

SECTION 5: ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

5.1 - Introduction

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, this Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR) 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 degree 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

Significant Unavoidable Impacts

This EIR has identified six significant unavoidable impacts of the proposed project: (1) project air emissions, (2) cumulative air emissions, (3) inconsistency with the Clean Air Plan, (4) greenhouse gas emissions, (5) growth inducement, and (6) freeway operations.

Previously Considered Alternatives

The previously certified City of San Ramon General Plan EIR and the City Civic Center EIRs evaluated the following alternatives:

City of San Ramon General Plan EIR

- **No Project:** The City of San Ramon 2020 General Plan would not be adopted, and the 1995 General Plan would remain in effect.
- **Infill/Maximum Open Space Preservation:** The 2020 General Plan would be amended to re-designate acreage in existing developed areas for more intense development, including mixed-use projects, and limiting development on undeveloped or rural parcels on the urban fringe.
- **Existing Density/Limited Hillside Growth:** The 2020 General Plan would be amended to allow for limited intensification of uses in Bishop Ranch and the San Ramon Valley Boulevard and Alcosta Boulevard corridors, and limiting hillside development. This was identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

City Civic Center EIR

- **No Project Alternative:** The City Civic Center project would not be developed, and the project site would remain in its existing condition.
- **Reduced Density Alternative:** The Council Chamber, City offices, a children's museum, a center for visual arts, and an aquatic center would be developed; the library and retail components would be eliminated.

Alternatives to the Proposed Project

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

- **No Project Alternative:** The project site would remain in its existing condition, and the proposed project would not be developed, except for Parcel 1A, which would be developed as a 328,220-square-foot office complex under an existing vested entitlement.
- **Reduced Density Option 1 Alternative:** The Plaza District would be eliminated from the project, and Bishop Ranch 1A, the City Hall, and Transit Center would be developed.
- **Reduced Density Option 2 Alternative:** Bishop Ranch 1A, the City Hall, and the Transit Center would be eliminated from the project, and the Plaza District would be developed. Parcel 1A would be developed as a 328,220-square-foot office complex under an existing vested entitlement.
- **City Civic Center Alternative:** The previously proposed City Civic Center Project would be developed on Parcels 1A and 3A.

As stated in Section 3.0, Project Description, the objectives of the proposed project are to:

- Strengthen San Ramon and Bishop Ranch with a vibrant mix of complementary uses, including retail, residential, office, hotel, and civic.
- Develop a new, vital neighborhood for living, working, shopping, dining, entertaining, learning, and gathering.
- Create new beautiful landscaped public spaces to accommodate community and cultural events.
- Replace the outdated and undersized current City offices and Council Chambers with a new municipal campus with modern, adequately sized facilities to serve the ever-increasing demands of planned growth in San Ramon.
- Enhance the public safety in San Ramon through the provision of a state-of-the-art Police Department headquarters.
- Improve the delivery and quality of library services to San Ramon residents through the provision of a larger, technologically advanced library.

- Increase mobility, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and promote energy conservation in San Ramon, Bishop Ranch, and the proposed project through the inclusion of a Transit Center that would serve as a convenient, centralized location for public transit providers.
- Capitalize on the proposed project's adjacency to the Iron Horse Trail to promote the use of pedestrian and bicycle modes of transportation and encourage trip and greenhouse gas reduction and energy conservation.
- Encourage trip and greenhouse gas reduction and energy conservation throughout San Ramon, Bishop Ranch, and the proposed project through the siting of residential and office uses near shopping, dining, and entertainment.
- Establish public improvements, including landscaped sidewalks, plazas, and pedestrian connections, streets, parking structures, and a new "ring road" extending Bishop Drive to Bollinger Canyon Road.
- Add new experiences at Bishop Ranch and to the San Ramon community, including a five-star hotel, an art-screen cinema, new gourmet restaurants, and destination retail attractions.
- Include high-quality, high-density housing in a mixed-use setting to increase the diversity of housing opportunities in San Ramon and provide a type of housing option that is not currently available to local residents.
- Use high-quality architecture and landscaping consistent with the style of Bishop Ranch that will maintain and enhance the aesthetic character of the City of San Ramon.
- Maximize roadway safety through the provision of multiple vehicular ingress and egress opportunities to the proposed project internal roadways and parking facilities and improvements to the surrounding circulation system.
- Create increased new property and sales taxes annually, in perpetuity, for the City of San Ramon, and increased annual property taxes for Contra Costa County and various other local government agencies.
- Increase property values throughout San Ramon and San Ramon Valley.

Four alternatives to the proposed project are analyzed below, including a parcel-by-parcel analysis, where applicable. 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 alternatives would result in a "Less than Significant Impact"). The actual degree of impact may be slightly different under each alternative, and this relative difference is the basis for a conclusion of greater or lesser impacts.

5.2 - Alternative 1 - No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed project would not be developed. Parcel 1A would be developed as a 328,220-square-foot office complex, as entitled under the existing City/Chevron Annexation and Development Agreement (since assigned to Sunset Development). Parcels 1B, 2, and 3A would remain in their existing condition.

Table 5-1 provides a summary of the net square footage of this alternative relative to the proposed project. This alternative would result in a net reduction of 1,222,722 square feet, which represents a 68-percent reduction relative to the proposed project.

Table 5-1: No Project Alternative Summary

Component	Square Footage
Existing vested office entitlement	328,220
Retention of Bishop Ranch 2	194,652
Total	522,872
Net change relative to proposed project	(1,122,722)
Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2007.	

5.2.1 - Impact Analysis

Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

Under the No Project Alternative, three of the four parcels would remain in their existing condition and would not experience any change. Parcel 1A would be developed as a 328,220-square-foot office complex under the existing vested entitlement. The proposed project’s impacts on scenic vistas visual character were found to be less than significant and did not require mitigation; therefore, the No Project Alternative would also have less than significant impacts on these areas. The No Project Alternative would result in the introduction of substantial new sources of light and glare on Parcel 1A, and mitigation similar to the proposed project would be required to reduce this impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have impacts on aesthetics, light, and glare similar to the proposed project.

Air Quality

This alternative would result in a net decrease of 1,122,722 square feet relative to the proposed project. Parcel 1A would be developed as a 328,220-square-foot office complex under the existing vested entitlement. Bishop Ranch 2 would not be demolished, and construction activities would be limited to approximately 13 acres. Construction emissions associated with the entitled development Parcel 1A would occur; however, because of the size of this project, the implementation of standard construction emission measures would be expected to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would avoid the significant unavoidable impact associated with construction air emissions. From an operational emissions perspective, the No Project

Alternative would result in a net decrease of 19,725 daily trips, a 79 percent reduction, relative to the proposed project. However, because this alternative would generate 3,178 daily trips, which is more than the approximately 3,000-daily-trip significance established by BAAQMD, the proposed project's operational emissions would be a significant and unavoidable operational air quality impact and, therefore, would be a significant unavoidable cumulative air quality impact. Because the entitled office space is accounted for in BAAQMD's Clean Air Plan, however, this alternative would be consistent with the plan. Therefore, this alternative would avoid the proposed project's significant unavoidable impact associated with inconsistency with the Clean Air Plan. Greenhouse gas emissions would also be emitted at lower levels under this alternative because of the reduction in project intensity; mitigation in the form of energy and water conservation measures would be implemented. Because of the much smaller scale of this alternative, its greenhouse gas emissions would not be considered cumulative considerable. In summary, the No Project Alternative would result in two significant unavoidable air quality impacts, but it would avoid three others that would occur because of the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer air quality impacts than the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Parcel 1A would be developed as an office complex under the No Project Alternative. Because Parcel 1A contains habitat suitable for the burrowing owl and nesting birds, this alternative would have the potential to significantly impact special-status wildlife species and would require mitigation similar to the proposed project. The implementation of mitigation would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on biological resources similar to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Parcel 1A would be developed as an office complex under the No Project Alternative. Because Parcel 1A contains undeveloped land, this alternative would have the potential to significantly impact previously undiscovered buried cultural resources and would require mitigation similar to the proposed project. The implementation of mitigation would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on cultural resources similar to the proposed project.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Parcel 1A would be developed as an office complex under the No Project Alternative. Because urban development would occur on Parcel 1A, this alternative would have the potential to create erosion during construction and expose persons or structures to hazards associated with unstable geologic units and expansive soil. As such, this alternative would require mitigation similar to the proposed project, the implementation of which would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity similar to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The No Project Alternative would result in the development of 328,220 square feet of office uses on Parcel 1A under the existing vested entitlement. There is the possibility that tenants of this office space could use hazardous materials and would be required to implement mitigation similar to the proposed project. The implementation of mitigation would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on hazards and hazardous materials similar to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Parcel 1A would be developed as an office complex under the No Project Alternative. Because urban development would occur on Parcel 1A, this alternative would have the potential to create water quality and drainage problems in downstream waterways. As such, this alternative would require mitigation similar to the proposed project, the implementation of which would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on hydrology and water quality similar to the proposed project.

Land Use

Similar to the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would maintain the existing General Plan and Zoning Ordinance designations of the project site. The 328,220-square-foot office complex on Parcel 1A is an existing entitlement and, therefore, is consistent with applicable General Plan and Zoning Ordinance policies. The remaining parcels of the project site would remain in their existing condition and would maintain their consistency with existing General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on land use similar to the proposed project.

Noise

This alternative would result in a net decrease of 1,122,722 square feet relative to the proposed project. Under this alternative, the only new construction would be the development of 328,220 square feet of office uses on Parcel 1A; all other parcels would remain unchanged. Construction activities would be required to implement mitigation similar to the proposed project that would reduce short-term noise impacts to a level of less than significant. Unlike the proposed project, the No Project Alternative does not include any residential uses and, therefore, it would not be necessary to implement the vibration and interior noise control mitigation measures identified for the proposed project. In addition, because the No Project Alternative would generate 19,725 fewer daily trips, it would have a substantial smaller contribution to ambient noise levels on local roadways, although the proposed project's contribution was not determined to be significant. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have fewer noise impacts than the proposed project.

Population and Housing

This alternative would result in a net decrease of 1,122,722 square feet relative to the proposed project. Under this alternative, 328,220 square feet of entitled office space would be developed on Parcel 1A. No direct population growth would occur under the No Project Alternative, and the

indirect population growth and employment growth created by this alternative have already been accounted for in local and regional forecasts, because this office space is currently entitled. Therefore, population and employment growth that would occur under this alternative would not exceed forecasted population growth assumptions. In contrast, the direct and indirect population growth facilitated by the proposed project would contribute to an exceedance of regional population projections for San Ramon and, therefore, would have a significant unavoidable impact. However, unlike the proposed project, this alternative would not include a residential component and would not contribute to providing affordable housing in accordance with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment allocation for San Ramon. Nonetheless, this alternative avoids a significant unavoidable impact associated with growth inducement while still allowing affordable housing goals to be pursued through other projects and programs. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer impacts on population and housing relative to the proposed project.

Public Services and Recreation

This alternative would result in a net decrease of 1,122,722 square feet relative to the proposed project. Because this alternative would not contain any residential uses and generate far fewer employment opportunities, it would result correspondingly lower impacts on public services and recreation through fewer calls for service, student generation, and park usage. Because this alternative would not include the Plaza District, it would not result in the potentially significant impact requiring mitigation for the Iron Horse Trail. Note that this impact was reduced to a level of less than significant after the implementation of mitigation. The 328,220 square feet of office uses on Parcel 1A would be multi-story structures and would be required to implement mitigation for fire response similar to the proposed project. However, because this alternative would not include a new Police Department headquarters or library, it would not result in the beneficial impacts of increased response times or improved delivery of services from the provision of these facilities. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have more impacts on public services and recreation than the proposed project.

Transportation

This alternative would result in a net decrease of 1,122,722 square feet relative to the proposed project. Parcel 1A would be developed as a 328,220-square-foot office complex under the existing vested entitlement. When the trips generated by the entitled office uses on Parcel 1A are factored in, the No Project Alternative would generate 19,725 fewer daily trips relative to the proposed project, including 62 fewer trips during the morning peak hour and 409 fewer trips during the afternoon peak hour. While peak-hour trips would be reduced under the No Project Alternative, intersection operation impacts would still occur, and mitigation would be required to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. In addition, because the development of the vested office entitlement would contribute new trips to Interstate 680 (I-680), which operates at LOS F during certain peak hours, it would have a significant unavoidable impact on freeway operations that is similar to the proposed project. The No Project Alternative would not modify intersections on Camino Ramon, Sunset Drive,

or other roadways and would avoid creating potentially significant queuing impacts; therefore, it would not need to implement mitigation to reduce this impact to a level of less than significant. In addition, the No Project Alternative would not narrow Camino Ramon to two lanes during the non-commute hours and would avoid the potentially significant impact requiring mitigation associated with that aspect of the proposed project. The No Project Alternative would be subject to City motorcycle parking and bicycle storage requirements and would implement mitigation similar to the proposed project for these issues. Because the No Project Alternative would not create the potentially significant queuing and roadway hazard impacts requiring mitigation, it would have fewer impacts on transportation than the proposed project.

Urban Decay

No new commercial retail uses would be developed under the No Project Alternative. In contrast, the proposed project would develop more than 600,000 square feet of retail uses as well as a 169-room hotel. As described in Section 4.13, Urban Decay, the proposed project's commercial retail uses would not be expected to cause store closures or long-term vacancies that would create physical deterioration associated with urban decay, and the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on this topical area. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have impacts on urban decay similar to the proposed project.

Utility Systems

The No Project Alternative would result in the development of 328,220 square feet of office uses on Parcel 1A and the retention of the existing uses on all other parcels. The reduced development intensity of this alternative would have correspondingly less demand for potable water relative to the proposed project. Nonetheless, because of the intensity of the office uses, this alternative would be required to implement water conservation mitigation measures similar to those of the proposed project to reduce potentially significant potable water impacts to a level of less than significant. The proposed project's wastewater and storm drainage impacts were determined to be less than significant and, therefore, the No Project Alternative would have less than significant impacts on these utility systems. The No Project Alternative would not require the demolition of Bishop Ranch 2 nor would involve the development of the proposed project's 2.1 million square feet of new buildings. As such, it would be expected to have a substantial reduction in construction waste generation; however, the development of 328,220 square feet of office uses would be considered significant enough to require construction and demolition debris recycling mitigation. In addition, this alternative would also generate substantial amounts of operational solid waste and require mitigation similar to the proposed project to reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant. Finally, while the No Project Alternative would have a substantially lower demand for energy, it would still require the implementation of similar energy conservation mitigation to reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would have impacts on utility systems similar to the proposed project.

5.2.2 - Conclusion

The No Project Alternative would have fewer impacts on noise, population and housing, and transportation, but would have a greater impact on public services and recreation than the proposed project. All other impacts would be similar to the proposed project. The No Project would meet the project objectives related to providing high-quality architecture and landscaping and enhancing property values; however, it would not meet the objectives of improving public facilities and delivery of services, developing a mixed-use district, creating new property and sales tax revenues, increasing housing options, reducing greenhouse gases, and enhancing mobility.

5.3 - Alternative 2 - Reduced Density Option 1 Alternative

The Reduced Density Option 1 Alternative consists of eliminating the Plaza District from the proposed project and developing only Bishop Ranch 1A and the City Hall and Transit Center. Bishop Ranch 1A and the City Hall and Transit Center would be identical in size, design, and use as envisioned by the proposed project. This alternative would amend the City/Chevron Annexation and Development agreement (since assigned to Sunset Development) to modify the existing 328,220-square-foot office entitlement to allow for the development of Bishop Ranch 1A. Parcels 2 and 3A would remain in their existing condition.

Table 5-2 provides a summary of the net square footage of this alternative relative to the proposed project. This alternative would result in a net reduction of 968,903 square feet, which represents a 60-percent reduction relative to the proposed project.

Table 5-2: Reduced Density Option 1 Alternative Summary

Component	Square Footage
Bishop Ranch 1A	681,769
City Hall and Transit Center	110,490
Existing vested office entitlement	(328,220)
Retention of Bishop Ranch 2	194,652
Total	658,691
Net change relative to proposed project	(986,903)
Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2007.	

5.3.1 - Impact Analysis

Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

This alternative would result in the development of close to 800,000 square feet of office and civic uses as well as parking structures on Parcels 1A and 1B and the retention of the Bishop Ranch 2 office complex, for a net development of 986,903 square feet on the project site. The proposed project's impacts on the visual character of scenic vistas were found to be less than significant and did not require mitigation; therefore, the Reduced Density Option 1 Alternative would also have less than

significant impacts on these areas. This alternative would result in the introduction of substantial new sources of light and glare on Parcels 1A and 1B, and mitigation similar to the proposed project would be required to reduce this impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the Reduced Density Option 1 Alternative would have impacts on aesthetics, light, and glare similar to the proposed project.

Air Quality

This alternative would result in a net decrease of 986,903 square feet of development relative to the proposed project. Construction emissions associated with Bishop Ranch 1A and City Hall would occur and be substantial; mitigation in the form of construction air pollution control measures would be required, but, because of the size and intensity of this alternative, it would not fully reduce this impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, construction air emissions would be significant and unavoidable under this alternative. From an operational emissions perspective, this alternative would result in a net decrease of 15,017 daily trips, a 40-percent reduction, relative to the proposed project. However, because this alternative would generate 9,909 daily trips, which is more than the approximately 3,000-daily-trip significance established by BAAQMD, the proposed project's operational emissions would be a significant and unavoidable impact. Because both construction and operational emissions would be significant and unavoidable, this alternative would also have a significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impact. This alternative would also generate population growth and vehicle trips that would exceed the projections contained in the Clean Air Plan and, therefore, would have a significant unavoidable impact associated with inconsistency with the plan. Mitigation would be required for greenhouse gas emissions and would be similar to the proposed project; however, because of the size and intensity of this alternative, its greenhouse gas emissions would be cumulatively considerable. In summary, this alternative would result in the same significant unavoidable air quality impacts associated with the proposed project, and therefore, would have impacts on air quality similar to the proposed project.

Biological Resources

This alternative would result in the development of close to 800,000 square feet of new office and civic uses as well as parking structures on Parcels 1A and 1B. Because Parcel 1A contains habitat suitable for the burrowing owl and nesting birds, this alternative would have the potential to significantly impact special-status wildlife species and would require mitigation similar to the proposed project. The implementation of mitigation would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on biological resources similar to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

This alternative would result in the development of close to 800,000 square feet of new office and civic uses, as well as parking structures, on Parcels 1A and 1B. Because Parcel 1A contains undeveloped land, this alternative would have the potential to significantly impact previously undiscovered buried cultural resources and would require mitigation similar to the proposed project.

The implementation of mitigation would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on cultural resources similar to the proposed project.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

This alternative would result in the development of close to 800,000 square feet of new office and civic uses, as well as parking structures, on Parcels 1A and 1B. Because urban development would occur on Parcel 1A, this alternative would have the potential to create erosion during construction and expose persons or structures to hazards associated with unstable geologic units and expansive soil. As such, this alternative would require mitigation similar to the proposed project, the implementation of which would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity similar to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative would result in the development of close to 800,000 square feet of new office and civic uses, as well as parking structures, on Parcels 1A and 1B. There is the possibility that tenants of Bishop Ranch 1A or City Hall could use hazardous materials and would be required to implement mitigation similar to the proposed project. The implementation of mitigation would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on hazards and hazardous materials similar to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Parcels 1A and 1B would be developed with close to 800,000 square feet of new office and civic uses as well as parking structures, under this alternative. Because urban development would occur on these parcels, this alternative would have the potential to create water quality and drainage problems in downstream waterways. As such, this alternative would require mitigation similar to the proposed project, the implementation of which would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on hydrology and water quality similar to the proposed project.

Land Use

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would maintain the existing General Plan and Zoning Ordinance designations of the project site. Both Bishop Ranch 1A and City Hall would consistent with applicable General Plan and Zoning Ordinance policies. The remaining parcels of the project site would remain in their existing condition and would maintain their consistency with the existing General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on land use similar to the proposed project.

Noise

This alternative would result in a net decrease of 986,903 square feet of development relative to the proposed project. Construction would be limited to Parcels 1A and 1B; no demolition or construction emissions would occur on Parcel 2 or 3A. Construction activities would be required to implement

mitigation similar to the proposed project that would reduce short-term noise impacts to a level of less than significant. However, unlike the proposed project, this alternative does not include any residential uses and, therefore, it would not be necessary to implement the vibration and interior noise control mitigation measures identified for the proposed project. In addition, because this alternative would generate 15,017 fewer daily trips, it would have a substantially smaller contribution to ambient noise levels on local roadways, although the proposed project's contribution was not determined to be significant. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer noise impacts than the proposed project.

Population and Housing

This alternative would result in a net decrease of 986,903 square feet of development relative to the proposed project. No direct population growth would occur under this alternative, and the indirect population growth and employment growth created would be less than half as much as the proposed project. Therefore, population and employment growth that would occur under this alternative would not exceed forecasted population growth assumptions. In contrast, the direct and indirect population growth facilitated by the proposed project would contribute to an exceedance of regional population projections for San Ramon and, therefore, have a significant unavoidable impact. However, unlike the proposed project, this alternative would not include a residential component and would not contribute to providing affordable housing in accordance with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment allocation for San Ramon. Nonetheless, this alternative avoids a significant unavoidable impact associated with growth inducement while still allowing affordable housing goals to be pursued through other projects and programs. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer impacts on population and housing relative to the proposed project.

Public Services and Recreation

This alternative would result in a net decrease of 986,903 square feet of development relative to the proposed project. Because this alternative would not contain any residential uses and generate far fewer employment opportunities, it would result in correspondingly lower impacts on public services and recreation through fewer calls for service, student generation, and park usage. Because this alternative would not include the Plaza District, it would not result in the potentially significant impact requiring mitigation for the Iron Horse Trail. Note that this impact was reduced to a level of significant after the implementation of mitigation. Bishop Ranch 1A and City Hall would be multi-story structures and would be required to implement mitigation for fire response similar to the proposed project. This alternative would include a new Police Department headquarters and library and would have similar beneficial impacts associated with increased response times and improved delivery of services from the provision of these facilities. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on public services and recreation similar to the proposed project.

Transportation

This alternative would result in a net decrease of 986,903 square feet of development relative to the proposed project. Bishop Ranch 1A would be developed in place of the existing entitlement for 328,220 square feet of office uses; City Hall would also be developed and Bishop Ranch 2 would be

retained. When all of these conditions are factored in, the alternative would generate 15,017 fewer daily trips relative to the proposed project, including 966 fewer trips during the afternoon peak hour, although there would be 72 more trips during the morning peak hour because of the retention of Bishop Ranch 2. While afternoon peak-hour trips would be reduced under this alternative, intersection operation impacts would still occur and mitigation would be required to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. In addition, because this alternative would contribute new trips to I-680, which operates at LOS F during certain peak hours, it would have a similar significant unavoidable impact on freeway operations as the proposed project. This alternative would not modify intersections on Camino Ramon, Sunset Drive or other roadways and would avoid creating potentially significant queuing impacts; therefore, it would not need to implement mitigation to reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant. In addition, this alternative would not narrow Camino Ramon to two lanes during the non-commute hours and would avoid the potentially significant impact requiring mitigation associated with that aspect of the proposed project. This alternative would be subject to City motorcycle parking and bicycle storage requirements and would implement mitigation similar to the proposed project for these issues. This alternative would include a Transit Center and would create the beneficial impacts associated with more convenient public transit facilities. Because this alternative would not create potentially significant queuing and roadway hazard impacts requiring mitigation, it would have fewer impacts on transportation than the proposed project.

Urban Decay

No commercial retail uses would be developed under this alternative. In contrast, the proposed project would develop more than 600,000 square feet of retail uses as well as 169-room hotel. As described in Section 4.13, Urban Decay, the proposed project's commercial retail uses would not be expected to cause store closures or long-term vacancies that would create physical deterioration associated with urban decay and the proposed project would have less than significant impact in relation to this topical area. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on urban decay similar to the proposed project.

Utility Systems

This alternative would result in the development of close to 800,000 square feet of new office and civic uses, as well as parking structures, on Parcels 1A and 1B. The reduced development intensity of this alternative would have correspondingly less demand for potable water relative to the proposed project. Nonetheless, because of the intensity of the office and civic uses, this alternative would be required to implement water conservation mitigation measures similar to those of the proposed project to reduce potentially significant potable water impacts to a level of less than significant. The proposed project's wastewater and storm drainage impacts were determined to be less than significant and, therefore, this alternative would have less than significant impacts on these utility systems. This alternative would not require the demolition of Bishop Ranch 2 and would develop 1.3 million fewer square feet of new buildings. As such, it would be expected to have a substantial reduction in

construction waste generation; however, the development of close to 800,000 square feet of office and civic uses would be considered significant enough to require construction and demolition debris recycling mitigation. In addition, this alternative would also generate substantial amounts of operational solid waste and require mitigation similar to the proposed project to reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant. Finally, while this alternative would have a substantially lower demand for energy, it would still implement similar energy conservation mitigation to reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on utility systems similar to the proposed project.

5.3.2 - Conclusion

The Reduced Density Option 1 Alternative would have fewer impacts on noise, population and housing, and transportation than the proposed project. All other impacts would be similar to the proposed project. The Reduced Density Option 1 Alternative would meet the project objectives related to improving public facilities and the delivery of services, providing high-quality architecture and landscaping, and enhancing property values; however it would not meet the objectives related to developing a mixed-use district, creating new property and sales tax revenues, increasing housing options, reducing greenhouse gases, and enhancing mobility.

5.4 - Alternative 3 - Reduced Density Option 2 Alternative

The Reduced Density Option 2 Alternative consists of eliminating the Bishop Ranch 1A and the City Hall and Transit Center components and developing only the Plaza District. The Plaza District would be identical in size, design, and use as envisioned by the proposed project. Under this alternative, the existing vested entitlement on Parcel 1A for 328,220 square feet of office uses would be exercised. Parcel 1B would remain in its existing condition.

Table 5-3 provides a summary of the net square footage of this alternative relative to the proposed project. This alternative would result in a net reduction of 135,819 square feet, which represents an 8 percent reduction relative to the proposed project.

Table 5-3: Reduced Density Option 2 Alternative Summary

Component	Square Footage
Plaza District	1,376,207
Existing vested office entitlement	328,220
Removal of Bishop Ranch 2	(194,652)
Total	1,509,775
Net change relative to proposed project	(135,819)
Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2007.	

5.4.1 - Impact Analysis

Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

This alternative would result in the development of more than 1.7 million square feet of new mixed-use and office development, as well as parking structures, on Parcels 1A, 2, and 3. The proposed project's impacts on scenic vistas visual character were found to be less than significant and did not require mitigation; therefore, this alternative would also have less than significant impacts on these areas. This alternative would result in the introduction of substantial new sources of light and glare on Parcels 1A and 3A and the intensification of existing sources on Parcel 2. Mitigation similar to the proposed project would be required to reduce this impact to a level of less than significant.

Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on aesthetics, light, and glare similar to the proposed project.

Air Quality

This alternative would result in a net decrease of 135,819 square feet of development relative to the proposed project. Construction emissions associated with the Plaza District and the entitled office space would occur and be substantial; mitigation in the form of construction air pollution control measures would be required, but because of the size and intensity of this alternative, they would not reduce the impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, construction air emissions would be significant and unavoidable under this alternative. From an operational emissions perspective, this alternative would result in a net decrease of 2,685 daily trips, an 8 percent reduction, relative to the proposed project. However, because this alternative would generate 22,241 daily trips, which is more than the approximately 3,000-daily-trip significance established by BAAQMD, the proposed project's operational emissions would be a significant and unavoidable impact. Because both construction and operational emissions would be significant and unavoidable, this alternative would also have a significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impact. This alternative would also generate population growth and vehicle trips that would exceed the projections contained in the Clean Air Plan and, therefore have a significant unavoidable impact associated with inconsistency with the plan. Mitigation would be required for greenhouse gas emissions and would be similar to the proposed project; however, because of the size and intensity of this alternative, its greenhouse gas emissions would be cumulatively considerable. In summary, this alternative would result in the same significant unavoidable air quality impacts associated with the proposed project, and therefore, would have impacts on air quality similar to the proposed project.

Biological Resources

This alternative would result in the development of more than 1.7 million square feet of new mixed-use and office development, as well as parking structures, on Parcels 1A, 2, and 3. Because Parcels 1A, 2, and 3A contains habitat suitable for the burrowing owl or nesting birds, this alternative would have the potential to significantly impact special-status wildlife species and would require mitigation similar to the proposed project. The implementation of mitigation would reduce impacts to a level of

less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on biological resources similar to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

This alternative would result in the development of more than 1.7 million square feet of new mixed-use and office development, as well as parking structures, on Parcels 1A, 2, and 3. Because Parcels 1A and 3A contain undeveloped land, this alternative would have the potential to significantly impact previously undiscovered buried cultural resources and would require mitigation similar to the proposed project. The implementation of mitigation would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on cultural resources similar to the proposed project.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

This alternative would result in the development of more than 1.7 million square feet of new mixed-use and office development, as well as parking structures, on Parcels 1A, 2, and 3. Because urban development would occur on Parcels 1A and 3A, this alternative would have the potential to create erosion during construction and expose persons or structures to hazards associated with unstable geologic units and expansive soil. As such, this alternative would require mitigation similar to the proposed project, the implementation of which would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity similar to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This alternative would result in the development of more than 1.7 million square feet of new mixed-use and office development, as well as parking structures, on Parcels 1A, 2, and 3. There is the possibility that tenants of the Plaza District and the entitled office space could use hazardous materials and would be required to implement mitigation similar to the proposed project. The implementation of mitigation would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on hazards and hazardous materials similar to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

This alternative would result in the development of more than 1.7 million square feet of new mixed-use and office development, as well as parking structures, on Parcels 1A, 2, and 3. Because urban development would occur on these parcels, this alternative would have the potential to create water quality and drainage problems in downstream waterways. As such, this alternative would require mitigation similar to the proposed project, the implementation of which would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on hydrology and water quality similar to the proposed project.

Land Use

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would maintain the existing General Plan and Zoning Ordinance designations of the project site. Both the Plaza District and the entitled office space would be consistent with applicable General Plan and Zoning Ordinance policies. Parcel 1B would remain in its existing condition and would maintain its consistency with existing General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on land use similar to the proposed project.

Noise

This alternative would result in a net decrease of 135,819 square feet of development relative to the proposed project. Construction would occur on Parcels 1A, 2, and 3A and consist of 1.7 million square feet of new mixed-use and office development. Construction activities would be required to implement mitigation similar to the proposed project that would reduce short-term noise impacts to a level of less than significant. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative includes residential uses and, therefore, it would be necessary to implement the vibration and interior noise control mitigation measures identified for the proposed project. In addition, because this alternative would generate 2,685 fewer daily trips, it would have a smaller contribution to ambient noise levels on local roadways, although the proposed project's contribution was not determined to be significant. Therefore, this alternative would have noise impacts similar to the proposed project.

Population and Housing

This alternative would result in a net decrease of 135,819 square feet of development relative to the proposed project. Direct population growth would occur under this alternative and would be equivalent to the proposed project. Employment opportunities created by this alternative would be slightly less than the proposed project because of the smaller size of the office entitlement relative to Bishop Ranch 1A. The direct and indirect population growth facilitated by the proposed project would contribute to an exceedance of regional population projections for San Ramon and, therefore, have a significant unavoidable impact. Because the population and employment growth that would occur under this alternative would not be significantly different from the proposed project, it would also have a significant unavoidable impact related to growth inducement. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would include a residential component and would contribute to providing affordable housing in accordance with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment allocation for San Ramon. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on population and housing similar to the proposed project.

Public Services and Recreation

This alternative would result in a net decrease of 135,819 square feet of development relative to the proposed project. Because this alternative would contain residential uses and would generate a substantial number of new employment opportunities, it would result in similar demands on public services and recreation through fewer calls for service, student generation, and park usage as the proposed project. This alternative would increase use of the Iron Horse Trail and require the

mitigation measure related to increased trail usage that would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. The Plaza District and the entitled office space would be multi-story structures and would be required to implement mitigation for fire response similar to the proposed project. Unlike the proposed project, this alternative would not include the City Hall and, therefore, would not provide a new Police Department headquarters and library. Therefore, this alternative would not create the beneficial impacts associated with increased response times and improved delivery of services from the provision of these facilities. As such, this alternative would have more impacts on public services and recreation than the proposed project.

Transportation

This alternative would result in a net decrease of 135,819 square feet of development relative to the proposed project. Development of the Plaza District would result in the removal of Bishop Ranch 2 and, therefore, remove those existing trips from local roadways. This alternative also assumes that the existing 328,220-square-foot, vested office entitlement on Parcel 1A would be developed. When all of these conditions are factored in, this alternative would generate 2,685 fewer daily trips relative to the proposed project, including 133 fewer trips during the morning peak hour and 263 fewer trips during the afternoon peak hour. While peak-hour trips would be reduced under this alternative, intersection operation impacts would still occur and mitigation would be required to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. In addition, because this alternative would contribute new trips to I-680, which operates at LOS F during certain peak hours, it would have a similar significant unavoidable impact on freeway operations as the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would also create a potentially significant impact associated with queuing because it would implement the substantial intersection modifications associated with the Plaza District that would result in several 95th percentile queues exceeding available storage capacity. As with the proposed project, this alternative would narrow Camino Ramon to two lanes during the non-commute hours and would create a potentially significant impact requiring mitigation. This alternative would be subject to City motorcycle parking and bicycle storage requirements and would implement similar mitigation as the proposed project for these issues. However, unlike the proposed project, this alternative would not include a transit center and would not create the beneficial impacts associated with more convenient public transit facilities. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on transportation similar to the proposed project.

Urban Decay

The commercial retail uses developed under this alternative would be identical in square footage and nature to the proposed project. As described in Section 4.13, Urban Decay, the proposed project's commercial retail uses would not be expected to cause store closures or long-term vacancies that would create physical deterioration associated with urban decay and the proposed project would have less than significant impact in relation to this topical area. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on urban decay similar to the proposed project.

Utility Systems

This alternative would result in the development of more than 1.7 million square feet of new mixed-use and office development, as well as parking structures, on Parcels 1A, 2, and 3. Because there would be only a net reduction of 135,819 square feet relative to the proposed project, potable water demand would be similar to the proposed project. As such, this alternative would be required to implement water conservation mitigation measures similar to those of the proposed project to reduce potentially significant potable water impacts to a level of less than significant. The proposed project's wastewater and storm drainage impacts were determined to be less than significant and, therefore, this alternative would have less than significant impacts on these utility systems. This alternative would involve the demolition of Bishop Ranch 2 and would develop more than 1.7 million square feet of new buildings. As such, it would generate substantial amounts of construction waste and would require construction and demolition debris recycling mitigation. In addition, this alternative would also generate substantial amounts of operational solid waste and require mitigation similar to the proposed project to reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant. Finally, while this alternative would have a lower demand for energy than the proposed project, it would still implement similar energy conservation mitigation to reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on utility systems similar to the proposed project.

5.4.2 - Conclusion

The Reduced Density Option 2 Alternative would not have fewer impacts on any topical area relative to the proposed project and would have greater impacts on public services and recreation. However, this alternative meets most of the project objectives to the same degree as the proposed project, particularly those related to creating a mixed-use district, providing high-quality architecture and landscaping, and enhancing property values; nevertheless, it would not meet the objectives related to improving public facilities, integrating civic uses within the mixed-use district, and the delivery of services or enhancing mobility.

5.5 - Alternative 4 - City Civic Center Alternative

The City Civic Center Alternative consists of developing the project detailed in City Civic Center Environmental Impact Report, certified by the San Ramon City Council in December 2003. The City Civic Center Project proposed 276,000 square feet of civic and commercial uses, including City offices, Council Chambers, a library, a children's museum, a 1,200-seat performing arts center with a smaller 300-seat theater, 40,000 square feet of retail on Parcel 3A, and an aquatic center on the City-owned portion of Parcel 1A. These uses would use the existing Bishop Ranch 3 parking structure located immediately north of Parcel 3A.

The square footage for the Parcel 3A components are as follows:

- City Offices and Council Chambers: 70,000 square feet

- Library: 50,000 square feet
- Children’s Museum: 20,000 square feet
- Center for Arts and Visual Arts Gallery: 96,000 square feet
- Retail: 40,000 square feet

The aquatic center would feature an Olympic-sized pool with stadium-style seating for 3,000 spectators and locker room facilities.

This alternative would amend the existing City/Chevron Annexation and Development Agreement (since assigned to Sunset Development) to modify the existing 328,220-square-foot office entitlement to allow for the development of the aquatic center. Parcels 1B and 2 would remain in their existing condition.

Table 5-4 provides a summary of the net square footage of this alternative relative to the proposed project. This alternative would result in a net reduction of 1,503,162 square feet, which represents a 91-percent reduction relative to the proposed project.

Table 5-4: City Civic Center Alternative Summary

Component	Square Footage
City Civic Center	276,000
Existing vested office entitlement	(328,220)
Retention of Bishop Ranch 2	194,652
Total	142,432
Net change relative to proposed project	(1,503,162)
Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2007.	

The impacts analysis below summarizes the conclusions presented in the previously certified City Civic Center EIR.

5.5.1 - Impact Analysis

Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

The City Civic Center EIR concluded that all impacts on aesthetics, light, and glare would be less than significant and would not require mitigation. In contrast, the proposed project would have a potentially significant impact on light and glare and would require mitigation to reduce this impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer impacts on aesthetics, light, and glare relative to the proposed project.

Air Quality

The City Civic Center EIR concluded that all air quality impacts could be mitigated to a level of less than significant. This includes construction emissions, which would be reduced to a level of less than

significant through implementation of standard air pollution control measures, and operational emissions, which would be less than significant and would not require mitigation. Because these impacts would be less than significant after mitigation, there would be no significant cumulative air quality impacts. In addition, the EIR found that the City Civic Center Alternative would be consistent with the projections contained in the Clean Air Plan. In contrast, the proposed project would have significant unavoidable impacts associated with all of the aforementioned areas. Note that the City Civic Center EIR did not consider greenhouse gas emissions. However, with the implementation of energy and water efficiency measures similar to those of the proposed project, it can be assumed that this alternative would not have a cumulatively considerable impact associated with greenhouse gas emissions because of its reduced size and intensity. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer air quality impacts than the proposed project.

Biological Resources

The City Civic Center EIR concluded that all biological resources impacts were less than significant and did not require mitigation. In contrast, the proposed project would have a potentially significant impact on special status wildlife species and would require mitigation to reduce this impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer impacts on biological resources than the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

The City Civic Center EIR concluded that all cultural resources impacts were less than significant and did not require mitigation. In contrast, the proposed project would have potentially significant impacts on historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources and burial sites, and it would require mitigation to reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer impacts on cultural resources than the proposed project.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The City Civic Center EIR concluded that all geology, soils, and seismicity impacts could be mitigated to a level of less than significant. Mitigation was required for seismic-related hazards and unstable geologic units and is similar to the mitigation required to the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity similar to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The City Civic Center EIR concluded that all hazards and hazardous materials impacts were less than significant and did not require mitigation. In contrast, the proposed project would have potentially significant impact related to potential hazardous materials usage and would require mitigation to reduce this impact to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer impacts on hazards and hazardous materials than the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The City Civic Center EIR concluded that all hydrology and water quality impacts could be mitigated to a level of less than significant. Mitigation was required for construction and operational water quality and is similar to the mitigation required to the proposed project. However, the proposed project would also have a potentially significant impact on drainage that would require mitigation to reduce it to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer impacts on hydrology and water quality than the proposed project.

Land Use

The City Civic Center EIR concluded that all land use impacts were less than significant and did not require mitigation. The proposed project's land use impacts also would be less than significant and would not require mitigation. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on land use similar to the proposed project.

Noise

The City Civic Center EIR concluded that all noise impacts could be mitigated to a level of less than significant. Construction noise impacts would be mitigated to a level of less than significant with noise control measures similar to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, the City Civic Center alternative would not result in substantial increases in roadway noise levels or onsite noise that would adversely impact nearby sensitive receptors. However, this alternative would not contain any residential uses and, therefore, would not require the proposed project's mitigation for potential impacts associated with onsite noise or vibration. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer noise impacts than the proposed project.

Population and Housing

The City Civic Center EIR concluded that all population and housing impacts were less than significant and did not require mitigation. In contrast, the proposed project would have a significant unavoidable impact on growth inducement because it would contribute to population growth in excess of regional projections. However, unlike the proposed project, this alternative would not include a residential component and would not contribute to providing affordable housing in accordance with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment allocation for San Ramon. Nonetheless, this alternative avoids a significant unavoidable impact associated with growth inducement while still allowing affordable housing goals to be pursued through other projects and programs. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer impacts on population and housing relative to the proposed project.

Public Services and Recreation

The City Civic Center EIR concluded that all public services and recreation impacts were less than significant and did not require mitigation. In contrast, the proposed project would have potentially significant impacts on fire protection and trails that would require mitigation to reduce them to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer impacts on public services and recreation than the proposed project.

Transportation

The City Civic Center EIR concluded that all transportation impacts could be mitigated to a level of less than significant. This alternative would result in potentially significant impacts associated with intersection operations; parking, bicycle, and pedestrian access to the Iron Horse Trail; and construction truck traffic. Mitigation would reduce all potentially significant transportation impacts to a level of less than significant. In comparison, the proposed project would also have potentially significant impacts associated with intersection operations, parking, bicycle use, and construction traffic, as well as significant impacts associated with freeway operations, queuing, and hazards associated with narrowing Camino Ramon to two lanes during non-commute hours. Mitigation is proposed for intersection operations, queuing, roadway hazards, parking, bicycle use, and construction traffic, and these impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant after mitigation. No mitigation is available for freeway operations impacts, and this would be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer transportation impacts than the proposed project.

Urban Decay

The City Civic Center EIR did not consider urban decay impacts. However, because this alternative has only 40,000 square feet of commercial retail uses, it can be assumed to have much lower economic impact relative to the proposed project. As described in Section 4.13, Urban Decay, the proposed project's commercial retail uses would not be expected to cause store closures or long-term vacancies that would create physical deterioration associated with urban decay, and the proposed project would have less than significant impact in relation to this topical area. Therefore, this alternative would have impacts on urban decay similar to the proposed project.

Utility Systems

The City Civic Center EIR concluded that all utility system impacts could be mitigated to a level of less than significant. Mitigation was required for water supply and infrastructure impacts and consisted of fees for new conveyance facilities and water conservation measures to reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant. The proposed project would also result in a significant increase in potable water demand and would implement water conservation measures to reduce the impact to a level of less than significant. However, the proposed project would generate substantial quantities of solid waste and demand substantial amounts of energy; both are potentially significant impacts requiring mitigation to reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would have fewer impacts on utility systems than the proposed project.

5.5.2 - Conclusion

The City Civic Center Alternative would result in fewer impacts on 11 topical areas relative to the proposed project and similar impacts on the remaining three topical areas. This alternative would partially meet the project objectives, particularly those related to improving public facilities and the delivery of services, providing high-quality architecture and landscaping, and enhancing property values; however it would not meet the objectives related to developing a mixed-use district, creating

new property and sales tax revenues, increasing housing options, reducing greenhouse gases, and enhancing mobility. Moreover, the financial viability of this alternative is extremely uncertain because the development of the facilities associated with the City Civic Center proposal is estimated to cost \$160 million. This cost would be borne entirely by the City of San Ramon, and there are significant concerns about the fiscal prudence of the City taking on such a substantial financial burden. In addition, several of the facilities included in this alternative (e.g., the aquatic center, the performing arts center, and the children’s museum) have been developed elsewhere in San Ramon or nearby communities since the certification of the EIR in 2003 and, therefore, would not be considered feasible project components.

5.6 - Environmentally Superior Alternative

The 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 Density Alternative - Option 1	Reduced Density Alternative - Option 2	City Civic Center Alternative
Aesthetics, Light, and Glare	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Fewer Impacts
Air Quality	Fewer Impacts	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Fewer Impacts
Biological Resources	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Fewer Impacts
Cultural Resources	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Fewer Impacts
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Fewer Impacts
Hydrology and Water Quality	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Fewer Impacts
Land Use	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts
Noise	Fewer Impacts	Fewer Impacts	Similar Impacts	Fewer Impacts
Population and Housing	Fewer Impacts	Fewer Impacts	Similar Impacts	Fewer Impacts
Public Services and Recreation	More Impacts	Similar Impacts	More Impacts	Fewer Impacts
Transportation	Fewer Impacts	Fewer Impacts	Similar Impacts	Fewer Impacts
Urban Decay	Fewer Impacts	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts
Utility Systems	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Fewer Impacts

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.

Each of the proposed alternatives would have fewer environmental impacts relative to the proposed project, with the City Civic Center Alternative having the fewest. Therefore, this alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative.

5.7 - Alternatives Rejected From Further Consideration

The following alternative was initially considered but was rejected from further consideration for the reasons described below.

Alternative Location

For an alternative location to be feasible to support the proposed project, it would need to meet the following criteria:

- Be located within the limits or the sphere of influence of the City of San Ramon.
- Contain a minimum of 40 acres, with the acreage being either contiguous or separated only by streets.
- Be designated for commercial, office, or mixed-uses by the City of San Ramon General Plan.
- Be located at an intersection on a highly visible commercial corridor (e.g., San Ramon Valley Boulevard, Crow Canyon Road, Bollinger Canyon Road, Alcosta Boulevard, or Camino Ramon).
- Be under the ownership of either Sunset Development or the City of San Ramon.

No alternative locations meet all of these criteria and, therefore, are not considered feasible sites for the proposed project.

