

## SECTION 5: ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

### 5.1 - Introduction

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, this Environmental Impact Report (EIR) contains a comparative impact assessment of alternatives to the proposed project. The primary purpose of this section is to provide decision makers and the general public with a reasonable number of feasible project alternatives that could attain most of the basic project objectives, while avoiding or reducing any of the project's significant adverse environmental effects. Important considerations for these alternatives analyses are noted below (as stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6).

- An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project.
- An EIR should identify alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but rejected as infeasible during the scoping process.
- Reasons for rejecting an alternative include:
  - Failure to meet most of the basic project objectives;
  - Infeasibility; or
  - Inability to avoid significant environmental effects.

#### 5.1.1 - Significant Unavoidable Impacts

The proposed project would result in the following significant unavoidable impacts:

- **Background Traffic Conditions:** Buildout of the Community Plan would result in significant impacts at four intersections, unless the City changes the minimum acceptable standard for the Community Plan area intersections to LOS E or F where one or no intersections would result in significant impacts, respectively. Conceptual improvements are identified for each location; however, such improvements may not be feasible because they may be in conflict with the City of Fremont General Plan's and Community Plan's vision for the area. As such, at a minimum, the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program would be required and certain physical improvements could be implemented if deemed feasible. However, because of the uncertainty surrounding the ability of TDM to reduce peak-hour trips to acceptable levels and the feasibility of certain improvements, the residual significance is significant and unavoidable.
- **2035 Traffic Conditions:** Buildout of the Community Plan would result in significant impacts at 14 intersections, unless the City changes the minimum acceptable standard for the Community Plan area intersections to LOS E or F where nine or no intersections would result in significant impacts. Certain intersections are projected to operate at LOS F and no feasible improvements are available. For other locations, conceptual improvements are identified; however, such improvements may not be feasible because they may be in conflict with the City of Fremont General Plan's and Community Plan's vision for the area. As such, at a

minimum, the implementation of a TDM program would be required and certain physical improvements could be implemented if deemed feasible. However, because of the uncertainty surrounding the ability of TDM to reduce peak-hour trips to acceptable levels and the feasibility of certain improvements, the residual significance is significant and unavoidable.

- **Congestion Management Plan:** Buildout of the Community Plan would result in significant impacts on various Congestion Management Plan-designated roadway and freeway facilities. Certain facilities are projected to operate at unacceptable levels and no feasible improvements are available. Furthermore, certain facilities are outside of the jurisdictional control of the City of Fremont; therefore, there is uncertainty as to whether feasible improvements could be implemented, if determined to be available. The TDM program would serve to partially alleviate the severity of this impact but would not fully reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the residual significance is significant and unavoidable.

### 5.1.2 - Alternatives to the Proposed Project

The three alternatives to the proposed project analyzed in this section are as follows:

- **No Project Alternative:** The proposed Warm Springs/South Fremont Community Plan would not be implemented and the existing land use activities within the plan area would continue for the foreseeable future. No increase in existing buildout potential would occur.
- **Reduced Plan Area Alternative:** The Warm Springs/South Fremont Community Plan boundaries would be reduced to encompass Areas 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9 and remove Areas 1, 2, 6, 7, and 10. The buildout potential of this alternative would be 4,000 dwelling units and 5,760,346 square feet of nonresidential uses (research and development, office, retail, and hotel).
- **Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative:** The Community Plan would consist entirely of nonresidential uses including industrial, research and development, office, retail, and hotel. The buildout potential of this alternative would be 16,032,010 square feet of nonresidential uses (industrial, research and development, office, retail, and hotel).

Three alternatives to the proposed project are analyzed below. These analyses compare the proposed project and each individual project alternative. In several cases, the description of the impact may be the same under each alternative when compared with the CEQA Thresholds of Significance (i.e., both the project and the alternative would result in a less than significant impact). The actual degree of impact may be slightly different between the proposed project and each alternative, and this relative difference is the basis for a conclusion of greater or lesser impacts.

## 5.2 - Project Objectives

As stated in Section 2, Project Description, the objectives of the proposed project are as follows:

1. Promote economic growth through new capital investment, the creation of new jobs and business opportunities, the development of new housing opportunities, and expansion of the tax base.
2. Facilitate the development of higher and better uses within the Community Plan area with an emphasis on high-density, transit- and pedestrian-oriented uses.
3. Promote the use of BART and other transit services by developing complementary residential and non-residential uses in proximity of the Warm Springs/South Fremont BART station.
4. Capitalize on the adjacency of Tesla Motors and other technology-oriented businesses in Fremont and Silicon Valley in order to facilitate the development of Innovation Way as a destination for technology entrepreneurship.
5. Expand the range of residential uses within Fremont to include high-density, transit-oriented uses.
6. Enhance all modes of circulation within the plan area and connectivity to surrounding land uses.
7. Promote land use compatibility between the proposed residential land uses and the adjoining commercial, industrial, and transportation land uses through the use of site planning techniques.
8. Develop a bicycle/pedestrian linkage between Innovation Way and the Warm Springs/South Fremont BART station that serves as non-motorized “spine” within the plan area.
9. Provide workforce housing close to employment centers.
10. Minimize adverse impacts to sensitive uses through the use of site planning and design techniques.

## 5.3 - Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed Warm Springs/South Fremont Community Plan would not be implemented and the existing land use activities within the plan area would continue for the foreseeable future. No increase in existing buildout potential would occur.

The existing City of Fremont General Plan and Zoning Ordinance land use designations would remain unchanged. Currently, these land use designations contemplate light industrial, commercial, and public facility land use activities within the plan area; refer to Table 2-2. More importantly, the existing land use designations do not contemplate residential development within the plan area; therefore, no such uses would be expected to develop within the area.

The under-construction Warm Springs/South Fremont BART station would still open in 2015 under the No Project Alternative. The station would be the southern terminus of the BART system until the extension to San Jose (Berryessa) is completed, which is anticipated to occur in 2018. In the absence of the Warm Springs/South Fremont Community Plan, little or no transit-oriented uses would be expected to develop in proximity of the BART station.

The purpose of this alternative is to evaluate the CEQA-required No Project Alternative in order to provide decision makers and the public with what would be reasonably expected to occur if the proposed project does not advance.

### 5.3.1 - Impact Analysis

The 879-acre Community Plan area would retain its existing land use and zoning designations. Although the City of Fremont General Plan identifies a Transit Oriented Development overlay for the plan area, the Community Plan would not be pursued; therefore, there would be no mechanism to facilitate development of these uses. As such, it would be expected that the Community Plan area would continue to support commercial and light industrial uses. The proposed Community Plan would result in a significant unavoidable impact associated with transportation, which would be avoided by the No Project Alternative. In addition, the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts on air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; geology, soils, and seismicity; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; noise; and utilities and service systems, all of which could be mitigated to a level of less than significant. None of these potentially significant impacts would occur under the No Project Alternative.

### 5.3.2 - Conclusion

The No Project Alternative would avoid the proposed project's significant and unavoidable impacts and would have less impact on all environmental topical areas. However, this alternative would not advance any of the project objectives, including those related to promoting economic development, providing new housing opportunities, and expanding the tax base; establishing a land use plan to guide transit-oriented uses around the Warm Springs/South Fremont BART station; and improving motorized, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connectivity within the Community Plan area.

## 5.4 - Alternative 2 – Reduced Plan Area Alternative

Under the Reduced Plan Area Alternative, the Warm Springs/South Fremont Community Plan boundaries would be reduced to encompass Areas 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9 and remove Areas 1, 2, 6, 7, and 10 (refer to Exhibit 2-3 for the locations of the planning areas). The buildout potential of this alternative would be 4,000 dwelling units and 5,760,346 square feet of nonresidential uses (research and development, office, and retail). Relative to the proposed project, this alternative would yield a reduction of 5,761,180 square feet of nonresidential uses. Note that the elementary school/open space area would still be developed in Area 4 under this alternative.

The retained areas would have the same land use designations and buildout targets as contemplated by the Community Plan. The removed areas would maintain their current General Plan land use

designations and Zoning, and no changes to existing development or land use activities would be expected to occur.

Table 5-1 summarizes the Reduced Plan Area Alternative. The purpose of this alternative is to evaluate a smaller plan area that is limited to the properties immediately adjacent to the planned Warm Springs/South Fremont BART station. Reducing the plan area would reduce the number of new dwelling units and the amount of new nonresidential square footage, thereby resulting in fewer vehicle trips (and associated traffic congestion), tailpipe emissions, noise impacts, and demand for public services and utilities.

**Table 5-1: Reduced Plan Area Alternative**

Scenario	Planning Area	Acres	Characteristics
Reduced Plan Area Alternative	3	27	450 – 1,000 dwelling units 430,382 square feet – Research and Development
	4	43	900 – 1,500 Dwelling Units 9 acres School/Public Open Space
	5	94	1,089,000 square feet – Research and Development 2,874,960 square feet – Office and Convention 188,000 square feet – Retail and Entertainment
	8	44	100 – 200 Dwelling Units 600-Room Hotel 529,907 square feet – Research and Development 566,497 square feet – Office and Convention 45,000 square feet – Retail and Entertainment
	9	39	1,250 – 1,500 Dwelling Units 300-Room Hotel 36,600 square feet – Retail
	Total	247	2,700 – 4,000 Dwelling Units 900 Hotel Rooms 2,049,289 square feet – Research and Development 3,441,457 square feet – Office and Convention 269,600 square feet – Retail <i>5,760,346 square feet – Nonresidential</i> 9 acres School/Public Open Space
Proposed Project	Total	879	11,521,526 square feet – Nonresidential 900 Hotel Rooms 4,000 Dwelling Units 9 acres School/Public Open Space
<b>Difference</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>(632)</b>	<b>(5,761,180 square feet – Nonresidential)</b>
Note: Refer to Exhibit 2-3 in Section 2, Project Description for the location of each Planning Area. Source: FirstCarbon Solutions, 2013.			

### 5.4.1 - Impact Analysis

#### Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

The Reduced Plan Area Alternative would result in a reduction of 632 acres and approximately 5.8 million square feet of nonresidential development relative to the proposed Community Plan. The proposed project's impacts on scenic vistas, State Scenic Highways, visual character, and light and glare were found to be less than significant and did not require mitigation. The Reduced Plan Area Alternative would also yield less than significant impacts on these areas because of the reduction in plan area and buildout potential. Therefore, the Reduced Plan Area Alternative would have impacts on aesthetics, light, and glare similar to the proposed project.

#### Air Quality/Greenhouse Gases

The Reduced Plan Area Alternative would result less construction activity and 11,016 fewer daily vehicle trips, which have corresponding reductions in the severity of construction and operational air quality and greenhouse gas emissions. Although this alternative would still implement mitigation measures similar to the proposed project, the reduction in development potential and vehicle trips would reduce the severity of air quality and greenhouse gas impacts. Therefore, this alternative would have less impact on air quality and greenhouse gas than the proposed project.

#### Biological Resources

The Reduced Plan Area Alternative would have the same potential to impact special status species as the proposed Community Plan, since its boundaries overlap with the largest undeveloped properties within the plan area. As such, this alternative would require mitigation similar to the proposed project, which would reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have biological resources impacts similar to the proposed project.

#### Cultural Resources

The Reduced Plan Area Alternative has the potential to result in adverse impacts to undiscovered cultural resources during subsurface earthwork activities and, thus, would implement mitigation similar to the proposed project to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Overall, this alternative would have cultural resources impacts similar to the proposed project.

#### Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The Reduced Plan Area Alternative would have the potential to expose people and structures to seismic hazards and, thus, would implement mitigation similar to the proposed project to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have geology, soils, and seismicity impacts similar to the proposed project.

#### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The 247 acres encompassed by the Reduced Plan Area Alternative primarily overlap with undeveloped land. Nonetheless, some of these undeveloped sites may be adjacent to hazardous materials users and, therefore, require the same mitigation measures associated with assessing

compatibility with existing hazardous materials users. Overall, this alternative would have hazards and hazardous materials impacts similar to the proposed project.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

The Reduced Plan Area Alternative would have the potential to introduce new sources of water pollution or increased runoff that could result in water quality impacts. As such, this alternative would implement mitigation similar to the proposed Community Plan to ensure that water pollution prevention and drainage measures are in place to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have hydrology and water quality impacts similar to the proposed project.

### **Land Use**

The Reduced Plan Area Alternative would involve the adoption of a Community Plan to guide future transit-oriented development around the Warm Springs/South Fremont BART station; however, the plan area would be 247 acres and have a buildout potential of 4,000 dwelling units and 5.8 million square feet of nonresidential development. This alternative would require land use approvals similar to the proposed Community Plan and would yield similar conclusions regarding General Plan and Zoning consistency. Therefore, this alternative would have land use impacts similar to the proposed project.

### **Noise**

The Reduced Plan Area Alternative would result in less construction activity and 11,016 fewer daily vehicle trips, which would have corresponding reductions in the severity of construction and operational noise impacts. Although this alternative would still implement mitigation measures similar to the proposed project, the reduction in development potential and vehicle trips would reduce the severity of noise impacts. Therefore, this alternative would have less impact on noise than the proposed project.

### **Public Services and Recreation**

The Reduced Plan Area Alternative would result in a reduction in development potential and yield fewer new residents and employees. Thus, this alternative would have a corresponding reduction in demand for public services and recreational facilities. Although the proposed Community Plan's public services and recreation impacts were found to be less than significant and did not require mitigation, this alternative would have less impact on public services and recreation than the proposed project.

### **Transportation**

The Reduced Plan Area Alternative would result in a reduction of in development potential. Table 5-2 summarizes the daily and peak-hour trip generation associated with the Reduced Plan Area Alternative. As shown in the table, this alternative would yield a reduction of 11,016 daily vehicle trips, 1,355 AM peak-hour vehicle trips, and 1,310 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. The trip reduction would contribute fewer vehicle trips to intersections and other roadway facilities that would operate at unacceptable levels. Although this alternative would not necessarily avoid the significant and unavoidable

transportation impacts, it would lessen the severity of these impacts. As with the proposed Community Plan, this alternative would implement similar mitigation measures in the form of traffic improvements and Transportation Demand Management measures. Overall, this alternative would have fewer transportation impacts than the proposed project.

**Table 5-2: Reduced Plan Area Alternative Trip Generation Summary**

Scenario	Planning Area	Trip Generation		
		Daily	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Reduced Plan Area Alternative	3	5,156	510	517
	4	6,440	726	582
	5	16,046	2,309	2,386
	8	7,748	771	810
	9	5,214	403	455
	Total	40,604	4,719	4,750
Proposed Project	Total	51,620	6,074	6,060
<b>Difference</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>(11,016)</b>	<b>(1,355)</b>	<b>(1,310)</b>

Source: FirstCarbon Solutions, 2013.

**Utilities and Service Systems**

The Reduced Plan Area Alternative would result in a reduction in development potential and yield fewer new residents and employees. Thus, this alternative would have a corresponding reduction in demand for utilities and service systems. As with the proposed Community Plan, this alternative would implement similar mitigation for potable water and solid waste to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Because this alternative would reduce demand for utilities relative to the proposed project, it would have less impact on utilities and service systems than the proposed project.

**5.4.2 - Conclusion**

The Reduced Plan Area Alternative would lessen the severity of, but would not avoid, the significant and unavoidable transportation impacts associated with the proposed project. Additionally, the Reduced Plan Area Alternative would lessen the severity of several of the significant impacts that can be reduced to a level of less than significant with mitigation (e.g., air quality, noise, and utilities).

The Reduced Plan Area would advance all of the project objectives, but to a lesser degree than the proposed project because of the reduction in new dwelling units and nonresidential development. This includes objectives related to promoting economic development, providing new housing opportunities, and expanding the tax base; establishing a land use plan to guide transit-oriented uses around the Warm Springs/South Fremont BART station; and improving motorized, pedestrian, bicycle and transit connectivity within the Community Plan area.

## 5.5 - Alternative 3 – Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative

Under the Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative, the Community Plan would consist of entirely nonresidential light industrial, research and development, office, retail, and hotel uses. No residential or school uses would be developed under this alternative. The buildout potential of this alternative would be 16,032,010 square feet of nonresidential uses. Relative to the proposed project, this alternative would yield a reduction of 4,000 dwelling units, no new elementary school, and a net increase of 4,510,484 square feet of nonresidential uses.

The eliminated residential uses would be primarily replaced by research and development and office uses (Areas 3, 4 and 9). Retail would experience a small increase in square footage near the Warm Springs/South Fremont BART station (Area 8).

This alternative would employ a similar backbone circulation system as the proposed project; however, internal block sizes would be larger, due to the elimination of the residential uses and site requirements for research and development and office uses.

Table 5-3 summarizes the Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative. The purpose of this alternative is to evaluate a Community Plan concept that eliminates residential and school uses, thereby eliminating any potential land use compatibility conflicts with existing or planned industrial and commercial uses in the project vicinity.

**Table 5-3: Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative**

Scenario	Planning Area	Acres	Characteristics
Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative	1	74	952,875 square feet – Industrial 359,370 square feet – Research and Development
	2	38	609,840 square feet – Research & Development 653,400 square feet – Office
	3	27	479,270 square feet – Research & Development
	4	43	2,156,715 square feet – Office
	5	94	696,960 square feet – Research and Development 4,051,080 square feet – Office 94,000 square feet – Retail
	6	319	Tesla (No Change)
	7	79	945,252 square feet – Industrial 370,260 square feet – Research and Development
	8	44	600 Hotel Rooms 223,245 square feet – Research and Development 1,486,485 square feet – Office 48,000 square feet – Retail

**Table 5-3 (cont.): Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative**

Scenario	Planning Area	Acres	Characteristics
Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative (cont.)	9	39	300 Hotel Rooms 653,550 square feet – Research and Development 39,000 square feet – Retail 9 acres Public Open Space
	10	122	457,380 square feet – Industrial 1,415,700 square feet – Research and Development 1,764,180 square feet – Office
	Total	879	900 Hotel Rooms 1,410,225 square feet – Industrial 4,328,925 square feet – Research and Development 10,111,860 square feet – Office 181,000 square feet – Retail 16,032,010 square feet – Nonresidential
Proposed Project	Total	879	4,000 Dwelling Units 900 Hotel Rooms 11,521,526 square feet – Nonresidential 9 acres School/Public Open Space
<b>Difference</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>(4,000 Dwelling Units)</b> <b>4,510,484 square feet – Nonresidential</b> <b>(9 acres School/Public Open Space)</b>
Note: Refer to Exhibit 2-3 in Section 2, Project Description for the location of each Planning Area. Source: FirstCarbon Solutions, 2013.			

### 5.5.1 - Impact Analysis

#### Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

The Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would eliminate 4,000 dwelling units and add 4.5 million square feet of nonresidential development relative to the proposed Community Plan. The proposed project’s impacts on scenic vistas, State Scenic Highways, visual character, and light and glare were found to be less than significant and did not require mitigation. The replacement of 4,000 dwelling units with 4.5 million square feet of nonresidential uses would not alter the prior conclusions, as the footprint of the plan area would remain the same and the nonresidential uses would be of similar visual character as those contemplated by the Community Plan. Therefore, the Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would have impacts on aesthetics, light, and glare similar to the proposed project.

#### Air Quality/Greenhouse Gases

The Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would result in less construction activity and 8,619 fewer daily vehicle trips, which have corresponding reductions in the severity of construction and operational air quality and greenhouse gas emissions. Although this alternative would still

implement mitigation measures similar to the proposed project, the reduction in development potential and vehicle trips would reduce the severity of air quality and greenhouse gas impacts. Therefore, this alternative would have less impact on air quality and greenhouse gas than the proposed project.

### **Biological Resources**

The Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would have the same potential to impact special-status species as the proposed Community Plan, since its boundaries would be the same. As such, this alternative would require mitigation similar to the proposed project, which would reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have biological resources impacts similar to the proposed project.

### **Cultural Resources**

The Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would have the potential to result in adverse impacts to undiscovered cultural resources during subsurface earthwork activities and, thus, would implement mitigation similar to the proposed project to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Overall, this alternative would have cultural resources impacts similar to the proposed project.

### **Geology, Soils, and Seismicity**

The Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would have the potential to expose people and structures to seismic hazards and, thus, would implement mitigation similar to the proposed project to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have geology, soils, and seismicity impacts similar to the proposed project.

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would eliminate 4,000 dwelling units and add 4.5 million square feet of nonresidential development relative to the proposed Community Plan. By eliminating residential and school uses from the Community Plan, this alternative would lessen the potential for exposing sensitive receptors to hazardous materials. Although the proposed Community Plan was found to have less than significant impact after mitigation, this alternative would obviate the potential for impacts and associated mitigation. As such, this alternative would have less impact on hazards and hazardous materials than the proposed project.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

The Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would have the same footprint as the Community Plan and contain both developed and undeveloped land; thus, this alternative would have the potential to introduce new sources of water pollution or increased runoff that could result in water quality impacts. As such, this alternative would implement mitigation similar to the proposed Community Plan to ensure that water pollution prevention and drainage measures are in place to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have hydrology and water quality impacts similar to the proposed project.

## Land Use

The Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would involve the adoption of a Community Plan to guide future transit-oriented development around the Warm Springs/South Fremont BART station; however, this alternative would develop 16.0 million square feet of nonresidential development within the plan area. This alternative would require land use approvals similar to the proposed Community Plan and would yield similar conclusions regarding General Plan and Zoning consistency. Therefore, this alternative would have land use impacts similar to the proposed project.

## Noise

The Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would result in less construction activity and 8,619 fewer daily vehicle trips, which would have corresponding reductions in the severity of construction and operational noise impacts. Although this alternative would still implement mitigation measures similar to the proposed project, the reduction in vehicle trips would reduce the severity of noise impacts. Therefore, this alternative would have less impact on noise than the proposed project.

## Public Services and Recreation

The Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would eliminate residential uses and, thus, have a corresponding reduction in demand for public services and recreational facilities. Moreover, this alternative would not include the elementary school/open space area in Area 4 because of the elimination of residential uses. Although the proposed Community Plan's public services and recreation impacts were found to be less than significant and did not require mitigation, this alternative would have less impact on public services and recreation than the proposed project.

## Transportation

The Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would eliminate 4,000 dwelling units and add 4.5 million square feet of nonresidential development relative to the proposed Community Plan. Table 5-4 summarizes the daily and peak-hour trip generation associated with the Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative. As shown in the table, this alternative would yield a reduction of 8,619 daily vehicle trips, 616 AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 431 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. The trip reduction would contribute fewer vehicle trips to intersections and other roadway facilities that would operate at unacceptable levels. Although this alternative would not necessarily avoid the significant and unavoidable transportation impacts, it would lessen the severity of these impacts. As with the proposed Community Plan, this alternative would implement similar mitigation measures in the form of traffic improvements and Transportation Demand Management measures. Overall, this alternative would have fewer transportation impacts than the proposed project.

**Table 5-4: Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative Trip Generation Summary**

Scenario	Planning Area	Trip Generation		
		Daily	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative	1	3,312	374	363
	2	1,096	165	153
	3	823	118	121
	4	4,118	683	722
	5	16,046	2,309	2,386
	7	2,868	331	321
	8	9,514	771	893
	9	932	138	120
	10	4,292	569	550
	Total	43,001	5,458	5,629
Proposed Project	Total	51,620	6,074	6,060
<b>Difference</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>(8,619)</b>	<b>(616)</b>	<b>(431)</b>

Source: FirstCarbon Solutions, 2013.

### Utilities and Service Systems

The Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would eliminate residential uses and, thus, would have a corresponding reduction in demand for utilities and service systems. As with the proposed Community Plan, this alternative would implement similar mitigation for potable water and solid waste to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Because this alternative would reduce demand for utilities relative to the proposed project, it would have less impact on utilities and service systems than the proposed project.

### 5.5.2 - Conclusion

The Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would lessen the severity of, but would not avoid, the significant unavoidable transportation impacts associated with the proposed project. Additionally, the Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would lessen the severity of several of the significant impacts that can be reduced to a level of less than significant with mitigation (e.g., air quality, hazardous materials, noise, and utilities).

The Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would not advance the project objectives associated with developing new residential uses (Objectives No. 3, 5, and 9) and only partially advance those associated with developing transit-oriented uses around the Warm Springs/South Fremont BART Station (Objectives No. 1, 2). It would fully advance the project objectives associated with developing new technology oriented jobs and businesses in proximity to TESLA Motors (Objective No. 4) and promoting land use compatibility with adjacent nonresidential uses (Objectives No. 7 and 10).

## 5.6 - Environmentally Superior Alternative

The qualitative environmental effects of each alternative in relation to the proposed project are summarized in Table 5-5.

**Table 5-5: Summary of Alternatives**

Environmental Topic Area	No Project Alternative	Reduced Plan Area Alternative	Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative
Aesthetics, Light, and Glare	Less Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
Air Quality/Greenhouse Gases	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Biological Resources	Less Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
Cultural Resources	Less Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	Less Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less Impact	Similar Impact	Less Impact
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
Land Use	Less Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
Noise	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Public Services and Recreation	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Transportation	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Utilities and Service Systems	Less Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact

Source: FirstCarbon Solutions, 2013.

As shown in Table 5-3, the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, as future development within the Community Plan area under the current General Plan and Zoning would result in less impact.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(e)(2) requires an EIR to identify an environmentally superior alternative. If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives.

Of the two remaining alternatives, the Reduced Plan Area Alternative has the potential to yield the greatest reductions in the severity of the proposed significant and unavoidable impacts associated with transportation, because it would develop fewer new dwelling units and less nonresidential square footage than the Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative. The Reduced Plan Area Alternative would generate 11,016 fewer daily vehicle trips compared with the proposed project, while the Nonresidential Community Plan Alternative would generate 8,619 fewer daily vehicle trips compared with the proposed project. Therefore, the Reduced Plan Area Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative.

## 5.7 - Alternatives Rejected From Further Consideration

The following alternatives were initially considered, but rejected from further consideration for the reasons described below.

### 5.7.1 - Alternative Location

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2) sets forth considerations to be used in evaluating an alternative location. The section states that the “key question” is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by relocating the project. The CEQA Guidelines identify the following factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of an alternative location:

- 1) Site suitability
- 2) Economic viability
- 3) Availability of infrastructure
- 4) General Plan consistency
- 5) Other plans or regulatory limitations
- 6) Jurisdictional boundaries
- 7) Whether the project applicant can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site

The CEQA Guidelines establishes that only locations that would accomplish this objective should be considered as alternative locations for the proposed project.

Two potential alternative locations within the Fremont city limits are evaluated in Table 5-6. Exhibit 5-1 depicts the location of each site in relation to the Community Plan area. As shown in the table, neither site is considered a feasible location for the Community Plan.

**Table 5-6: Alternative Location Feasibility Analysis**

Location	Description	Feasibility Analysis
Creekside Landing	Approximately 59 acres located on the west side of I-880 south of Bayside Business Park and north of Dixon Landing Road. This site was previously graded and contains raised pads suitable for new development. Development on this site requires the extension of Fremont Boulevard from its current terminus at Flood Channel B to Dixon Landing Road. This site is designated Tech Industrial with a Commercial/Industrial overlay by the City of Fremont General Plan and zoned Restricted Industrial by the Fremont Zoning Ordinance.	<b>Not Feasible:</b> This site is currently entitled for a 750,000-square-foot warehouse project and construction has commenced. Therefore, this location is considered committed to another higher-and-better use. Additionally, the acreage of this site (59 acres) is less than 7 percent of the acreage of the Community Plan area (879 acres) and, thus, is too small to accommodate the level of development contemplated by the proposed project. Finally, a key objective of the proposed Community Plan is to develop transit-oriented uses around the Warm Springs/South Fremont

**Table 5-6 (cont.): Alternative Location Feasibility Analysis**

Location	Description	Feasibility Analysis
Creekside Landing (cont.)		<p>BART station. The Creekside Landing site is 2.7 miles south of the BART station and, thus, is too distant to be considered transit-oriented development.</p> <p>Developing the proposed project at the Creekside Landing site would be contrary to this objective. These factors preclude the possibility of developing the project at this location.</p>
Skysailing Airport Site	<p>Approximately 175 acres located on the west side of I-880 south of Pacific Commons and north of Cushing Parkway. This site previously supported the Skysailing Airport and was the subject of a baseball stadium proposal that did not advance. This site is designated Tech Industrial and Resource Conservation by the City of Fremont General Plan and zoned P-2000-214 by the Fremont Zoning Ordinance.</p>	<p><b>Not Feasible:</b> The acreage of this site (175 acres) is 20 percent of the acreage of the Community Plan area (879 acres) and, thus, is too small to accommodate the level of development contemplated by the proposed project. Additionally, the project site contains a significant wetland area, which would need to be either avoided or minimally impacted, which would reduce the developable acreage. Finally, a key objective of the proposed Community Plan is to develop transit-oriented uses around the Warm Springs/ South Fremont BART station. The Creekside Landing site is 1 mile west of the BART station and located on the opposite side of I-880. Thus, it is too far to be considered transit-oriented development. Developing the proposed project at the Skysailing Airport site would be contrary to this objective. These factors preclude the possibility of developing the project at this location.</p>

Source: FirstCarbon Solutions, 2013.



Source: ESRI Aerial Imagery.

**Legend**

 Study Area



Exhibit 5-1

Potential Alternative Locations

