure that potential impacts to the Acme Landfill are reduced to less than significant.

Similar to the Project, Alternative 3, the level of impacts on utilities and service systems would be less than significant.

Resource Areas with Potentially Significant Impacts

Air Quality

The No Project Alternative analyzes expansion allowed under the existing General Plan. This alternative would allow only commercial development and no residential development. Under this alternative, 51,800 square feet of new commercial space would be constructed. It was also estimated that 630,000 square feet of new garages would be constructed. Construction of this alternative is depicted below in **Table 5-12**, and follows the same modeling methodology as described for the Project.

As can be seen from the data in Table 5-12, unmitigated construction-related emissions (Impact AIR-1) would be below BAAQMD thresholds for ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. Unmitigated diesel particulate matter emissions from construction (Impact AIR-3) under this alternative are

estimated to be far lower than those estimated for the Project and continue for one year rather than 30 to 36 months. Consequently, TAC cancer risk

TABLE 5-12
NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE
ANNUAL AVERAGE DAILY CONSTRUCTION-RELATED POLLUTANT EMISSIONS (pounds/day)^a

Year	ROG	NOx	Exhaust PM10 ^b	Exhaust PM2.5 ^b
Unmitigated Emissions				
2014	5	16	1	1
<i>BAAQMD Construction Threshold</i>	54	54	82	54
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No

^a Emissions include results modeled with CalEEMod. Fewer daily vendor trips and fewer workers) and shorter duration were assumed for this alternative versus the Project. Additional data and assumptions are described Chapter 3, *Project Description*, and Appendix C.

^b BAAQMD's proposed construction-related significance thresholds for PM10 and PM2.5 apply to exhaust emissions only and not to fugitive dust.

associated with construction of this alternative is anticipated to be less than significant and no mitigation would be required. Like the Project, chronic and acute health risk, as well as PM2.5 concentrations would be less than significant. Like the Project, Impact AIR-1 for the No Project alternative would be less than significant. ***Unlike the Project, Impact AIR-3 for Alternative 3 would be less than significant.***

In regards to operations (Impact AIR-2), this alternative would result in fewer number of weekday trips than the Project. Operation of the alternative are depicted below in **Table 5-13**, and follows the same modeling methodology as described for the Project.

As indicated in Table 5-13, operational emissions for this alternative would not exceed the respective BAAQMD thresholds. Like the Project, TAC impacts and PM2.5 concentrations would be less than significant for existing receptors. Overall emissions for this alternative would be less than the Project during operations. Therefore, like the Project, Impact AIR-2 for Alternative 3 would be less-than-significant.

Biological Resources

Under Alternative 3, the No Project Alternative, the Project would not happen and reasonably foreseeable development would take place under current plans and available infrastructure and services. There will be no demolition and much less new development would occur than the Project. Like the Project, this alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact on biological resources.

**TABLE 5-13
NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE
DAILY OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS**

Emissions Source	Alternative Emissions - Year 2017 (pounds/day) ^a			
	ROG	NOx	PM10	PM 2.5
Unmitigated Emissions				
Area Source	1	<1	0	0
Vehicular Source	6	9	10	1
Total	7	9	10	1
<i>BAAQMD Operations Thresholds</i>	54	54	82	54
Significant (Yes or No)?	No	No	No	No

^a Emissions were generated using CalEEMod model with a default vehicle mix. Daily estimates are for summertime or wintertime conditions, whichever are greater. Additional data and assumptions are described Chapter 3, *Project Description*, and Appendix C.

Cultural Resources

Under Alternative 3, the No Project Alternative, the Project would not happen and buildings older than 45 years and potentially eligible for listing on the state or national historic registers would likely not be demolished. There would be no new excavation and the potential impact to archaeological and paleontological resources would be avoided. While there may be new projects to expand individual stores on the Project Site, those projects would be subject to separate environmental review, and the existing buildings are not significant historic resources. Like the Project, this alternative would have a less-than-significant impact on cultural resources.

Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change

Construction and operational emissions associated with the No Project Alternative were modeled following the same methodology as described for the Project. This alternative would allow only commercial development and no residential development. GHG emissions associated with the construction phase would result in a maximum annual generation of approximately 312 metric tons of CO₂e, as shown in Appendix E. **Table 5-14** presents a gross estimate of unmitigated and mitigated operational CO₂e emissions resulting from the increases in motor vehicle trips resulting from each scenario, grid electricity usage, solid waste, as well as from other sources (including area sources, natural gas combustion, and water/wastewater conveyance).

Data in Table 5-14 indicate that GHG emissions that would result from this alternative would exceed the 1,100 metric tons per year and 4.6 metric tons of CO₂e annually per service population thresholds established by BAAQMD and would be significant, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1 described for the Project. However, GHG emissions for this alternative would be substantially less than the Project. Therefore, like the Project, Alternative 3 would have significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas emission impacts.

**TABLE 5-14
ESTIMATED EMISSIONS OF GREENHOUSE GASES FROM
OPERATIONS OF THE NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE**

Source	Emissions (metric tons CO ₂ e per year)
Unmitigated Emissions	
Motor Vehicle Trips	1,192
Energy	184
Solid Waste	25
Other Sources (i.e., Area Sources, Natural Gas, Water/Wastewater)	12
Total Unmitigated Operational GHG Emissions	1,413
<hr/>	
<i>BAAQMD GHG Brightline Threshold^a</i>	1,100
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes
Operational GHG Emissions per Service Population (116 jobs)	12.2
<i>BAAQMD Efficiency Threshold</i>	4.6
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes
<hr/>	
Mitigated Emissions^b	
Motor Vehicle Trips	1,192
Energy	173
Solid Waste	25
Other Sources (i.e., Area Sources, Water/Wastewater)	11
Total Mitigated Operational GHG Emissions	1,400
<hr/>	
<i>BAAQMD GHG Brightline Threshold^a</i>	1,100
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes
Operational GHG Emissions per Service Population (116 jobs)	12.1
<i>BAAQMD Efficiency Threshold</i>	4.6
<i>Significant (Yes or No)?</i>	Yes
<hr/>	
^a GHG emissions from vehicles and area sources (including natural gas combustion) associated with the alternative was calculated using CalEEMod Version 2011.1.1 model and trip generation data from the traffic analysis. The number of jobs (for the service population criterion) was estimated based on the approximate 2.23 jobs per net ksf for the Project. Additional data and assumptions are included in Appendix E.	
^b Mitigation Measure GHG-1 described for the Project was incorporated into CalEEMod using default model reductions. Additional assumptions are included in Appendix E.	

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under Alternative 3, the No Project Alternative, the Project would not happen and reasonably foreseeable development would take place under current plans and available infrastructure and services. Any new construction activities involving demolition, soil disturbance, excavation, and trenching could continue to potentially expose construction workers and residents to potential hazards and hazardous materials as identified for the Project. Like the Project, any new construction would be required to have similar mitigation and maintain best management practices. Like the Project, this alternative would have a less-than-significant hazards and hazardous materials impact.

Noise and Vibration

Under Alternative 3, the No Project Alternative, the Project would not happen and reasonably foreseeable development would take place under current plans. Given the substantially less development and related construction activity that would occur under the No Project Alternative compared to the Project, and the proportionally fewer new residents and workers that would occur in the Project Area, construction and operational noise impacts would be less than identified for the Project. *Unlike the Project, the No Project Alternative would have a less-than-significant noise impact.*

Transportation and Circulation

As shown in Table 5-2, Alternative 3 the No Project Alternative, would result in the lowest number of new weekday and peak hour trips. Compared to the Project under the Maximum Commercial Scenario, the number of weekday trips would be reduced by 7,530 trips to 1,570 trips and the number of a.m. and p.m. peak hour trips would be reduced by 177 trips to 31 trips and by 739 trips to 156 trips.

Because the Alternative 3 would result in fewer trips than the Project, the traffic volumes at the study locations would also be lower, thus resulting in fewer adverse impacts than those identified for the Project. As presented in Section 4.13, *Transportation and Circulation*, no significant impact has been identified for the Project; therefore, Alternative 3 would not result in a significant impact at the study locations.

5.4.4 Non-CEQA Alternatives

Relocated Parking Alternative

This alternative would be the same as the Project, but would eliminate Garage B, and shift the approximately 650 parking spaces from Garage B into Garages C and D. Compared to the Project, there would be additional underground parking in Garage D and additional rooftop parking in Garages C and D. The construction schedule and activity (including excavation) is expected to be about the same as for the Project. This alternative would be studied to determine the optimum location for parking on the site.

The construction schedule and activity (including excavation) is expected to be about the same as for the Project.

This alternative would shift the impacts of excavation from one portion of the Project Site to another. However, given the type of soils, the location of the Project Site, and its disturbed nature, there is no likelihood that any potentially significant impacts could be avoided. Relocating the parking would enable any archeological resources at the site of the original garage to be preserved in place, but that beneficial impact would be offset by the increased (but still very low) potential for disturbance of archeological resources for Garage D. As a result, impacts would be similar.

The Project trip generation and trip distribution of the Relocated Parking Alternative would be the same as the Project, but the trip assignment on the roadway network would be different due to the change in garage access. Therefore, selected intersections in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site were analyzed to ascertain the localized effects of the Relocated Parking Alternative. Further, locations where the Project would have a significant impact are also assessed.

Baseline Conditions

Intersection operations under Baseline conditions are presented in **Table 5-15**. Like the Project, the Relocated Parking Alternative would not result in any significant impact at the study intersections.

Near Term Cumulative Conditions

Intersection operations under Near Term Cumulative conditions are presented in **Table 5-16**. Like the Project, Alternative 4 would not result in a significant impact at the study intersections.

Cumulative Conditions

Intersection operations under Cumulative conditions are presented in **Table 5-17**. Alternative 4 would contribute to the already substandard operation at the intersection of Broadway and Mount Diablo Boulevard during the p.m. peak hour and cause the v/c to increase by 0.05; thereby exceeding the significance threshold.

This is a new significant impact not identified in Section 4.13, *Transportation and Circulation*. This cumulative impact was addressed in the General Plan EIR Impact TRAF-4, which includes the Broadway and Mount Diablo Boulevard intersection along with a number of other intersections. The General Plan EIR stated that “the opportunities to improve these intersections are limited due primarily to right-of-way constraints as well as the desire to maintain the pedestrian-oriented nature of the Core Area...this would be considered a *significant and unavoidable* impact.” Therefore, the project’s contribution to the cumulative impacts at this intersection would be considered *significant and unavoidable*.

Extra Parking Alternative

Alternative 5 assumes the same land use and roadway network as the Project. The only difference is that it would include an additional 300 parking spaces in the proposed Garage C and Garage D. Parking, in and of itself, is not a land use type that would generate vehicular trips. However, it has a potential to redistribute trips in the vicinity by attracting vehicles from other potential parking locations. This EIR analysis focuses on the potential effects on the operations of the transportation network during the a.m. and p.m. peak commute hours on a typical weekday. For the assessment of Alternative 5, this discussion below emphasizes the p.m. peak hour since most of the commercial uses that the additional parking would serve are not opened during the a.m. peak hour.

Previous parking survey and analysis have shown that there is ample parking availability in the downtown area during the p.m. peak commute period. Therefore, it is unlikely that any new

**TABLE 5-15
INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) BASELINE CONDITIONS – RELOCATED PARKING ALTERNATIVE**

Intersection	Peak Hour	Baseline No Project			Preferred Project Max Commercial			Preferred Project Max Mixed Use			Relocated Parking Alt with Max Commercial Option			Relocated Parking Alt with Max Mixed Use Option		
		LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c
4 N. Main St/Civic Dr	AM	A	0.45		A	0.45		A	0.45		A	0.45		A	0.45	
	PM	B	0.67		B	0.68		B	0.68		B	0.68		B	0.68	
5 N. Broadway/Civic Dr	AM	A	0.43		A	0.43		A	0.43		A	0.43		A	0.43	
	PM	B	0.68		C	0.71		C	0.70		C	0.71		C	0.7	
13 Main St/Mt. Diablo Blvd	AM	A	0.41		A	0.42		A	0.42		A	0.41		A	0.42	
	PM	A	0.58		B	0.66		B	0.64		B	0.61		B	0.64	
14 Broadway Plz St/Mt. Diablo Blvd ^{de}	AM	A		0.1	A		0.1	A		0.1	A		0.1	A		0.1
	PM	A		0.2	A		0.2	A		0.2	A		0.2	A		0.2
15 Broadway/Mt. Diablo Blvd	AM	A	0.58		A	0.59		A	0.59		A	0.59		A	0.59	
	PM	C	0.78		D	0.82		D	0.81		D	0.84		D	0.81	
21 S. Main St/Olympic Blvd	AM	A	0.17		A	0.19		A	0.20		A	0.18		A	0.2	
	PM	A	0.36		A	0.43		A	0.41		A	0.38		A	0.42	
23 S Main St/Botelho Dr	AM	A	0.16		A	0.17		A	0.18		A	0.17		A	0.18	
	PM	A	0.4		A	0.43		A	0.43		A	0.45		A	0.44	
24 S. Broadway/ North Drwy Entry ^{de}	AM	A		0.5	A		0.4	A		0.4	A		0.4	A		0.4
	PM	A		1.0	A		0.4	A		0.4	A		0.4	A		0.4
25 S. Main St/ Broadway Plaza access	AM	A	0.18		A	0.21		A	0.21		A	0.18		A	0.21	
	PM	A	0.27		A	0.44		A	0.40		A	0.28		A	0.4	
26 S. Broadway/South Driveway Entrance	AM	A	0.28		A	0.31		A	0.32		A	0.33		A	0.32	
	PM	A	0.49		B	0.69		B	0.66		C	0.74		B	0.66	
28 S. Main St/Newell Ave	AM	A	0.56		A	0.57		A	0.58		A	0.58		A	0.58	
	PM	A	0.52		A	0.57		A	0.56		A	0.62		A	0.57	

**TABLE 5-15 (Continued)
INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) BASELINE CONDITIONS – RELOCATED PARKING ALTERNATIVE**

Intersection	Peak Hour	Baseline No Project			Preferred Project Max Commercial			Preferred Project Max Mixed Use			Relocated Parking Alt with Max Commercial Option			Relocated Parking Alt with Max Mixed Use Option		
		LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c
29 Maria Ln/Newell Ave	AM	A	0.38		A	0.38		A	0.38		A	0.38		A	0.38	
	PM	A	0.46		A	0.48		A	0.48		A	0.52		A	0.48	
30 S. Broadway/Newell Ave	AM	A	0.47		A	0.47		A	0.47		A	0.47		A	0.47	
	PM	A	0.53		A	0.55		A	0.54		A	0.55		A	0.55	

^a LOS = Level of Service

^b V/C = Volume-to-Capacity ratio;

^c Delay = Average intersection delay in seconds

^d Average vehicle delay are reported for unsignalized intersections

^e The City does not have a level of service standard for unsignalized intersections. LOS is provided for information purpose only.

Source: Kittelson/Dowling Associates, Inc., February 2012

**TABLE 5-16
INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) NEAR TERM CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS – RELOCATED PARKING ALTERNATIVE**

Intersection	Peak Hour	Near Term Cumulative No Project			Near Term Cumulative plus Project Max Commercial			Near Term Cumulative plus Project Max Mixed Use			Alternative 4 with Max Commercial Option			Alternative 4 with Max Mixed Use Option		
		LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c
4 N. Main St/Civic Dr	AM	A	0.48		A	0.48		A	0.48		A	0.48		A	0.48	
	PM	C	0.74		C	0.74		C	0.74		C	0.74		C	0.74	
5 N. Broadway/Civic Dr	AM	A	0.46		A	0.47		A	0.46		A	0.47		A	0.46	
	PM	C	0.74		C	0.77		C	0.76		C	0.77		C	0.76	
13 Main St/Mt. Diablo Blvd	AM	A	0.44		A	0.44		A	0.45		A	0.44		A	0.45	
	PM	B	0.70		C	0.77		C	0.75		C	0.72		C	0.75	
14 Broadway Plz St/Mt. Diablo Blvd ^{d,e}	AM	A		0.1	A		0.1	A		0.1	A		0.1	A		0.1
	PM	A		0.2	A		0.2	A		0.2	A		0.2	A		0.2
15 Broadway/Mt. Diablo Blvd	AM	B	0.62		B	0.63		B	0.63		B	0.63		B	0.63	
	PM	D	0.87		E	0.91		E	0.9		E	0.93		E	0.9	
17 I-680 NB Ramps/Olympic Blvd	AM	D(C)	0.88	27.1	D(C)	0.88	27.2	D(C)	0.89	27.2	D(C)	0.88	27.1	D(C)	0.89	27.2
	PM	F(F)	1.27	83.5	F(F)	1.30	93.2	F(F)	1.29	90.3	F(F)	1.30	93.1	F(F)	1.29	90.3
21 S. Main St/Olympic Blvd	AM	A	0.21		A	0.22		A	0.23		A	0.21		A	0.23	
	PM	A	0.43		A	0.50		A	0.48		A	0.45		A	0.48	
23 S Main St/Botelho Dr	AM	A	0.18		A	0.19		A	0.20		A	0.19		A	0.19	
	PM	A	0.45		A	0.50		A	0.48		A	0.49		A	0.48	
24 S. Broadway/North Drwy Entry ^{d,e}	AM	A		0.5	A		0.4	A		0.4	A		0.4	A		0.4
	PM	A		1.0	A		0.4	A		0.4	A		0.6	A		0.5
25 S. Main St/ Broadway Plaza access	AM	A	0.19		A	0.23		A	0.23		A	0.19		A	0.23	
	PM	A	0.31		A	0.48		A	0.44		A	0.31		A	0.44	

**TABLE 5-16 (Continued)
INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) NEAR TERM CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS – RELOCATED PARKING ALTERNATIVE**

Intersection	Peak Hour	Near Term Cumulative No Project			Near Term Cumulative plus Project Max Commercial			Near Term Cumulative plus Project Max Mixed Use			Alternative 4 with Max Commercial Option			Alternative 4 with Max Mixed Use Option		
		LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c
26 S. Broadway/South Driveway Entrance	AM	A	0.28		A	0.32		A	0.32		A	0.33		A	0.32	
	PM	A	0.51		C	0.71		B	0.68		C	0.76		B	0.68	
28 S. Main St/Newell Ave	AM	A	0.54		A	0.55		A	0.55		A	0.55		A	0.55	
	PM	A	0.47		A	0.52		A	0.51		A	0.55		A	0.51	
29 Maria Ln/Newell Ave	AM	A	0.38		A	0.39		A	0.39		A	0.39		A	0.39	
	PM	A	0.47		A	0.49		A	0.48		A	0.52		A	0.48	
30 S. Broadway/Newell Ave	AM	A	0.48		A	0.48		A	0.48		A	0.48		A	0.48	
	PM	A	0.55		A	0.57		A	0.56		A	0.57		A	0.56	

^a LOS = Level of Service

^b V/C = Volume-to-Capacity ratio;

^c Delay = Average intersection delay in seconds

^d Average vehicle delay are reported for unsignalized intersections

^e The City does not have a level of service standard for unsignalized intersections. LOS is provided for information purpose only.

Source: Kittelson/Dowling Associates, Inc., February 2012

**TABLE 5-17
INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS – RELOCATED PARKING ALTERNATIVE**

Intersection	Peak Hour	Cumulative No Project			Cumulative plus Project Max Commercial			Cumulative plus Project Max Mixed Use			Alternative 4 with Max Commercial Option			Alternative 4 with Max Mixed Use Option		
		LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c
4 N. Main St/Civic Dr	AM	D	0.86		D	0.86		D	0.86		D	0.86		D	0.86	
	PM	F	1.22		F	1.22		F	1.22		F	1.22		F	1.22	
5 N. Broadway/Civic Dr	AM	D	0.84		D	0.84		D	0.84		D	0.84		D	0.84	
	PM	E	0.96		E	0.98		E	0.98		E	0.98		E	0.98	
13 Main St/Mt. Diablo Blvd	AM	D	0.86		D	0.87		D	0.87		D	0.86		D	0.87	
	PM	D	0.82		D	0.86		D	0.85		D	0.84		D	0.85	
14 Broadway Plz St/Mt. Diablo Blvd ^{de}	AM	A		0.1	A		0.1	A		0.1	A		0.1	A		0.1
	PM	A		0.2	A		0.2	A		0.2	A		0.2	A		0.2
15 Broadway/Mt. Diablo Blvd	AM	D	0.81		D	0.81		D	0.82		D	0.81		D	0.82	
	PM	F	1.12		F	1.16		F	1.15		F	1.17		F	1.15	
17 I-680 NB Ramps/Olympic Blvd	AM	F(F)	1.26	214.5	F(F)	1.26	215.8	F(F)	1.26	218.1	F(F)	1.26	215.8	F(F)	1.26	218.1
	PM	F(F)	1.56	246.5	F(F)	1.58	256.1	F(F)	1.58	253.4	F(F)	1.58	255.9	F(F)	1.58	253.4
19 Olympic Blvd/S. California Blvd	AM	A	0.53		A	0.53		A	0.54		A	0.53		A	0.54	
	PM	E	0.90		E	0.95		E	0.94		E	0.93		E	0.94	
21 S. Main St/Olympic Blvd	AM	B	0.69		C	0.70		C	0.71		B	0.7		C	0.71	
	PM	D	0.81		D	0.88		D	0.86		D	0.83		D	0.86	
23 S Main St/Botelho Dr	AM	A	0.45		A	0.47		A	0.47		A	0.46		A	0.47	
	PM	C	0.79		D	0.82		D	0.81		D	0.82		D	0.81	
24 S. Broadway/North Drwy Entry ^{de}	AM	A		0.4	A		0.3	A		0.3	A		0.3	A		0.3
	PM	A		1.7	A		0.4	A		0.4	A		0.4	A		0.4
25 S. Main St/ Broadway Plaza access	AM	A	0.38		A	0.39		A	0.40		A	0.39		A	0.4	
	PM	A	0.44		A	0.58		A	0.55		A	0.45		A	0.55	

TABLE 5-17 (Continued)
INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS – RELOCATED PARKING ALTERNATIVE

Intersection	Peak Hour	Cumulative No Project			Cumulative plus Project Max Commercial			Cumulative plus Project Max Mixed Use			Alternative 4 with Max Commercial Option			Alternative 4 with Max Mixed Use Option		
		LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c	LOS ^a	V/C ^b	Delay ^c
26 S. Broadway/South Driveway Entrance	AM	A	0.35		A	0.38		A	0.39		A	0.39		A	0.39	
	PM	A	0.59		C	0.80		C	0.77		C	0.85		C	0.77	
28 S. Main St/Newell Ave	AM	B	0.67		B	0.68		B	0.68		B	0.68		B	0.68	
	PM	C	0.73		C	0.77		C	0.77		C	0.78		C	0.75	
29 Maria Ln/Newell Ave	AM	A	0.32		A	0.33		A	0.33		A	0.33		A	0.33	
	PM	A	0.44		A	0.46		A	0.45		A	0.49		A	0.45	
30 S. Broadway/Newell Ave	AM	A	0.55		A	0.55		A	0.55		A	0.55		A	0.55	
	PM	A	0.58		A	0.59		A	0.59		A	0.60		A	0.59	

^a LOS = Level of Service

^b V/C = Volume-to-Capacity ratio;

^c Delay = Average intersection delay in seconds

^d Average vehicle delay are reported for unsignalized intersections

^e The City does not have a level of service standard for unsignalized intersections. LOS is provided for information purpose only.

Source: Kittelson/Dowling Associates, Inc., February 2012

vehicle trips would be generated or that motorists would be drawn to the proposed Garage C and Garage D, which is located on the edge of the Pedestrian Retail District, due to the additional parking spaces. This conclusion is primarily based on findings presented in the 2006 Walnut Creek Downtown Parking and Transportation Study⁴ and a 2008 memorandum on parking demand and occupancy at Broadway Plaza.⁵ Both studies were conducted prior to the current economic slowdown; thus are likely to represent periods when there were higher parking demand in the Pedestrian Retail District.

The Downtown Parking Study provides a glimpse of the parking demand in the downtown area. It covers portions of the Pedestrian Retail District including Broadway Plaza's South Main Street parking garage but not the garages off South Broadway. Occupancy surveys were conducted on a Friday and a Saturday in July 2005. It was found that the peak parking hour occurred during midday on both days. During the peak hour, there was an 80 percent parking occupancy in the downtown study area on Friday with more than 1,400 parking spaces available. The Broadway Plaza garage was 98 percent full during this period. The overall parking occupancy was lower during Saturday's peak hour in the study area. The Broadway Plaza garage was 81 percent full during this time.

The Broadway Plaza parking memorandum offers a narrower scope with its focus on parking facilities within Broadway Plaza. However, it provides a comparison of typical, non-holiday weekend and weekday parking demand. The occupancy surveys were conducted on a Tuesday, a Friday, and a Saturday in February and March of 2008. The findings were consistent with the Downtown Parking Study in that the peak parking periods occurred during the midday on all three days. However, the survey found higher occupancy during the Saturday peak hour (around 98 percent) than Friday (around 82 percent). The occupancy rate was much lower on Tuesday at around 70 percent during the peak midday hour. The occupancy rate was even lower during the p.m. peak commute period, which generally occurs between 4:00 pm and 6:00 pm. The parking occupancy reduced to 50 percent or lower during this period on the Tuesday of the survey, which means that there were over 1,200 parking spaces available. Even though weekday parking occupancy data are not available for the overall downtown, it can be surmised that there are ample available parking spaces during the weekday p.m. commute peak period throughout downtown.

Since the Project would meet the City's parking requirement for the proposed land use, these 300 parking spaces would not be needed to serve the proposed Project. Therefore, it would provide spaces for other downtown and surrounding uses. While the locations of the proposed Garage C and Garage D, at the eastern edge of the Pedestrian Retail District, would be convenient for Broadway Plaza, these garages would not likely be the most attractive choices for other downtown uses when other more close-in parking options would be available.

⁴ Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates, *City of Walnut Creek Downtown Parking and Transportation Study Final Report*, July 2006.

⁵ Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., Memorandum to Chuck Davis, The Macerich Company, *Broadway Plaza – Existing Parking Demand Evaluation, Projected Parking Occupancy, and Valet Needs Determination*, 4 April 2008.

The Alternative 5 would not result in significant transportation impacts during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours because 1) parking in itself does not generate new traffic; 2) ample parking spaces in the downtown area are currently available; therefore, no induced growth is projected because of the additional parking spaces; and 3) more convenient parking locations are available; therefore, no diverted trip is projected because of the additional parking spaces.

5.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines requires that the EIR identify an environmentally superior alternative (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6), which is the CEQA alternative that reduces or avoids to the greatest extent the environmental impacts identified for the Project. The evaluation below first considers the extent to which each of the CEQA alternatives reduces or avoids the significant and unavoidable impacts identified with the Project. The extent to which an alternative reduces or avoids less-than-significant impacts identified with the Project is also considered, balanced by consideration of the extent to which the impact affects the physical environment. The comparison of impacts resulting with the Project and all of the alternatives discussed in this chapter is summarized in **Table 5-18**, Summary Comparison of Impacts, at the end of this chapter.

5.5.1 Assessment of Environmentally Superior Alternative

Alternative 3, the No Project Alternative, has the fewest significant impacts and reduces significant air quality, greenhouse gases and noise impacts that were identified with the Project to less than significant levels (Impacts AIR-3, GHG-1, NOI-1 and NOI-2). Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that if the No Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR shall identify another alternative as the environmentally superior alternative.

Alternative 2, the Reduced Development Alternative-96,000 Square-foot Expansion, is considered the environmentally superior alternative because it would avoid and/or substantially reduce significant impacts of the Project to the greatest extent compared to the other action alternative. Specifically, Alternative 2 would reduce exposure of persons to substantial levels of Toxic Air Contaminants during construction activities to a level that is less than significant with mitigation, compared to the Project, which would result in a significant and potentially unavoidable impact (Impact AIR-3). All other impacts resulting with the Project would continue to occur with Alternative 2. However, because the alternative would develop substantially less net new development and result in less new population on site, the less-than-significant effects identified for all other topics, would also occur to a lesser degree than would occur with the Project.

Under Alternative 2, the total net expansion at the Project Site would be approximately 203,984 square feet less than with the Project. The total amount of demolition would be approximately 114,016 square feet of space less than would be proposed with the Project, and new construction would be approximately 203,984 square feet less than proposed with the Project. Similar to the Project, this alternative would require a General Plan Amendment

applicable to all parcels (except Parcel 2) to increase the FAR to 0.80. This alternative does not have a residential component, and therefore, no change in land use category would be required. Further, this alternative would include a new PD zoning district to establish a shared FAR and long term development and design criteria for all parcels. Alternative 2 would comply with the land use, plans, and policies as fully as with the Project.

**TABLE 5-18
SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.	Proposed Project		Alternative 1		Alternative 2	Alternative 3
	Maximum Commercial	Maximum Mixed-Use	Maximum Commercial	Maximum Mixed-Use		
Air Quality						
Impact AIR-1: Activities associated with demolition, site preparation, and construction would generate short-term emissions of criteria pollutants, including suspended and inhalable particulate matter and equipment exhaust emissions (Criteria 1 and 2).	LSM	LSM	LSM↓	LSM↓	LSM↓	LS↓
Impact AIR-2: Operation of the Project would result in increased long-term emissions of criteria pollutants (Criteria 1 and 2).	LSM	LSM	LS↓	LSM↓	LS↓	LS↓
Impact AIR-3: The Project would expose persons to substantial levels of TACs, during short-term construction activities, which may lead to adverse health effects (Criteria 4).	PS	PS	PS↓	PS↓	LSM	LS
Impact AIR-4: The Project, together with anticipated cumulative development in the Bay Area Air Basin, would contribute to regional criteria pollutants (Criterion 3).	LSM	LSM	LSM↓	LSM↓	LSM↓	LSM↓
Biological Resources						
Impact BIO-1: The Project could negatively impact special-status wildlife species (Criterion 1).	LS	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
Impact BIO-2: The Project would not impact sensitive natural communities recognized by CDFG, such as riparian woodland or freshwater wetland (Criterion 2).	LS	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
Impact BIO-3: The Project would not impact jurisdictional waters, including wetlands and other waters of the U.S. within San Ramon Creek (Criterion 3).	LS	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
Impact BIO-4: The Project would not impact movement of wildlife species, active wildlife corridors, or wildlife nursery sites (Criterion 4).	LS	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
Cultural Resources						
Impact CUL-1: The Project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource (Criterion 1).	LS	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
Impact CUL-2: The Project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource (Criterion 2).	LS	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓

Legend

- LS Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
 LSM Less than significant impact, after mitigation
 S Significant impact, mitigation required to lower impact to less than significant level
 PS Significant impact, mitigation measures may be able to reduce impact to less-than-significant level
 SU Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
 N No impact
 ↑↓ Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation, but with no change in impact determination; **Changes from proposed project impact determination shown in bold.**

TABLE 5-18 (Continued)
SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.	Proposed Project		Alternative 1		Alternative 2	Alternative 3
	Maximum Commercial	Maximum Mixed-Use	Maximum Commercial	Maximum Mixed-Use		
Impact CUL-3: The Project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature (Criterion 3).	LS	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
Impact CUL-4: The Project could disturb human remains (Criterion 4).	LS	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
Impact CUL-5: The Project, combined with cumulative development, including past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development, could result in a significant adverse cumulative cultural resources impact.	LS	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change						
Impact GHG-1: Construction and operation of the Project would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution towards global climate change (Criterion 1).	SU	SU	SU↓	SU↓	SU↓	SU↓
Impact GHG-2: The Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an appropriate regulatory agency adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions (Criterion 2).	LS	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
Hazards and Hazardous Materials						
Impact HAZ-1: The Project could encounter contamination from past releases of hazardous materials in the area of the Project Site, such as from underground fuel storage tanks, could potentially expose residents or workers to hazardous materials or wastes (Criteria 1 and 4).	LSM	LSM	LSM↓	LSM↓	LSM↓	LSM↓
Noise and Vibration						
Impact NOI-1: Construction activities of the Project would expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in General Plan 2025 (Criterion 1).	SU	SU	SU↓	SU↓	SU↓	LS
Impact NOI-2: Traffic generated by the Project, in combination with traffic from past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could substantially increase traffic noise levels in the Project Area; and construction and operational noise levels in combination with traffic from past, present, existing, approved, pending and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could increase ambient noise levels if reasonably foreseeable future projects are constructed simultaneously with the Project	SU	SU	SU↓	SU↓	SU↓	LS

Legend

LS	Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required
LSM	Less than significant impact, after mitigation
S	Significant impact, mitigation required to lower impact to less than significant level
PS	Significant impact, mitigation measures may be able to reduce impact to less-than-significant level
SU	Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation
N	No impact
↑↓	Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation, but with no change in impact determination; Changes from proposed project impact determination shown in bold.

TABLE 5-18 (Continued)
SUMMARY COMPARISON OF IMPACTS: PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

NOTE: Significance levels shown in the table reflect levels of significance after mitigation and indicate maximum impact during buildout and operation, unless otherwise specified.	Proposed Project		Alternative 1		Alternative 2	Alternative 3
	Maximum Commercial	Maximum Mixed-Use	Maximum Commercial	Maximum Mixed-Use		
Transportation and Circulation						
Impact TRA-1: The Project, under both scenarios, could substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses (Criterion 4).	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM	LSM
Impact TRA-2: Remediation, demolition and construction activities associated with the Project, under both scenarios, would result in temporary circulation impacts on the street system (Criteria 1, 4, and 6).	LSM	LSM	LSM↓	LSM↓	LSM↓	LSM↓
Utilities and Service Systems						
Impact UTIL-1: The Project would result in temporary adverse effects on solid waste landfill capacity (Criterion 6).	LSM	LSM	LSM↓	LSM↓	LSM↓	LSM↓

Legend

LS Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required

LSM Less than significant impact, after mitigation

S Significant impact, mitigation required to lower impact to less than significant level

PS Significant impact, mitigation measures may be able to reduce impact to less-than-significant level

SU Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, after mitigation

N No impact

↑↓ Impact is more severe or less severe than project impact, after mitigation, but with no change in impact determination; **Changes from proposed project impact determination shown in bold.**