

D. ALTERNATIVE PROJECT SITE ALTERNATIVE

CEQA Section 15126.6 indicates that an EIR shall describe and analyze a range of potential alternatives to the proposed Project. Per Section 15126.6(a), “An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.”

Per CEQA Section 15126.6(f), “The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a ‘rule of reason’ that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project.”

CEQA Section 15126.6(f)(1) states that “...factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site. No one of these factors establishes a fixed limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives (*Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990)).”

The Alternative Project Site alternative includes analysis of a project similar in scope to the proposed Project located at an Alternative Project Site. Although the project applicant does not have control of or ownership of the Alternative Project Site, *Citizens of Goleta Valley v Board of Supervisors* (1990) determined that an alternative project site cannot be dismissed or determined infeasible based solely on lack of ownership by the applicant. Therefore, due to similarities between the Alternative Project Site and the Project Site/Add Area and the feasibility of constructing a project similar in scope to the proposed Project on this site, the Alternative Project Site alternative was determined appropriate for further analysis. These similarities are discussed in the following paragraph.

The Project Site and Add Area comprise approximately 50.0 acres, which is similar in size to the Alternative Project Site. The Project Site/Add Area combination is currently industrially designated by the Chatsworth - Porter Ranch Community Plan and is surrounded on three sides by commercially designated and utilized properties. Similarly, the Alternative Project Site is currently industrially designated by the Chatsworth - Porter Ranch Community Plan and is surrounded on three sides by commercially designated and utilized properties. In light of the industrial zoning imposed on both the Project Site/Add Area and the Alternative Project site, both project areas are currently utilized primarily for research and development with limited manufacturing conducted on site. Both the Project Site/Add Area and the Alternative Project Site are located at the intersection of two heavily traveled, major highways within the San Fernando

Valley. Due to the likeness in current land use and zoning designations, the size of both the project areas, and the similarities in the circumstances of surrounding properties, it was determined that the Alternative Site was appropriate for analysis.

The Homeplace Retirement facility included in the proposed Project has been approved by the City of Los Angeles for the Project Site. The Alternative Project Site alternative analysis assumes the Homeplace project would be constructed as approved on the Project Site, and would not be included in the Alternative Project Site alternative. All potential impacts are assumed to be the worst-case scenario.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Alternative Project Site is located at 20700 Nordhoff Street in the Chatsworth area of the City of Los Angeles, California, within the Chatsworth - Porter Ranch Community Plan Area. The project area is approximately fifty acres in size, located within a developed portion of the western San Fernando Valley. The Alternative Project Site is bounded by Nordhoff Street to the north, De Soto Avenue to the west, residential properties that extend parallel to Gresham Street to the south, and Lurline Avenue to the east. The site is currently zoned MR2-1, Light Industrial and P-1, Parking. The General Plan designation for this site is Light Manufacturing.

Portions of the property have been developed since the early 1960s. The site is currently occupied by The Boeing Company who design and produce components for aerospace applications. The site is currently developed with approximately 655,516 square feet of office and industrial uses (assumed to be approximately fifty percent office and fifty percent industrial). These uses are divided between approximately eight buildings spread out across the southern two thirds of the site.

Parking is located along the northern portion of the site in two surface parking lots extending eastward from De Soto Avenue. Additionally, parking is available along the southern portion of the site, extending from De Soto Avenue to Lurline Avenue. Vegetation on the site is limited to landscaping along the southern property boundary acting as a buffer for residential properties to the south. Further, small clusters of trees are located along the property borders with Lurline Avenue and De Soto Avenue. Approximately eighty five percent of the site is impervious in nature, covered with buildings or pavement.

Regional access to the site is provided by the Ronald Reagan Freeway (CA-118) to the north, Topanga Canyon Boulevard (CA-27) to the west; the Ventura Freeway (US-101) to the south, and the San Diego Freeway (I-405) to the east. Immediate access to the site is provided by De Soto Avenue and Lurline Avenue.

Surrounding land uses include commercial and light industrial. To the north, across Nordhoff Street, land uses include a restaurant, an auto and truck accessory store, a hardware store, an industrial building, and a gym. To the west, across De Soto Avenue, land uses include a gas station, automotive parts and repair shops, small retail strip malls, and a two story apartment building. To the south, the site is bordered by two and three story apartments. To the east, across Lurline Avenue, the site is bordered by light industrial and office buildings.

1. Aesthetics

The Alternative Project Site is located within a developed portion of the San Fernando Valley. Currently, views from this location are primarily of the foreground with occasional background views. Development in the area of the Alternative Project Site is similar to that of the Project Site with respect to land uses and building characteristics. Properties surrounding the Alternative Project Site are commercial, industrial, and residential in nature. Building heights surrounding the Alternative Project Site are low-rise, generally one- to three-stories in height. As with the proposed Project, the proposed development of six stories or 75 feet in height could result in a significant impact to views in the area. However, views in the area include existing industrial, commercial, and residential developments that are not listed as significant in the Community Plan. There are no geographic features or visual characteristics identified as significant by the Community Plan. The Alternative Project Site alternative would result in continuity with the current commercial nature of the area including development of either retail or office buildings. This would not eliminate any natural feature in the area. Development on the Alternative Project Site will not result in the insertion of a prominent feature that would substantially alter the existing visual character of the area. The Alternative Project Site alternative will not result in a significant impact to the visual character of the area. Additionally, the Alternative Project Site alternative will not result in a significant impact on views in the area.

2. Air Quality

Existing development at the Alternative Project Site is assumed to be approximately 327,758 square feet of office use and 327,758 square feet of industrial use. This development currently generates approximately 5,587 daily trips at the Alternative Project Site.

The proposed Project at the Alternative Project Site would generate a maximum of approximately 16,128 daily trips, an increase of approximately 10,541 daily trips at the Alternative Project Site. The proposed Project at the Project Site would result in a maximum increase of approximately 13,136 trips. Therefore, the Alternative Project Site alternative would result in a reduction of approximately 2,595 daily trips, or 20 percent, compared to the proposed Project.

Due to the direct relationship between air quality and trip generation, a 20 percent reduction in trip generation will result in an approximately 20 percent reduction in impacts to air quality. Based on an air quality analysis conducted for the proposed Project at the Project Site, development of the proposed Project at the Alternative Project Site would generate a maximum of approximately 28 pounds of CO, 71 pounds of ROG, 46 pounds of NO_x, 3 pounds of SO_x, and 84 pounds of PM₁₀ during the construction phase. Therefore, construction of the Alternative Project Site alternative would not exceed air quality thresholds established by the SCAQMD after mitigation and would result in a less than significant impact to air quality during the construction phase.

Assuming a 20 percent reduction in trip generation, the Alternative Project Site alternative would generate approximately 1,284 pounds of CO, 139 pounds of ROG, 144 pounds of NO_x, 1 pound of SO_x, and 64 pounds of PM₁₀ during the operational phase. Therefore, as with the proposed Project, operational activities of the Alternative Project Site alternative after mitigation would exceed air quality thresholds established by the SCAQMD for CO, ROG, and NO_x and would result in a significant impact to air quality.

3. Biological Resources

The Alternative Project Site is located in a developed portion of the western San Fernando Valley. The Alternative Project Site is not located within a designated Biological Resource Area or a Significant Ecological Area (SEA). Therefore, the Alternative Project Site alternative would not result in a significant impact to biological resources due to conflict with an established local plan or ordinance.

Vegetation on the Alternative Project Site is limited to landscaped grassy areas and street trees. Development of the Alternative Project Site alternative may result in significant impacts to biological resources due to the removal of trees and landscaping on the site. However, as with the proposed Project, incorporation of a mitigation measure to replace any trees removed will reduce any potential impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Alternative Project Site alternative will result in a less than significant biological resources impact.

4. Geologic Hazards

Impacts from seismic hazards would be similar to those anticipated at the Project Site. As with the Project Site, the Alternative Project Site may be subject to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. However, this hazard is common in Southern California and the effects of ground shaking can be mitigated by proper engineering design and construction in conformance with current building codes and engineering practices.

According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, the Alternative Project Site is not located within a designated area of liquefaction. Due to the location of the Alternative Project Site in an inland area, there is no potential for impacts resulting from seismically induced tsunamis. No large bodies of permanently stored water are located such that they would adversely impact the Alternative Project Site due to seiches or flooding due to ground shaking. Therefore, the Alternative Project Site alternative would result in less than significant geologic hazards impacts due to liquefaction, tsunamis, seiches, or flooding.

5. Hazardous Materials and Waste

Current development at the Alternative Project Site is assumed to include both office and industrial uses. Therefore, it is likely that the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous waste takes place on the Alternative Project Site. With the proposed development of office, retail, or residential land uses at the Alternative Project Site, the rate of use, transport, and disposal of hazardous waste would likely decrease. Due to the age and type of buildings existing on the Alternative Project Site, it is likely that asbestos and lead paint may be located within the buildings. Similar to the proposed Project at the Project Site, proper stabilization and removal of such materials must occur prior to demolition of buildings. After mitigation, the Alternative Project Site alternative would result in a less than significant hazardous materials and hazardous waste impact.

6. Hydrology

The Alternative Project Site is currently developed with office and light manufacturing buildings, surface parking lots, and other impervious surfaces. Vegetation covers only approximately fifteen percent of the Alternative Project Site and is limited to landscaped areas and street trees. Due to the amount of existing impervious surface on the Alternative Project Site in addition to the lack of vegetation, hydrology will not be substantially altered as a result of any redevelopment. Therefore, as with the proposed Project at the Project Site, the Alternative Project Site alternative would result in a less than significant impact to hydrology in the area due to a substantial change in the quantity or quality of stormwater runoff from the Site.

Catch basins, which contain sheet flow runoff from the Alternative Project Site, are currently located at the northwest corner of De Soto Avenue and Nordhoff Street, along the west side of De Soto Avenue south of Nordhoff Street, along the east side of De Soto Avenue south of Nordhoff Street, along the east side of Lurline Avenue, and along the west side of Lurline Avenue. On-site drainage would be controlled in a manner similar to the proposed Project at the Project Site. As with the proposed Project at the Project Site, the Alternative Project Site alternative would result in a less than significant impact to hydrology due to the direction or movement of stormwater runoff from the Site.

7. Land Use

The Alternative Project Site is currently zoned MR2-1, Industrial, and P-1, Parking. With the adoption of a General Plan designation and zoning that are consistent, the Alternative Project Site Alternative would result in a less than significant land use impact. This would be similar to the land use impact anticipated from the proposed Project at the Project Site and development scenarios analyzed for the Add Area.

8. Noise

The Alternative Project Site is located in an urban environment. The existing noise environment is characterized by the mix of land uses within it, which includes residential, commercial and industrial development as well as arterial roadways. Similar to the proposed Project Site, vehicular traffic is the primary source of noise in the vicinity and is the largest consistent noise source.

The Alternative Project Site Alternative will generate approximately 2,595 fewer daily trips than the proposed Project at the Project Site. Because the primary source of noise in the project area is vehicular traffic, with a reduction of daily trips, noise in the project area will decrease. Therefore, impacts to noise at the Alternative Project Site will be similar to, or less significant than (as a result of the reduced trip generation) impacts of the proposed Project. The Alternative Project Site alternative would result in a less than significant noise impact.

9. Population and Housing

The Alternative Project Site is currently developed with office and industrial buildings. As with the proposed Project at the Project Site, the total population and number of housing units as a result of development will not exceed projections made for the project area in the City of Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework EIR. Therefore, as with the proposed Project, the Alternative Project Site alternative will result in a less than significant impact to population or housing.

10. Employment

Currently, there are approximately 1,859 employees on the Alternative Project Site. Development of the Alternative Project Site alternative could result in approximately 6,518 employees, an increase of approximately 4,659 employees at the Alternative Project Site. As with the proposed Project, this increase will not exceed employment projections developed by SCAG for the Chatsworth - Porter Ranch Community Plan Area. Therefore, the Alternative Project Site alternative would result in a less than significant employment impact.

11. Fire Protection

The Alternative Project Site is currently served by the following fire stations:

Fire Station No. 96 21800 Marilla Street Chatsworth CA 91311	Fire Station No. 107 20225 Devonshire Street Chatsworth CA 91311	Fire Station No. 72 6811 De Soto Avenue Canoga Park CA 91303
---	---	---

Based on City of Los Angeles requirements, the first due Engine Company should be within 1.0 miles of the site and the first due Truck Company should be within 1.5 miles of the site for commercial properties. Based on response distance criteria, fire protection of the Alternative Site would be considered inadequate. However, as with the proposed Project, with the incorporation of mitigation measures required by the LAFD, the Alternative Project Site alternative will result in a less than significant impact to fire protection services.

12. Police Protection

The Alternative Project area is currently located within the Devonshire Division of the LAPD, Reporting District 1774. Approximately 318 major (part I) crimes were reported within Reporting District 1774 in the year 2001; approximately 12,582 part I crimes for 2001 within the Devonshire Division; and approximately 187,069 part I crimes were reported Citywide in 2001.¹³⁴ Part I crimes include homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, burglary/theft from a motor vehicle, grand theft, and auto theft. Based on this data, the annual crime rate within Reporting District 1774 is higher than the Citywide average annual crime rate of approximately 186 crimes per reporting district.¹³⁵ Further, the annual crime rate within Reporting District 1774 is higher than the average annual crime rate within the Devonshire Division of approximately 153 crimes per reporting district.¹³⁶

Average response time to emergency calls for the Devonshire Division in 2001 was approximately 11 minutes. Within Reporting District 1774, the average response time to emergency calls was approximately 10.8 minutes. The Citywide average response time to emergency calls in 2001 was 9.8 minutes.

¹³⁴Letter from Bradley R. Merritt, Captain, Commanding Officer Management Services Division, LAPD to Carrie Riordan, Planning Associates, Inc.; June 5, 2002.

¹³⁵Based on 1,006 Reporting Districts Citywide.

¹³⁶Based on 82 Reporting Districts within the Devonshire Division.

The Devonshire area currently has approximately 324 sworn officers and 27 civilian support staff. Currently, the Devonshire Area is under deployed by approximately 30 police officers, eighteen percent under their authorized strength.

As with the proposed Project, the Alternative Project Site alternative would result in a significant impact to police protection services in the area.

13. Libraries

The Alternative Project Area is currently served by the following Los Angeles Public Library Branches: Northridge Branch, Chatsworth Branch, and Porter Ranch Branch. The Northridge and Chatsworth Branches are currently closed; however, it is anticipated that these branches will open in the year 2003. Based on the current service capacity of the Porter Ranch Library (approximately 100,000 residents), the demand for library services would not exceed the level of service available at the library branch currently serving the project area. As with the proposed Project, the Alternative Project Site alternative will result in a less than significant library services impact.

14. Schools

LAUSD schools serving the Alternative Project Site include: Limerick Elementary School, Lawrence Middle School, and Chatsworth High School. Currently, all three of the schools operate on a traditional school calendar. While development of the Alternative Site would generate school aged children (approximately twenty eight students) which may result in a significant impact on school facilities, this impact would be mitigated by the payment of school fees. As with the proposed Project, the Alternative Project Site alternative would result in a less than significant impact to school services.

15. Recreation

As with the proposed Project, there is no open space or parkland located on the Alternative Project Site and the proposed development scenarios do not include the construction or removal of open space or parkland. Development of the Alternative Project Site alternative could increase population in the area which would result in a decrease in the ratio of acres of parkland to residents from 32.5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents to 31.8 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. As with the proposed Project, this ratio is still greater than both the City of Los Angeles requirement of 4 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents and the City of Los Angeles provision of 4.25 acres per 1,000 residents. Further, as with the proposed Project at the Project Site will pay an in-lieu fee in accordance with the City's Ordinance (No. 141,422) and as set forth in the Zoning Code (Section 17.12). Therefore, as with the proposed Project, the Alternative Project Site alternative will result in a less than significant impact on parkland and open space.

There are no existing recreational facilities, active or passive, located on the Alternative Project Site. Development will not result in the removal or construction of any recreational facilities. Based on the number of facilities available in the project area, both public and private, the potential increase in population and housing units as a result of development will not result in an increased demand on recreational facilities that cannot be absorbed by existing facilities in the area. Further, any development will be required to pay in-lieu park fees, otherwise known as Quimby fees, as required by the City's Ordinance (No. 141,422) and as set forth in the City's Zoning Code (Section 17.12). As with the proposed Project, the Alternative Project Site will result in a less than significant impact to recreational facilities.

16. Traffic

Existing development on the Alternative Project Site includes approximately 327,758 square feet of office use and 327,758 square feet of light industrial use. Current development at the Alternative Project Site generates approximately 5,587 daily trip ends. Based on the proposed project scenarios, development of the Alternative Project Site alternative will generate a maximum of approximately 16,128 trips. Based on current development on site, the Alternative Project Site alternative could increase trip generation in the project area by a maximum of approximately 10,541 trips. This increase is less than the maximum increase of approximately 13,027 trips anticipated from the proposed Project at the Project Site. The Alternative Project Site alternative will result in less of an impact than the proposed Project. As with the proposed Project, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, the Alternative Project Site alternative would result in a less than significant traffic impact.

17. Electricity

Current development on the Alternative Project Site consumes approximately 7,685,925 Kwh annually. The Alternative Project Site alternative could use approximately 22,017,837 Kwh annually, an increase of approximately 14,331,912 Kwh annually. As with the proposed Project at the Project Site, the LADWP has determined that they can provide electricity for this Alternative without affecting the electricity distribution system. The LADWP does not expect disruption of service to existing customers as a result of connection of the proposed Project.¹³⁷ This Alternative would result in a less than significant impact to electricity provision.

18. Natural Gas

Development on the Alternative Project Site currently consumes approximately 1,737,117 cubic feet of natural gas monthly. The Alternative Project Site alternative could require approximately 5,555,477 cubic feet of natural gas monthly, an increase of approximately 3,818,360 cubic feet.

¹³⁷Letter from Charles Holloway, Supervisor of the Environmental Assessment Division of the LADWP to Carrie Riordan of Planning Associates, Inc. June 11, 2002.

Demand projections by The Gas Company can accommodate additional demand from this site as well as the cumulative impact of future proposals in the project area. The Southern California Gas Company has adequate supply for estimated demand in the foreseeable future and future service problems are not anticipated.¹³⁸ As with the proposed Project, the Alternative Project Site alternative would result in a less than significant impact to natural gas provision.

19. Water

Development on the Alternative Project Site currently consumes approximately 85,217 gallons of water daily, or 95 acre-feet annually. Development proposed for the Alternative Project Site alternative could consume approximately 392,382 gallons of water daily, or 440 acre-feet annually, an increase of approximately 307,165 gallons daily or 345 acre-feet annually.

According to the Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework EIR, the projected average water supply in year 2010 for the City of Los Angeles is expected to be 756,500 acre-feet per year while the projected maximum total available water supply is expected to be 1,370,646 acre-feet per year.¹³⁹ Based on the a Citywide water use of approximately 667,467 acre-feet in 2000-2001¹⁴⁰, an increase of approximately 345 acre-feet as a result of development at this site would be accommodated by the LADWP projected water supply for 2010. Further, a water supply assessment conducted by the LADWP for the proposed Project at the Project Site, indicates that the projected growth in water demand from the Alternative Project Site alternative of approximately 339 acre-feet annually falls within the range of expected water demand growth within the City.¹⁴¹ Therefore, it is expected that, as with the proposed Project, the LADWP will have sufficient water supplies to serve the needs of the Alternative Project Site alternative during normal and drought conditions and will not require additional infrastructure improvements. The Alternative Project Site alternative will result in a less than significant water supply impact.

20. Sewers

Development at the Alternative Project Site currently generates approximately 98,328 gallons of sewage daily. The Alternative Project Site alternative could generate approximately 361,525 gallons of sewage daily, an increase of approximately 263,197 gallons daily. According to the Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework EIR, the Tillman WRP currently operates at a

¹³⁸Letter from Jim Hammel, Technical Services, Northern Region of The Gas Company to Carrie Riordan of Planning Associates, Inc. May 9, 2002.

¹³⁹Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework EIR, Section 2.6.3.6 Projected Water Supply.

¹⁴⁰Final Year 2000 2001 Urban Water Management Plan Update

¹⁴¹LADWP WSA. Baseline water consumption for the proposed project was based on estimates of Sewer Generation Rates developed by the LADPW, Bureau of Engineering. Sewer Generation Rates provide an approximation of the amount of water used in various facilities within the City of Los Angeles.

surplus and an increase of approximately 263,197 gallons per day will not exceed the capacity of the Tillman WRP. Therefore, as with the proposed Project, the Alternative Project Site alternative would result in a less than significant impact to sewage treatment in the project area.

According to a sewer capacity analysis conducted by the City of Los Angeles - Bureau of Engineering for the proposed Project, it is likely that sewers currently located in Corbin Avenue and Nordhoff Street would have adequate capacity to facilitate construction of the proposed Project at the Project Site. However, development of the Alternative Project Site may need to be studied independently. Therefore, the Alternative Project Site alternative is not anticipated to result in a significant impact to sewers in the project area.

21. Solid Waste

The Alternative Project Site is currently improved with approximately 327,758 square feet of office uses and 327,758 square feet of industrial uses. Demolition of these improvements would generate approximately 41,462 tons of debris. A portion of the materials could be recycled. The remainder of the demolition debris will be disposed of at a landfill.

Construction of the proposed project at the Alternative Project Site would generate approximately 2,116 tons of debris. Based on the materials utilized during construction, it is assumed that a portion of the debris could be recycled. The remainder of the construction debris will be disposed of within a landfill. Any waste generation resulting from the construction phase of the Alternative Project Site alternative would be temporary in nature and would not result in long-term disposal of waste into any one landfill. Based on the temporary nature of the construction phase and the limited amount of debris generated, the Alternative Project Site alternative would result in a less than significant impact to solid waste during the construction phase.

Existing improvements at the Alternative Project Site generate approximately 22,452 pounds per day of solid waste. The proposed project at the Alternative Project Site would generate approximately 11,002 pounds of solid waste daily, a decrease of approximately 11,450 pounds of solid waste daily. As with the proposed Project, the Alternative Project Site alternative will result in a less than significant impact to solid waste.

A summary of the land use comparison between the proposed Project and project Alternatives is presented in **Table 133: Alternatives Land Use Summary**.

TABLE 133
ALTERNATIVES LAND USE SUMMARY

Project/Alternative	Industrial/ Manufacturing	Warehouse/ Storage	Office	Retail	Residential	Retirement Facility
Proposed Project Compared to Existing	0 (397,450)	0 (131,800)	1,516,000 1,488,600	540,000 540,000	400 400	389 + 35 389 + 35
No Project Alternative Compared to Project Compared to Existing	0 0 (397,450)	123,800 (8,000) (8,000)	0 (1,516,000) (27,400)	0 (540,000) 0	0 (400) 0	389 + 35 0 389 + 35
All Residential Alternative Compared to Project Compared to Existing	0 0 (397,450)	0 0 (131,800)	0 (1,516,000) (27,400)	0 (540,000) 0	4,660 4,260 4,660	389 + 35 0 389 + 35
Reduced Project Alternative Compared to Project Compared to Existing	0 0 (397,450)	0 0 (131,800)	151,875 (1,364,125) 124,475	0 (540,000) 0	54 (346) 54	389 + 35 0 389 + 35
Alternative Project Site Alternative Compared to Project Compared to Existing	0 0 (327,758)	0 0 0	1,516,000 0 1,188,242	540,000 0 540,000	400 0 400	0 (389 + 35) 0