8.0 Project Alternatives

8.1 Introduction

A key purpose of an environmental impact report (EIR) is to identify potential alternatives to the project, including alternatives considered but rejected, a no project alternative, and the environmentally superior alternative. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines require an EIR to address a range of reasonable alternatives to the project. CEQA does not require an EIR to consider every conceivable alternative to a project; however, the Lead Agency must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives. Because the proposed Project involves roadway connections and traffic control devices, alternatives considered involve alternate routes and phased implementation or changes to the circulation network.

Typically an EIR would evaluate one proposed project in detail and provide a discussion of alternatives to the project in the Alternatives chapter. The structure of this DEIR is unique in that the City has not selected a preferred project. It was determined that all four alternatives or circulation scenarios would be fully evaluated in this DEIR to ensure that decision makers have sufficient information in the DEIR necessary to select a preferred project. The four scenarios are considered feasible alternatives and are referred to as Scenarios 1 through 4 in this section for consistency. With the full analysis of the alternatives provided in Section 3.0, this section of the DEIR provides a comparison of the alternatives, and additionally identifies those which fulfill the no project alternative and environmentally superior alternative under CEQA.

8.1.1 Project Objectives

The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15124[b]) require that a project description contain a statement of objectives including the underlying purpose of the project. The overall objective of the proposed Project is to evaluate and resolve the General Plan 2025 goals and policies relative to the status of the gates, the connection of Overlook Parkway, and a connection from Washington Street to the SR-91 freeway. The project objectives address:

- Public safety concerns related to both emergency vehicle access and increased traffic volumes within residential neighborhoods associated with the gates on Green Orchard Place and Crystal View Terrace;

- Traffic patterns related to the Overlook Parkway connection and the connection westerly of Washington Avenue consistent with the General Plan 2025;

- Comprehensive circulation system, including multiple modes of transportation such as bikeways and pedestrian routes consistent with the General Plan 2025;

- Historic integrity of Victoria Avenue and the Gage Canal as well as designations which protect the Arlington Heights Greenbelt, and Proposition R and Measure C consistent with the General Plan 2025.

8.1.2 Rationale for Alternative Selection

In accordance with Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR shall describe "a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to the project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making. . . ."

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f) states that "the range of alternatives in an EIR is governed by the 'rule of reason' that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice." The CEQA Guidelines provide several factors that may be considered with regard to the feasibility of an alternative: (1) site suitability; (2) economic viability; (3) availability of infrastructure; (4) general plan consistency; (5) other plans or regulatory limitations; (6) jurisdictional boundaries; and (7) whether the project applicant can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site (if an off-site alternative is evaluated).

The alternatives "fully evaluated" pursuant to CEQA Section 15126.6(d), and summarized in this section, include the four circulation scenarios analyzed in Section 3.0 of this DEIR. A conclusion regarding each of the scenario's (alternatives) ability to avoid or minimize significant impacts is included in this section and is intended to allow for informed decision making and public participation. Additionally, the four scenarios provide enough variation to also serve as a "reasonable range of alternatives," as required pursuant to CEQA Section 15126.6(a).

8.1.3 Alternatives Considered But Rejected

The CEQA Guidelines state that the EIR needs to examine in detail only the alternatives the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. Further, the EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Among the factors used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in the EIR are: failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, or inability to avoid or lessen significant environmental effects (Guidelines 15126.6(c)).

Several alternatives, in addition to the four scenarios, were considered, but were rejected from further analysis. These alternatives were considered but rejected from further analysis because they do not reduce impacts compared to the four project scenarios. One alternative represents an optional four-lane configuration for the bridge portion of Overlook Parkway in the east, and three alternatives represent alternative routes considered for a route for the Proposed C Street. The City conducted preliminary traffic model runs for the three alternate routes near the western terminus of Overlook Parkway. During the course of conducting this modeling, one alternative route (Proposed C Street under Scenario 4) was selected for further study at an equal level of study for all scenarios. Of key importance to the decision to select this route was traffic flow at the intersection of Victoria Avenue and Washington Street, combined with the feasibility of roadway engineering and cost compared to the other three alternative routes described below.

8.1.3.1 Overlook Parkway – Stripe to Four Lanes Alternative

Under the *Overlook Parkway - Stripe to Four Lanes Alternative*, the connection of Overlook Parkway easterly to Alessandro Boulevard and across the Alessandro Arroyo would be constructed in a similar alignment as proposed under Scenarios 3 and 4: 88 feet of curb-to-curb improvements with a 12-foot median, within a 110-foot right-of-way. However, under this alternative, Overlook Parkway would be striped as a four-lane arterial in the near-term for the bridge over the Alessandro Arroyo. The General Plan 2025 Master Plan of Roadways exhibit includes a note which specifies that, “Overlook Parkway shall be a 2-lane, 110-foot arterial with a wide median parkway...” Additionally, General Plan 2025 Policy CCM-4.1 limits the Overlook Parkway completion over the arroyo to a two-lane roadway within a 110-foot right-of-way.

Because striping to four lanes in this segment is not consistent with the General Plan 2025, this alternative would require an additional discretionary action to amend Policy CCM-4.1. Although the easterly connection of Overlook Parkway would allow for the provision of the four lanes, as proposed under this alternative, limiting the bridge segment to two lanes in the near-term can serve as a deterrent to cut-through traffic and as a traffic calming measure especially when used in combination with other devices, signage, and design treatments. Striping Overlook Parkway to four lanes over the bridge segment was not considered for further analysis as it would not reduce any of the impacts associated with the connection of Overlook Parkway in Scenarios 3 and 4.

8.1.3.2 Proposed C Street - Madison Street Extension Alternative

The *Proposed C Street - Madison Street Extension Alternative* provides an alternate route for the connection to SR-91. This alignment involves an alternative alignment for Proposed C Street from the existing terminus of Overlook Parkway to the existing

intersection of Madison Street and Victoria Avenue (Figure 8-1). This alternative involves construction of a new roadway as well as improvements to existing segments of Madison Street. The extension of the Proposed C Street under this alternative would begin at the existing Overlook Parkway/Washington Street intersection, and then continue west toward the existing three-way intersection at Madison Street, Dufferin Avenue, and Prenda Avenue. From here, the alignment would continue along the existing segment of Madison Street before connecting at the Victoria Avenue/Madison Street intersection. The alignment would traverse west of the residential area within the Arlington Heights Greenbelt and would not involve the closure of Washington Street or Dufferin Avenue.

With construction of the Proposed C Street under this alternative, Prenda Avenue would connect to Madison Street 250 feet west of the realigned Dufferin Avenue/Madison Street intersection. Pontoosuc Avenue would provide a new access route to Dufferin Avenue. Realignment of Dufferin Avenue would give motorists the added option to use Jefferson Street or Adams Street to connect to SR-91. Madison Street improvements would terminate approximately 100 feet north of the Victoria Avenue/Madison Street intersection. South of Victoria Avenue, Madison Street would become the Proposed C Street.

Improvements to Victoria Avenue would consist of minor right-of-way acquisition and improvements for ADA accessibility. A traffic signal at the Victoria Avenue/Madison Street intersection would likely be required in order to accommodate the anticipated increase in traffic volumes; however, a thorough traffic study would be necessary to justify this need.

The proposed alignment would consist of a four-lane arterial with an 80-foot right-of-way. Madison Street currently is a two-lane arterial with design speeds of 40-45 miles per hour (mph). Existing posted signs along Madison Street alert vehicles to slow to 25 mph due to curves leading into the residential area. Design speeds for the improved route would vary between 35-45 mph. Under this alternative, the proposed alignment would include a wider curve, allowing a smoother transition requiring no less than a 35 mph zone.

This alternative was removed from further consideration for a variety of engineering and acquisition reasons and rejected from further study on environmental grounds. Generally, impacts under this alternative would be similar to Scenario 4; however, this alternative route would not reduce significant impacts over and above those caused by the Scenario 4. This proposed alternative alignment would cross the Gage Canal, undeveloped parcels, and would result in minor impacts to driveways and adjacent citrus groves. The land use along this alignment is primarily residential and agricultural. This alternative also has the potential to draw more traffic onto Madison, which is located further into the Arlington Heights Greenbelt. This alignment for Proposed Street C would require significant right of way taking to widen Madison at an additional cost to the City.

Source: Boyle Engineering Corporation

PROP. ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS

FIGURE 8-1

Proposed C Street - Madison Street Extension Alternative

RECON

M:\JOBS4\6103\air\graphics\fig8-1.ai 04/27/12

The traffic and physical alignment would adversely affect the residential area between Dufferin and Victoria Avenues, create adverse agricultural impacts, and encroach into private properties. For these reasons, this alternative was not considered for further analysis.

8.1.3.3 Proposed C Street – Victoria Underpass Alternative

The *Proposed C Street– Victoria Underpass Alternative* involves an alternate alignment for a connection in the west. Under this alternative, the Proposed C Street would begin at the existing Overlook Parkway/Washington Street intersection and extend in the northerly direction toward the SR-91. In order to avoid impacts to Victoria Avenue, the alignment would include an underpass at Victoria Avenue (Figure 8-2). In order to protect views and features which contribute to the historic character along Victoria Avenue, the underpass would begin transitioning to a below-grade roadway several hundred feet south of Victoria Avenue. North of this intersection, the Proposed C Street would include two 350-foot-radius curves and would branch off in both the eastern and western directions connecting at Madison Street and Washington Street. The two legs that branch off the main alignment would serve as one-directional (one-way) arterials; the eastern leg would connect traffic to Washington Street, while the western leg would connect traffic to the main alignment from Madison Street. This configuration would enable southbound motorists traveling along Madison Street to continue to the Overlook Parkway/Washington Street intersection by way of the west leg of the proposed alignment of the Proposed C Street.

From a circulation standpoint, this alternative would provide limited access to Madison/Washington by the creation of one-way routes, and the alignment would not be effective in accommodating northbound traffic traveling to SR-91. A stop sign would be added at the realigned intersection of Madison Street, where access would be provided to Victoria Avenue and the surrounding local streets. Similarly, Washington Street at the east end of the Proposed C Street alignment would have a new signalized intersection due to sight-distance constraints. The residential area surrounding this alternative Proposed C Street alignment would maintain its access to Washington Street, Madison Street, and Dufferin Avenue.

Improvements to Washington Street under this alternative would include widening the existing two-lane roadway to four lanes from Victoria Avenue to Indiana Avenue. Lenox Avenue would be realigned, providing a connection to the new Proposed C Street alignment and existing Washington Street. Dufferin Avenue would also have a connection to the new Proposed C Street alignment. North of the Overlook Parkway/Washington Street intersection and just south of existing Lenox Avenue, a section of Washington Street would terminate in a cul-de-sac, and a portion of the street would be vacated.

Source: Boyle Engineering Corporation

PROP. ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS

FIGURE 8-2

Proposed C Street – Victoria Underpass Alternative

RECON

M:\JOBS4\6103\air\graphics\fig8-2.ai 04/27/12

This proposed alignment would cross the Gage Canal, undeveloped parcels, and citrus groves. The Proposed C Street alignment proposed under this alternative would consist of a four-lane arterial with an 80-foot right-of-way. Madison Street exists as a four-lane arterial. The alignment east of Victoria Avenue would be a four-lane arterial with a design speed of 45 mph; design speeds would be reduced to 25 mph on the one-way roadways branching off to the east and west.

Of the four routes in the west, this alternative would have reduced impacts to intersections in this area of the Project vicinity and would meet Project objectives similar to the alignment analyzed under Scenario 4; however, this alternative has the potential to result in increased construction-related and historic impacts. This alternate route and an underpass to bypass the Victoria Avenue/Washington Street intersection would require the taking of private properties above and beyond that of the Proposed Project under Scenario 4. This alternative alignment would result in greater impacts than the proposed Project associated with the additional grading and excavation that would be required. The construction of an underpass would require significant soils excavation and grading, resulting in potentially significant construction air quality impacts over and above the impacts that would result from the proposed Project. In addition, although the underpass is intended to avoid Victoria, the scale of the underpass could have potentially significant aesthetics impacts near Victoria Avenue, which is currently dominated by agriculture and residential uses, or compromise the integrity of Victoria Avenue. In order to provide a north-south roadway that transitions to below-grade under Victoria Avenue, retaining walls for the underpass would be required leading up to Victoria Avenue. Such impacts would be contrary to one of the four project objectives, in addition to being contrary to the City's General Plan 2025, which has policies to protect Victoria Avenue. In addition, the underpass design would require intersection improvements along Victoria Avenue. Further, the expense of engineering such an underpass, particularly when added to the costs of acquiring the multiple private properties and construction costs associated with grading and creating the underpass is significantly increased (107 percent increase) and prohibitive compared to the Proposed Street C under Scenario 4. For these reasons, this route was considered infeasible as a viable alternative.

8.1.3.4 Washington Street and Lincoln Street Improvements Alternative (No Proposed C Street)

The purpose of the *Washington Street and Lincoln Street Improvements Alternative* is to provide an alignment that minimizes the amount of required construction and right-of-way acquisition from construction of new roadways (e.g., the Proposed C Street) by improving existing roadways along Washington Street and Lincoln Avenue. Reconstruction of existing Washington Street would consist of increasing the number of lanes from two to four between Overlook Parkway and Lincoln Avenue (Figure 8-3).

Source: Boyle Engineering Corporation

PROP. ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS

FIGURE 8-3

Washington Street and Lincoln Street Improvements (No Proposed C Street)

RECON

M:\JOBS4\6103\air\graphics\fig8-3.ai 04/27/12

Washington Street is currently a two-lane arterial between Overlook Parkway and Lincoln Avenue. The right-of-way is 80 feet, with curb-to-curb widths of 40 feet. Lincoln Avenue is also an existing two-lane roadway with a right-of-way of 80 feet. Widening would primarily occur to the west side of Washington Street and both sides of Lincoln Avenue. Widening the two existing roadways would necessitate the acquisition of right-of-way from adjacent properties. Lincoln Avenue and Washington Street are bordered by homes on either side, and widening would involve redesign of driveways/parkways and the removal/replacement of light/electrical poles, catch basins, etc. Traffic signal modifications on existing signals also would be needed to accommodate the additional lanes.

The Washington Street/Victoria Avenue intersection is a four-way stop, which consists of two northbound lanes and one southbound lane. Minor improvements to this intersection would be necessary. The intersection would maintain the four-way stop. Widening would be required to an achieve 88-foot right-of-way and two northbound/southbound lanes.

The advantage of widening Washington Street and Lincoln Avenue depends greatly on whether the easterly connection of Overlook Parkway to Alessandro Boulevard is completed or not. Similar to Scenario 4, the completion of Overlook Parkway in the east would be required in order to have a more functional circulation network. With the easterly Overlook Parkway extension completed, intra-city commuters would take Overlook Parkway to Washington Street to then connect to the SR-91. Currently, the Victoria Avenue/Washington Street and Lincoln Avenue/Washington Street intersections are four-way stops. Due to the facilities' anticipated increase in capacity after improvements, the stop sign at the Lincoln Avenue/Washington Street intersection likely would need to be replaced by traffic signals. The Madison Street/Lincoln Avenue intersection has a traffic signal; however, due to the addition of lanes, these signals likely would need modification under this alternative.

If the easterly connection of Overlook Parkway were not completed, the alignment of this alternative would serve primarily local traffic from the residential areas. In this case, the improved route would still accommodate anticipated increase in traffic volumes; however, projected traffic volumes may not warrant traffic signals at the Victoria Avenue/Washington Street and Lincoln Avenue/Washington Street intersections.

Similar to the other alternate routes for Proposed C Street, this alternative was not considered for further analysis as it would not reduce traffic impacts. Preliminary traffic model runs indicated that this route could increase traffic impacts in the network. Similar to Scenario 4, improvements to intersections along Victoria Avenue would be warranted that could change or affect the historic character, and therefore, this alternative would also result in significant unavoidable impacts to historical resources.

Although this alternative would reduce some impacts of Scenario 4 associated with placing a new roadway within the Arlington Heights Greenbelt, widening both Washington Street and Lincoln Avenue would necessitate the acquisition of right-of-way from adjacent properties. The construction costs and additional right-of-way acquisition costs are significantly increased (57 percent) and prohibitive compared to the Proposed Street C under Scenario 4. Lincoln Avenue and Washington Street are bordered by homes on either side, and widening could involve redesign of driveways/parkways and the removal/replacement of light/electrical poles, catch basins, etc. These modifications would result in other potential new impacts and costs not associated with the proposed Project. In addition, this alternative has the potential to create significant delays at the BNSF rail crossing on Madison and cause more traffic to use Victoria Avenue in order to access SR-91.

Overall, this alternative would result in more impacts to intersections and links in the western portion of the Project vicinity. In addition, this route does not provide the westerly connection anticipated and described in the City's General Plan 2025 and would not meet the project's objectives concerning comprehensive traffic patterns and circulation. Widening of Washington Street and Lincoln Streets would require construction that could have potential associated impacts to air quality and noise. Thus, this alternative was rejected on environmental grounds, and was not considered for further analysis.

8.1.4 Summary of Alternatives

Table 8-1 provides a general comparison of the impacts of the four scenarios which are fully described in Section 3.0 of this DEIR and summarized below under each of the scenarios. As discussed in Section 3.0, the various scenarios could result in the following:

- **significant, unavoidable** environmental impacts related to: cultural resources (historic), greenhouse gases (emissions), noise (vehicular traffic), and traffic (2035 LOS impacts; consistency with the Congestion Management Plan);

- impacts that would be reduced to a **less than significant level, with mitigation** to: biological resources; cultural resources (archaeological and paleontological resources); noise (construction noise); and traffic (2011 LOS impacts, and emergency access); and

- **less than significant** impacts to all other issues: agriculture, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, energy, population and housing, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems.

TABLE 8-1
COMPARISON OF SCENARIO IMPACTS

Environmental Issue	**Scenario 1** Environmentally Superior Alternative	**Scenario 2** No Project Alternative (Existing Condition)	**Scenario 3** No Project/Adopted Plan Alternative (Development Consistent with the General Plan 2025)	**Scenario 4**
3.1 Agricultural Resources				
Farmland Conversion	No Impact	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Conflict with Zoning or Williamson Act Contract	No Impact	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.2 Air Quality				
Air Quality Plan Implementation	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
Construction Emissions	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
Operational Emissions	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
Sensitive Receptors (hot spots and air toxics)	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
Odors	No impact	No impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.3 Biological Resources				
Special Status Species	No impact	No impact	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated
Riparian Wetland	No Impact	No impact	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated
Wildlife Corridors	No Impact	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Local Policies and Ordinances	No impact	No impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Conservation Plans	No impact	No impact	Less than significant	Less than significant

TABLE 8-1
COMPARISON OF SCENARIO IMPACTS
(continued)

Environmental Issue	**Scenario 1** Environmentally Superior Alternative	**Scenario 2** No Project Alternative (Existing Condition)	**Scenario 3** No Project/Adopted Plan Alternative (Development Consistent with the General Plan 2025)	**Scenario 4**
3.4 Cultural/Historical/Paleontological				
Historic Resources (Built Environment)	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	Significant and unavoidable
Archaeological Resources	No Impact	No Impact	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated
Paleontological	No Impact	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated
Human Remains	No Impact	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.5 Hydrology and Water Quality				
Water Quality Standards/Run-off	No Impact	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Groundwater	No Impact	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Drainage Patterns (Erosion/Siltation/Flooding)	No Impact	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.6 Energy Use and Conservation				
Electric Power	No impact	No impact	No impact	No impact
Fuel	No impact	No impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.7 Geology and Soils				
Seismic Hazards	No Impact	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Soil Erosion	No Impact	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Unstable and Expansive Soils	No Impact	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant

TABLE 8-1
COMPARISON OF SCENARIO IMPACTS
(continued)

Environmental Issue	**Scenario 1** Environmentally Superior Alternative	**Scenario 2** No Project Alternative (Existing Condition)	**Scenario 3** No Project/Adopted Plan Alternative (Development Consistent with the General Plan 2025)	**Scenario 4**
3.8 Greenhouse Gases				
GHG Emissions (Total)	Significant and unavoidable	Less than significant	Significant and unavoidable	Less than significant
Consistency with Plans, Policies, and Regulations	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.9 Land Use and Aesthetics				
Physically divide an established community	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
Plan Consistency/Regulatory Conformance	Significant and unavoidable	Significant and unavoidable	Significant and unavoidable	Significant and unavoidable
Habitat Conservation Plan	No impact	No impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Scenic Resources and Vistas	No impact	No impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
Visual Character/Light and Glare	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
3.10 Noise				
Traffic Noise Exposure– Existing Roadways	Less than significant	Less than significant	Significant and unavoidable	Significant and unavoidable
Traffic Noise Exposure – New and Gated Roadways	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Significant and unavoidable
Construction Noise	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
Permanent Ambient Noise Increase	Less than significant	Less than significant	Significant and unavoidable	Significant and unavoidable
Temporary ambient Noise Increase	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant

TABLE 8-1
COMPARISON OF SCENARIO IMPACTS
(continued)

Environmental Issue	**Scenario 1** Environmentally Superior Alternative	**Scenario 2** No Project Alternative (Existing Condition)	**Scenario 3** No Project/Adopted Plan Alternative (Development Consistent with the General Plan 2025)	**Scenario 4**
3.11 Transportation/Traffic				
1. Circulation System				
1a. City of Riverside Significance Criteria				
Year 2011 – Gates Closed				
Intersections	Less than significant	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated
Roadway Links	Less than significant	Significant and unavoidable	Significant and unavoidable	Significant and unavoidable
Year 2011 – Gates Open				
Intersections	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated
Roadway Links	Significant and unavoidable	Less than significant	Significant and unavoidable	Significant and unavoidable
Year 2035 – Gates Closed				
Intersections	No Impact	Significant and unavoidable after mitigation incorporated (at six locations)	Significant and unavoidable after mitigation incorporated (at five locations)	Significant and unavoidable after mitigation incorporated (at four locations)
Roadway Links	No Impact	Significant and unavoidable (at six locations)	Significant and unavoidable (at five locations)	Significant and unavoidable (at five locations)
Year 2035 – Gates Open				
Intersections	Significant and unavoidable after mitigation incorporated (at four locations)	No Impact	Significant and unavoidable after mitigation incorporated (at five locations)	Significant and unavoidable after mitigation incorporated (at three locations)
Roadway Links	Significant and unavoidable (at eight locations)	No Impact	Significant and unavoidable (at five locations)	Significant and unavoidable (at five locations)
1b. Potential Cut-through Traffic	No Impact	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant
1c. Construction Traffic	No Impact	No Impact	Less than significant	Less than significant

TABLE 8-1
COMPARISON OF SCENARIO IMPACTS
(continued)

Environmental Issue	**Scenario 1** Environmentally Superior Alternative	**Scenario 2** No Project Alternative (Existing Condition)	**Scenario 3** No Project/Adopted Plan Alternative (Development Consistent with the General Plan 2025)	**Scenario 4**
3.11 Transportation/Traffic (continued)				
2. Conflict with Congestion Management Programs	Significant and unavoidable after mitigation	Significant and unavoidable after mitigation	Significant and unavoidable after mitigation	Significant and unavoidable after mitigation
3. Emergency Access	Less than significant with mitigation incorporated	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
4. Traffic Hazards	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
5. Conflict with adopted plans, policies, or programs regarding transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant

8.1.5 Identification of No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative is addressed to compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state against environmental effects which would occur if the project is approved. "No project" can be interpreted as no development or maintaining the existing condition. As discussed throughout this DEIR, Scenario 2 (with gates open) most closely represents the existing condition at the time of the release of the NOP. Although the gates would be removed under Scenario 2, this would be a minor alteration to the physical setting. Therefore, Scenario 2, which is fully analyzed, meets the requirements of the No Project Alternative (Existing Condition), as required pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e).

"No project" can also be interpreted as development under an adopted plan. Scenario 3 would meet the requirements of the No Project/Adopted Plan Alternative (Development Consistent with the General Plan 2025). This alternative includes improvements that what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if they were to proceed based on the plans and policies of the adopted General Plan 2025, specifically implementation of the Master Plan of Roadways (Figure 2-3).

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A) states:

> When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy or ongoing operation, the "no project" alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan, policy, or operation into the future. Typically this is a situation where other projects initiated under the existing plan will continue while the new plan is developed.

Both Scenarios 2 and 3 are discussed further below in Section 8.3 and 8.4, respectively.

8.1.6 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e)(2) requires that an EIR identify the "environmentally superior alternative" based on the evaluation of the project and its alternatives. Considerations relevant to the identification and discussion of the environmentally superior alternative include a proposal which contemplates less development than the proposed project and which correspondingly reduces most or all of the proposed project's adverse environmental impacts. As described in Section 3.0 and summarized in Table 8-1, Scenario 2 (also a No Project Alternative) would be the environmentally superior alternative.

When a No Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative from the other alternatives.

Because Scenario 2 serves as the No Project Alternative and represents the current physical condition (gates open), another alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative. Due to the lack of construction activities and ground disturbance, Scenario 1 would result in the fewest impacts compared to Scenarios 3 and 4 and is therefore identified as the environmentally superior alternative. Scenario 1 is described under Section 8.2.

8.2 Scenario 1: Gates Closed to Through Traffic, No Connection of Overlook Parkway

Scenario 1 includes only one action – the existing Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place gates would be maintained as a traffic control device and closed to all traffic except emergency vehicles. This scenario is described in Section 2.6.1 of this DEIR.

8.2.1 Summary of the Environmental Impact Analysis

Table 8-2 summarizes the impacts from all scenarios. Scenario 1 proposes no construction, and would, therefore, result in less ground disturbance than Scenarios 3 and 4. Because Scenario 1 does not include any construction, grading, or ground disturbing activity, impacts relative to several issues would be less for this alternative as compared to the development alternatives (Scenarios 3 and 4), which include ground disturbing activities which result in impacts to air quality (construction emissions), biological resources, cultural resources (archaeological and paleontological resources), hydrology and water quality, energy, geology and soils, and noise (construction and vehicles).

All scenarios would have a significant impact related to land use as a result of inconsistency with a policy related to traffic impacts; however, overall land use and aesthetics impacts would be less under this scenario as compared to Scenarios 3 and 4 because there would be no change to the existing visual environment. Due to the presence of the gates and the lack of roadway connections, Scenario 1 would also result in impacts relative to GHG emissions (VMT) and emergency access (increased response times for emergency personnel). This latter impact is unique to Scenario 1, but it would be reduced to a level less than significant with mitigation.

All scenarios result in a similar level of impacts to intersections and links. Overall, most traffic-related can be reduced to less than significant with mitigation in the near term (2011); however, there are multiple significant impacts at buildout (2035), some of which remain significant after mitigation. Scenario 2 results in the most significant and unavoidable impacts to intersections in 2035, followed by Scenario 1. Both Scenarios 1 and 2 result in the most significant and unavoidable impacts to roadway links in 2035

(see Tables 3.11-40 and 3.11-41). Because traffic impacts affect Congestion Management Plan (CMP) roadways, all scenarios would result significant unavoidable impacts where the mitigation has been determined to be infeasible. In addition, the off-site improvements (i.e., traffic mitigation) would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to four intersections along Victoria Avenue, similar to Scenarios 2 and 3. However, whether to implement off-site improvements is under the discretion of the decision-making body, and those improvements are not part of the Project proposed by this alternative.

In summary, due to the limited scope of Scenario 1, this scenario would not result in construction-related impacts, but would result in impacts to traffic (emergency access and 2011 links) that would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. Scenario 1 would also result in significant, unavoidable impacts associated with: greenhouse gas emissions (VMT), as described in Section 3.8; land use (policy inconsistency with General Plan 2025), as described in Section 3.9, and traffic (impacts to roadway segments and intersections in 2035), as described in Section 3.11.

8.2.2 Relationship to Project Objectives

All of the scenarios meet the project objectives to a degree (see Table 8-1 below). Scenario 1 would attain or partially attain several Project objectives. This scenario would fail to fully meet objectives 1, 2, and 3. Under Scenario 1, the gates at Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would remain closed. The gates address concerns associated with increased traffic volumes on local streets. With implementation of mitigation, new gates would be installed to better accommodate emergency vehicles, however, the gates would not address the full range of public safety concerns or facilitate emergency access. Safety concerns regarding emergency evacuation by residents would remain.

Under Scenario 1, Overlook Parkway would not be constructed and the Proposed C Street would not be constructed, thus not allowing for a new western route, nor would any other roadway improvements occur. However, Scenario 1 would not change the City's Master Plan of Roadways. Scenario 1 would not remove Overlook Parkway from the Master Plan of Roadways, and therefore Overlook Parkway and/or a new connection in the west could be built in the future. However, this scenario does not advance the circulation network in the General Plan 2025 adopted for buildout of the City. Under this scenario, it is assumed that Overlook Parkway would not be connected in the near term; therefore, the planned connections and an improved traffic flow. The discontinuous bike paths and sidewalks that presently exist on Overlook Parkway would remain in their existing condition. These are all aspects of a comprehensive circulation system, a system that is planned to accommodate the City's growth as it reaches buildout.

Due to the limited scope Scenario 1 and the fact that no construction of new roadways is proposed, this scenario would meet objective 4 related to the preservation of historical resources and the Arlington Heights Greenbelt. Scenario 1 does not propose any new roadways in or near the Greenbelt. Although mitigation for intersection impacts at Victoria Avenue may be necessitated to reduce traffic impacts at intersections, whether to implement those improvements is under the discretion of the decision-making body, and those improvements are not part of the Project proposed by this alternative.

TABLE 8-2
COMPARISON OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND SCENARIOS

Project Objectives	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
Objective 1: Address public safety concerns related to both emergency vehicle access and increased traffic volumes within residential neighborhoods associated with the gates on Green Orchard Place and Crystal View Terrace	Partially	Partially	Yes	Yes
Objective 2: Address traffic patterns related to the Overlook Parkway connection and the connection westerly of Washington Avenue	Not in the near term	Not in the near term	Partially	Yes
Objective 3: Address comprehensive circulation system, including multiple modes of transportation, including bikeways and pedestrian routes	Not in the near term	Not in the near term	Yes	Yes
Objective 4: Address the historic integrity of Victoria Avenue and the Gage Canal as well as designations which protect the Arlington Heights Greenbelt, and Proposition R and Measure C	Yes[1]	Yes[1]	Yes[1]	Partially[1]

[1] Off-site improvements at intersection along Victoria Avenue, if implementation, would result in significant unavoidable impacts under all scenarios.

8.3 Scenario 2: Gates Open, No Connection of Overlook Parkway

Under Scenario 2, the gates at both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would be removed and there would be no connection of Overlook Parkway across the Alessandro Arroyo and easterly to Alessandro Boulevard. The Proposed C Street also would not be constructed under this alternative, thus not allowing for a connection to SR-91. This scenario is described in Section 2.6.2 of this DEIR.

8.3.1 Summary of the Environmental Impact Analysis

Because Scenario 2 does not include any construction, grading, or ground disturbing activity, impacts relative to several issues would be less for this alternative as compared to the alternatives with proposed roadway connections in Scenarios 3 and 4 (see Table

8-1). The process to remove the gates is considered a routine procedure within the City's right-of-way. Therefore, impacts which result from ground disturbing activities would be reduced, including: agricultural resources, air quality (construction emissions), biological resources, cultural resources (archaeological and paleontological resources), hydrology and water quality, energy, geology and soils, GHG emissions (construction), and noise (construction and vehicles). GHG (VMT-related emissions) would be less under this scenario as compared to the other alternatives. Also, because the gates would be removed to allow access and improve traffic flow, impacts Scenario 2 would be less than Scenario 1. Without the gates, emergency access would be improved and response times would be reduced for fire and police department personnel.

Similar to Scenario 1, this scenario would have a significant impact related to land use as a result of inconsistency with a policy related to traffic impacts; however, overall land use and aesthetics impacts would be less under this scenario as compared to Scenarios 3 and 4 because there would be no change to the existing visual environment.

As illustrated in Table 8-1, Scenario 2, would result in significant, unavoidable impacts to land use (policy inconsistency with General Plan 2025), and to traffic (roadway segments and intersections within the traffic study area in 2035, CMP roadways). Compared to the other scenarios, Scenario 2 would result in the most significant and unavoidable impacts to intersections in 2035, and the same level of significant and unavoidable impacts to roadway links in 2035 as Scenario 1 (see Tables 3.11-40 and 3.11-41). In addition, the off-site improvements (i.e., traffic mitigation) would also result in significant and unavoidable impacts to four intersections along Victoria Avenue. However, whether to implement off-site improvements is under the discretion of the decision-making body, and those improvements are not part of the Project proposed by this alternative.

In summary, with no construction or new roadways proposed as part of Scenario 2, this scenario would have the least significant impacts as it relates to project activities and construction. With the gates open to traffic, VMT would be reduced compared to Scenario 1 and impacts from greenhouse gas emissions would also be less than significant. However, Scenario 2 would result in impacts to traffic, some of which can be reduced to a level less than significant with mitigation, and others which remain significant and unavoidable in both 2011 and 2035. All scenarios would result in a conflict with land use (policy inconsistency with General Plan 2025).

8.3.2 Relationship to Project Objectives

As summarized in Table 8-2, Scenario 2 would meet or partially meet several Project objectives. First, it would partially meet objective 1 in that under Scenario 2, the gates at Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would be removed allowing unimpeded access by emergency vehicles and emergency evacuation by residents. Traffic volumes

would increase on Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place and any increase in traffic raises safety concerns for some local residents, however traffic volumes in this neighborhood are within the capacity of the residential street classifications.

Because Overlook Parkway and the Proposed C Street would not be constructed, this Scenario would not facilitate additional connection in the east or west portion of the Project vicinity. Scenario 2 would also not immediately provide a comprehensive solution to the circulation system, including the connection of Overlook Parkway under objective 2 or the bikeways and other modes of transportation under objective 3. The discontinuous bike paths and sidewalks that presently exist on Overlook Parkway would remain in their existing condition. Scenario 2 would maintain the existing patterns of vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation within the Project vicinity. Overlook Parkway would remain as a two-lane, discontinuous roadway with no connection over the Alessandro Arroyo. Other capital improvements called for under the adopted General Plan 2025 (i.e., streetscape amenities such as landscaping and bicycle lanes) would not occur. However, Overlook Parkway would remain on the Master Plan of Roadways and could be constructed at a future date.

Without the Proposed C Street, this Scenario would maintain the Arlington Heights Greenbelt and Gage Canal as they currently are today. No improvements to intersections along Victoria Avenue are proposed as part of the Scenario. Similar to all scenarios, mitigation for intersection impacts along Victoria Avenue would be required to reduce traffic impacts. If implemented, impacts related to historical resources would be significant.

8.4 Scenario 3: Gates Open and Connection of Overlook Parkway

Under Scenario 3, the gates at Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would be removed, and Overlook Parkway would be connected between Via Vista Drive and Sandtrack Road and over the Alessandro Arroyo, allowing for a through connection to Alessandro Boulevard as identified in General Plan 2025. No connection to SR-91 through the construction of the Proposed C Street would occur. A complete description of the project components under Scenario 3 is provided in Section 2.6.3.

8.4.1 Summary of the Environmental Analysis

As illustrated Table 8-1, Scenario 3 would result in significant, unavoidable impacts associated with: greenhouse gas emissions (VMT); traffic noise on existing roadways, along with a permanent increase in ambient noise associated with vehicular traffic; and traffic impacts to roadway segments and intersections within the traffic study area in 2035. This alternative would result in significant, but mitigable, impacts to the following

issues areas: biological resources, cultural resources (archaeological resources), , and traffic (2011 LOS impacts).

Compared to Scenarios 1 and 2, Scenario 3 would have greater ground disturbance, and associated impacts from construction of roadway segments such as biological resources and cultural resources. However, Scenarios 3 and 4 provide roadway connections that improve traffic flow and therefore result in less significant unavoidable impacts to traffic in 2035 (see Tables 3.11-40 and 3.11-41).

For all scenarios, there would be a significant impact related to land use as a result of inconsistency with a General Plan 2025 policy related to traffic impacts and from significant unavoidable impacts to CMP roadways. For all alternatives, the off-site improvements (i.e., traffic mitigation) would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to four intersections along Victoria Avenue. However, whether to implement off-site improvements is under the discretion of the decision-making body, and those improvements are not part of the Project proposed by this alternative.

In summary, unlike Scenarios 1 and 2, the completion of Overlook Parkway would result in construction-related impacts to biological resources and cultural resources that would be reduced to a level less than significant with mitigation. In addition, with no construction or new roadways proposed as part of Scenario 2, this scenario would have the least significant impacts as it relates to project activities and construction. With the gates open to traffic, VMT would be reduced compared to Scenario 1 and impacts from greenhouse gas emissions would also be less than significant. However, Scenario 2 would result in impacts to traffic, some of which can be reduced to a level less than significant with mitigation, and others which remain significant and unavoidable in both 2011 and 2035. All scenarios would result in a conflict with land use (policy inconsistency with General Plan 2025).

8.4.2 Relationship to Project Objectives

Scenario 3 would meet or partially meet all of the project objectives. Project objectives (see Table 8-2). First, it would partially meet objective 1 in that under Scenario 3, the gates at Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would be removed, allowing unimpeded access by emergency vehicles and emergency evacuation by residents. As stated above, residential streets in this area would operate at acceptable levels. Scenario 3 also would partially meet objective 2, in that providing the easterly connection of Overlook Parkway would allow for a more direct route through the Alessandro Heights neighborhood to Washington Street.

Scenario 3 most closely represents the circulation element plans and policies of the adopted General Plan 2025. Scenario 3 would meet objective 3 in that the easterly connection of Overlook Parkway would provide a more complete circulation network,

including multiple modes of transportation, continuous bikeways, and pedestrian routes. Because a thorough traffic study was conducted for the proposed Project, Scenario 3 fulfills the need to study this route.

There would be increased connections in this area of the City for pedestrians and bike access as well as alternative transportation routes. However, the complete connection to the western portion of the City and SR-91 would not occur. Although this connection is anticipated in the General Plan 2025, this scenario would allow the connection of Overlook Parkway without the additional roadway in the western portion of the Project vicinity. Because of this, Scenario 3 would potentially provide greater protection of agricultural land in the Greenbelt while traffic would continue to use existing routes. Without construction of the Proposed C Street, this alternative would not result in new roadway alignments west of Washington in the Arlington Heights Greenbelt.

This alternative does not propose any improvements to Victoria Avenue. Although mitigation for intersections along Victoria Avenue may be necessitated to reduce traffic impacts at intersections, whether to implement those improvements is under the discretion of the decision-making body, and those improvements are not part of the Project proposed by this alternative.

8.5 Scenario 4: Gates Removed, Overlook Parkway Connected, and the Proposed Road C Constructed

Under Scenario 4, both Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place gates would be removed, and Overlook Parkway would be connected between Via Vista Drive and Sandtrack Road and over the Alessandro Arroyo. In addition, the Proposed C Street would be constructed west of Washington Street. The Proposed C Street would be located within the Arlington Heights Greenbelt and would intersect with Washington Street at the east and connect with Madison Avenue at the western end. A complete description of Scenario 4 is provided in Section 2.6.4.

8.5.1 Summary of the Environmental Impact Analysis

As illustrated in Table 8-1, Scenario 4 would result in significant, unavoidable impacts associated with historical resources; traffic noise on existing roadways, along with a permanent increase in ambient noise associated with vehicular traffic; land use inconsistency with General Plan 2025 policy for level of service on arterials; and impacts to CMP roadways; and traffic impacts to roadway segments and intersections within the traffic study area in 2035. Compared to Scenarios 1 and 2, the completion of roadways under Scenarios 3 and 4 would result in less significant and unavoidable impacts to intersections and links in 2035 (see Tables 3.11-40 and 3.11-41). In addition, the off-site

improvements (i.e., traffic mitigation) would result in significant and unavoidable impacts, similar to all other scenarios. Scenario 4, unlike the other three scenarios, would also have significant and unavoidable impacts to Victoria Avenue from the construction of the Proposed C Street at Victoria Avenue and Madison Street. Although the Project would reduce impacts to historic resources through design considerations, construction of the Proposed C Street would result in significant and unavoidable historical resource impacts.

In summary, this alternative would result in significant, but mitigable, impacts to three issue areas: biological resources, cultural resources (archaeological resources, paleontological resources), and noise (temporary construction noise). However, this scenario would also result in significant and unavoidable impacts to land use (policy consistency), traffic (2011, 2035, CMP roadways), and noise (noise on roadways, increase in ambient noise).

8.5.2 Relationship to Project Objectives

Scenario 4 would meet several Project objectives (see Table 8-2). First, it would meet objective 1 in that under Scenario 4, the gates at Crystal View Terrace and Green Orchard Place would remain open, allowing unimpeded access by emergency vehicles and emergency evacuation by residents. Although traffic volumes would increase on these two streets without the gates as a traffic control device, the volumes would not exceed capacity. Scenario 4 also would meet objective 2, in that it would provide an easterly connection of Overlook Parkway through the Alessandro Heights neighborhood to Washington Street and a future connection (Proposed C Street), which would allow for a route to SR-91.

Objectives 2 and 3 are closely tied together for Scenario 4; this scenario fully addresses traffic patterns related to the Overlook Parkway connection and the connection westerly of Washington Avenue. Both these roadways are anticipated to occur with buildout of the City to accommodate planned growth. Scenario 4 with the connection of Overlook Parkway in the east provides for efficient travel routes, multiple modes of transportation, including continuous bikeways and pedestrian routes.

The connection in the west also seeks to provide a more efficient route for vehicles traveling to SR-91. There is currently traffic through this area. Although the Proposed C Street would be located within the Greenbelt, it is located within the northernmost portion and is intended to carry some of the vehicles that currently use Washington Street between Victoria Avenue and Dufferin Avenue. A portion of Washington Street would be vacated in order to redirect traffic to the Proposed C Street. This scenario proposes several improvements at its intersection with Victoria Avenue, including a traffic signal and a relocated crosswalk across the median. These improvements would result in a

substantial adverse impact to an historical resource. Therefore, objective 4 would not be fully met by Scenario 4.

Further impacts to Victoria could result from implementation of off-site improvements, if implemented as mitigation for traffic. As mentioned above, the implementation of such improvements is under the discretion of the decision-making body, and are not part of the Project proposed by this alternative.