



**SECTION 6.0**  
**ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

---



## 6.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

### 6.1 INTRODUCTION

CEQA requires EIRs to discuss a range of reasonable alternatives to a project, or to the project location, 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 (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(a)).

This section describes alternatives that satisfy these two criteria, i.e., alternatives which both: (a) attain most of the project's basic objectives; and, (b) lessen the project's potentially significant environmental effects. Pursuant to Section 15126.6 (f)(1) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, among the 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 (or the site is already owned by the proponent)." Although these factors do not present a strict limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives to be considered, they help establish the context against which "the rule of reason" is measured when determining an appropriate range of alternatives sufficient to establish and foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making.

#### 6.1.1 ALTERNATIVES TO BE ANALYZED

This analysis focuses on alternatives capable of eliminating significant adverse environmental effects or reducing them to less than significant levels, even if these alternatives would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the project objectives. The alternatives chosen for consideration in this EIR were developed based on public comments during project scoping and with input from the City's Planning and Historic Preservation staff. Alternatives chosen for analysis were designed to reduce or eliminate significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project as well as to assess the impacts of a broad range of uses for the site. These alternatives include the No Project Alternative, an alternative that involves different proposed uses, and several alternatives for preservation of historic resources and reduced density development. Alternative locations for most project components were not considered, however, because the project's purpose is to revitalize a key opportunity site in the Raincross District as envisioned in the *Downtown Specific Plan*. Potential environmental impacts associated with the six separate alternatives are compared to impacts from the proposed project below.



These alternatives include:

- Alternative One: No Project/No Development Alternative. No action would be taken to develop the project site and the site would remain in its existing state developed with retail, institutional, and automotive uses, and public and private parking lots. Alternative One serves as the “No Project” Alternative in accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e).
- Alternative Two: Adaptive Reuse Alternative. All existing eligible and designated historic buildings in the project site would be retained. All non-historic buildings and surface parking lots would be demolished to create development sites. This Alternative would result in less than one-half of the proposed Fox Plaza development intensity, with 96,378-square-feet of retail and restaurant uses, 210 residential dwelling units, and 730 parking spaces. New construction would fill in the vacant portions of the project blocks to create a unified street wall. The overall reduction of proposed uses would correspond to a reduction in structural heights throughout the project site, although the combined footprints of proposed and adapted, existing structures would not be changed relative to the proposed project. Consequently, this Alternative would result in a maximum building height of three stories above ground, except on Block C, where additional height would be required for an above ground parking structure and 400 public parking spaces to serve the Fox Theater. Surface parking, in interior courtyards or in small-scale parking structures, on Blocks B, C, and D, would be provided to allow the project to still meet City parking requirements, although the use of surface areas for parking would reduce the amount of ground floor retail provided within the project.
- Alternative Three: Mixed Preservation and Off-Site Development Alternative. This Alternative involves retention of two historic buildings, located at 3510 and 3650 Fairmount Boulevard, and retention of the facades of seven historic buildings and demolition of all non-historic structures. Existing vacant sites and newly created development sites would be developed with a new project similar to Fox Plaza, although at a reduced intensity, with 230 residential units, 38,000 square-feet of retail and restaurant space, and 630 parking spaces. Building heights would range between three and four stories throughout the project site. This option also involves construction of a two-story, 400-space parking structure to serve the Fox Theater. The proposed location for this structure is outside of the existing project site at existing joint Greyhound Bus and Riverside Transit Agency facility south of the intersection of Fairmount Boulevard and Mission Inn Avenue. As a result, although the intensity of development would be reduced, the overall development footprint associated with this Alternative would be larger than the proposed project.



- Alternative Four: Reduced Intensity Alternative. Redevelopment of the entire project site with urban uses similar to the proposed project, but reduced by 50 percent in terms of intensity, both for new construction and associated parking for the Fox Plaza project. This would result in the construction of 266 residential units, 38,000 square feet of retail and restaurant spaces, and 652 parking spaces. Building heights would range between three and four stories throughout the project site. This Alternative would include full retention of all historic building facades, with new development filling in vacant portions of the project blocks to create a solid street wall. The proposed Fox Theater parking structure would not be reduced in size and would still provide 400 parking spaces and approximately 12,000 square-feet of theater-support retail space.
- Alternative Five: Stalder Façade Alternative. Redevelopment of the project site with urban uses similar to the proposed project, but the historic Stalder Building façade would be preserved, with a ten-foot setback between the façade and any new construction. This Alternative proposes the removal of all other historic buildings on the project site. Unit counts, retail square footage, and parking provisions would be unchanged, with units and parking displaced by the façade preservation incorporated elsewhere in the project. As a result, building heights in Blocks B and C would be increased in height from six to eight stories.
- Alternative Six: Retail/Office Only Alternative. Redevelopment of the entire project site with a mix of retail and office uses, but no residential units. Uses would be developed in a manner consistent with the development standards of the *Downtown Specific Plan*. All historic buildings would be demolished to accommodate the new development.

A comparison of the proposed project with the alternatives is provided in *Table 6-1, Comparison of Proposed Project and Alternatives*.

**Table 6-1  
Comparison of Proposed Project and Alternatives**

Use	Proposed Project	No Project	Adaptive Reuse	Mixed Preservation	Reduced Intensity	Stalder Façade	Retail/Office Only
Retail/Restaurant/Office (Square Feet)	76,000	55,000	96,378	44,663	38,000	76,000	750,000
Residential Units	532	0	210	230	266	532	0
Institutional Uses (Square Feet)	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0	0
Parking Spaces	1,693	236	1,130	1,030	1,052	1,693	3,450



The potentially significant impacts associated with implementation of the proposed project are set forth in Section 5.0 of this EIR. The proposed project would result in potentially significant or significant impacts in regards to: traffic, air quality, noise, and historic resources.

Throughout the following analysis, impacts of alternatives are examined only for those issue areas where significant unavoidable impacts after the imposition of mitigation measures were identified in Section 5.0 of this EIR. In this manner, each alternative can be compared to the proposed project on an issue-by-issue basis for the issues identified below.

### **Significant Unavoidable Impacts**

- Traffic: Forecast Year 2009 Traffic Impacts
- Traffic: Forecast Year 2025 Traffic Impacts
- Traffic: 2009 State Highway Intersection Impacts
- Traffic: 2025 State Highway Intersection Impacts
- Traffic: 2009 State Highway Freeway Segment Impacts
- Traffic: 2025 State Highway Freeway Segment Impacts
- Traffic: Cumulative Traffic Impacts
- Air Quality: Short-Term Construction Impacts (Project and Cumulative)
- Air Quality: Long-Term Operational Impacts (Project and Cumulative)
- Noise: Short-Term Construction Noise (Project and Cumulative)
- Noise: Long-Term Traffic Noise (Cumulative)
- Historic Resources: Project Impacts to Designated Historic Resources
- Historic Resources: Project Impacts Potential Historic Resources
- Historic Resources: Cumulative Project Impacts to Historic Resources

Specifically, the following structures would be impacted by the proposed project:

- 3660-3666 Market Street and 3757-3769 Mission Inn Avenue (Stalder Building),
- 3510 Fairmount Boulevard (First Assembly of God Church),
- 3601-3665 Market Street,
- 3620 Fairmount Boulevard,
- 3650 Fairmount Boulevard, and
- 3547, 3583, 3595 Market Street.

The analysis of alternatives includes the assumption that all applicable mitigation measures associated with the proposed project would be implemented with the appropriate alternatives. However, applicable mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce or avoid the potential impacts of the alternative under consideration, and may not precisely match those identified for the proposed project.



Each alternative's environmental impacts are compared to the proposed project and determined to be environmentally superior, inferior, or neutral. However, only those impacts found to be significant and unavoidable for the proposed project are used in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed project.

## 6.1.2 ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED AND REJECTED

### Building Relocation

A structural analysis was conducted on each historic building to determine the feasibility of relocating some or all the historic buildings within the project site. The unreinforced masonry buildings, which are all of the buildings except the church, would require extensive structure retrofitting prior to relocation, which would involve select demolition of load-bearing walls to install structure supports and does not guarantee the structural integrity of the walls during the retrofit or relocation. The buildings are also mostly constructed on concrete slabs, which could not be moved with the buildings, requiring the walls to be cut into smaller sections and rebuilt at the relocation site(s), which may diminish the exterior integrity, and therefore historic significance of the buildings. Given the numerous technical constraints with the relocation of these buildings, the economic costs, and the possible degradation of the historic significance of the buildings, this Alternative is rejected.

## 6.1.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The following objectives have been established for the Fox Plaza Project:

- Encourage the revitalization of underutilized commercial properties through development of high-quality, mixed-use development consistent with the *Downtown Specific Plan*.
- Implement smart growth principles to improve the quality of life for City residents and to reduce urban sprawl.
- Encourage high-quality mixed-use development to significantly increase residential presence in the Raincross District.
- Encourage the establishment of a vibrant mix of uses that will serve the needs of both residents and visitors and will help create a vibrant daytime, evening, and weekend environment.
- Maintain a continuity of pedestrian activity through active retail and restaurant ground level uses along Mission Inn Avenue and Market Street.



- Provide current and prospective residents with increased variety of housing options.
- Increase supply of parking for proposed land uses, while eliminating surface parking lots and minimizing, or completely screening, the visibility of above-ground parking structures.
- Construct a public parking structure that will provide 400 public parking spaces available for use by the Fox Theater, as well as other uses in the area.
- Allow for higher density residential uses at underutilized in-town locations where residents will have access to transit and supportive commercial services.
- Improve the visual character of the City's built environment.
- Enhance the public streetscape.
- Encourage quality design that enhances the overall appearance of Downtown Riverside.
- Reduce commutes to Downtown by adding new residential units near existing employment opportunities.
- Reinforce the character of Downtown by providing high-quality building designs with pedestrian amenities.
- Provide a project that has substantial market value and/or reasonable uses within the Downtown Core.

## **6.2 ALTERNATIVE ONE: NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE**

### **6.2.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE**

The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes the Fox Plaza Project would not be implemented and the proposed land uses and other improvements would not be constructed. The project site would remain unaltered and the existing underutilized and non-conforming automotive, commercial and institutional uses and surface parking lots on-site would continue to operate as they do currently.



## 6.2.2 IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

### Traffic

Under this Alternative, no development would occur on-site, and therefore new traffic would not be added to the local roadway network. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not increase traffic levels or affect levels of service or overall traffic system function; thereby eliminating the significant unavoidable traffic impacts associated with the proposed project.

This Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding traffic impacts as it would not adversely affect traffic levels or traffic facilities relative to existing conditions, and it would completely eliminate the significant unavoidable traffic impacts associated with the proposed project.

### Air Quality

Grading and construction activities associated with the proposed project would not occur with this Alternative. Emissions associated with construction equipment, which would exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District construction thresholds for nitrogen oxides, respirable particulate matter, and volatile organic compounds would not occur. In addition, the South Coast Air Quality Management District operational emissions thresholds for carbon monoxide, reactive organic gasses, and nitrogen oxides would not be exceeded. Further, while the No Project Alternative would result in no new greenhouse gas emissions, it would not implement smart growth strategies that may assist in reducing overall greenhouse gas emissions. Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative would be consistent with the regional air quality plan and would not result in significant cumulative air quality impacts.

This Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project from an air quality perspective as it would not create new short-term construction or long-term operational air emission impacts, and it would completely eliminate the significant unavoidable impacts associated with the proposed project.

### Noise

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, no new land uses would be developed on the project site. Nearby sensitive receptors would not be subjected to construction-related noise. Increased stationary and mobile noise sources would not occur and ambient noise levels would not increase. Thus, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.



## Historic Resources

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in any direct or indirect impacts to historical resources, as no physical alteration of the site would occur under this Alternative. Thus, no designated historical resources (Stalder Building) or eligible historic resources (3547, 3583, 3595, and 3601-3665, Market Street, and 3510, 3620, and 3650 Fairmount Boulevard) would be demolished or altered under this Alternative. In addition, the cumulative impact to historic resources is reduced with this Alternative.

This Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project regarding historic resources impacts as it would not destroy or alter either designated historical resources or eligible historic resources, and it would completely eliminate the significant unavoidable impacts associated with the proposed project.

### 6.2.3 ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

This Alternative's ability meet each of the proposed project's objectives is summarized below. The discussion cites the objective, which is shown in italicized text, and if the Alternative meets the intent of the objective.

- *Encourage the revitalization of underutilized commercial properties through development of high-quality, mixed-use development consistent with the Downtown Specific Plan.*

This Alternative fails to satisfy this objective because it provides for no changes to the existing development pattern or character and creates no new opportunities for mixed use development.

- *Implement smart growth principles to improve the quality of life for City residents and to reduce urban sprawl.*

This Alternative fails to satisfy this objective because it provides for no additional development and does not allow for the creation of housing in proximity to employment centers. Thus, this Alternative does not reduce sprawl or implement smart-growth principles.

- *Encourage high-quality mixed-use development to significantly increase residential presence in the Raincross District.*

This Alternative fails to satisfy this objective because it does not provide any increase in residential units within the Raincross District.



- *Encourage the establishment of a vibrant mix of uses that will serve the needs of both residents and visitors and will help create a vibrant daytime, evening, and weekend environment.*

The lack of parking currently associated with buildings on Blocks A, B, and D severely restricts reuse potential. While the *Downtown Specific Plan* does not require parking for designated historic structures, practical use of the sites would require the availability of parking, of which there is not sufficient surplus to accommodate a significant intensification of activity at this sites. Thus, because it fails to generate additional parking or create a mix of uses, this Alternative would not satisfy this objective.

- *Maintain a continuity of pedestrian activity through active retail and restaurant ground level uses along Mission Inn Avenue and Market Street.*

This Alternative fails to satisfy this objective because with no development of new buildings, there is no opportunity to remove the surface parking lots and gaps in the street wall.

- *Provide current and prospective residents with increased variety of housing options.*

This Alternative fails to satisfy this objective because it provides no new housing options.

- *Increase supply of parking for proposed land uses, while eliminating surface parking lots and minimizing, or completely screening, the visibility of above-ground parking structures.*

This Alternative fails to satisfy this objective because it provides no new parking and does not eliminate any surface parking lots.

- *Construct a public parking structure that will provide 400 public parking spaces available for use by the Fox Theater, as well as other uses in the area.*

This Alternative fails to satisfy this objective because it provides no new parking for the Fox Theater.

- *Allow for higher density residential uses at underutilized in-town locations where residents will have access to transit and supportive commercial services.*

This Alternative fails to satisfy this objective because it does not provide any housing options.



- *Improve the visual character of the City's built environment.*

This Alternative fails to satisfy this objective because no changes to the visual character would occur under this Alternative.

- *Enhance the public streetscape.*

This Alternative fails to satisfy this objective because no changes to the public streetscape would occur under this Alternative.

- *Encourage quality design that enhances the overall appearance of Downtown Riverside.*

This Alternative fails to satisfy this objective because no new construction would occur under this Alternative.

- *Reduce commutes to Downtown by adding new residential units near existing employment opportunities.*

This Alternative fails to satisfy this objective because it does not reduce commute lengths as there would be no change in existing development patterns and no addition of residential units within the project site.

- *Reinforce the character of Downtown by providing high-quality building designs with pedestrian amenities.*

This Alternative fails to satisfy this objective because it maintains the existing character unchanged without providing high-quality design and pedestrian amenities.

- *Provide a project that has substantial market value and reasonable uses within the Downtown Core.*

This Alternative fails to satisfy this objective because it maintains the existing character unchanged, which does not result in new development in the Downtown Core that provides a reasonable mix of land use that result in increased market value of the properties.

As detailed above, under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the proposed retail, restaurant, and residential uses, as envisioned by the *Downtown Specific Plan*, would not be developed, and the existing underutilized commercial uses would remain on-site. Therefore, none of the project objectives identified in [Section 3.6, Project Objectives](#), would be met under the No Project/No Development Alternative. Further, the downtown streetscape would not be enhanced with high quality design. Additionally, the supply of parking would not be



increased, and surface parking lots would not be removed or enhance the aesthetic quality of the site. As a result, the No Project Alternative would not meet the goal of providing 400 parking spaces for use by the Fox Theater or any new public parking for other uses in the area. Although the historic Stalder Building and the eligible historic structures would be preserved, Downtown Riverside's housing supply, streetscape aesthetic, and parking supply would not be improved with this Alternative.

## **6.3 ALTERNATIVE TWO: ADAPTIVE REUSE ALTERNATIVE**

### **6.3.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE**

The Adaptive Reuse Alternative would retain all existing potentially eligible and designated historic buildings in the project site. All non-historic buildings and surface parking lots would be demolished to create development sites. This Alternative would provide 96,378 square-feet of retail and restaurant uses, 210 residential dwelling units, and 730 parking spaces. New construction would fill in the vacant portions of the project blocks to create a unified street wall. The overall reduction of proposed uses would correspond to a reduction in structural heights throughout the project site, although the combined footprints of proposed and adapted, existing structures would not be changed relative to the proposed project. Consequently, this Alternative would result in a maximum building height of three stories above ground, except on Block C, where additional height would be required for an above ground parking structure and 400 public parking spaces to serve the Fox Theater. Surface parking, in interior courtyards and in small-scale parking structures on Blocks B, C, and D, would be provided to allow the project to still meet City parking requirements, although the use of surface areas for parking would reduce the amount of ground floor retail provided within the project. Development on Block A would be limited to new residential construction on the northwest corner of 6th Street and Fairmount Boulevard. Access to Block A would be limited to Fairmount Boulevard. Access to Block B would be limited to Market and 6th Streets. Access to Block C would be limited to the alley on the east side of the block. Access to Block D would be limited to the alley on the east side of the block and 6th Street.

### **6.3.2 IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

#### **Traffic**

Development under this Alternative would be similar in land use types to that of the proposed project, but overall intensity would be increased as a result of the additional retail and restaurant space provided in this Alternative. As such, it is anticipated that this Alternative would result in greater trip generation traffic, approximately 6,857 average daily trips



compared to the 6,767 average daily trips for the proposed project. Impacts to the public transit system and State highways would also be increased under this Alternative, so traffic impacts would remain significant given current traffic volumes.

Because the traffic impacts would increase slightly, the four mitigation measures for the Forecast Years 2009 and 2025 scenarios would still be necessary, which include improvements at 1) Market Street/6th Street, 2) Lime Street/9th Street-SR-91 Westbound On-Ramp, 3) Market Street/Mission Inn Avenue, and 4) Main Street/SR-60 Westbound Ramps. Even with the imposition of Mitigation Measures TR-1 through TR-4, however, significant unavoidable impacts would occur under this Alternative.

The Adaptive Reuse Intensity Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project regarding traffic impacts as it would increase the traffic levels relative to the proposed project, and it would still contribute to the Alternative’s contribution to the significant unavoidable impacts.

**Air Quality**

*Table 6-2, Alternative Two Projected Air Quality Emissions*, provides a comparison of the anticipated air quality emissions associated with Alternative Two and with the proposed project.

**Table 6-2  
Alternative Two Projected Air Quality Emissions**

Alternative	ROG	NOx	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>
Adaptive Reuse	80.49/ 121.46	101.59/ 123.30	824.32/ 894.66	0.71/ 0.85	115.58/ 129.69	22.91/ 36.49	72,991/ 70,075
	125.51/ 136.09	142.70/ 171.69	1,149.27/ 1,121.07	0.98/ 0.84	160.40/ 160.57	31.78/ 31.95	103,676/ 97,918
Values represent sum of Daily Area Source and Operational Emissions (summer day/winter day)							

Short-term construction impacts would be reduced under this Alternative, given that approximately 45 percent of the proposed project is anticipated under this Alternative. However, NOx and PM10 construction emissions would still exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds, resulting in significant short-term air quality impacts, even with the implementation of mitigation measures.

However, operational emissions would increase under this Alternative, and therefore Carbon Monoxide, ROC, and NOx emissions would continue to exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds. Also, because traffic increases slightly under this Alternative, greenhouse gas emissions would be expected to be slightly higher than the proposed project.



As with the proposed project, this Alternative would exceed localized thresholds for NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations, but would not result in Carbon Monoxide “hot spots.” Given the reduction in development intensity relative to the proposed project, this Alternative would also be consistent with the regional air quality management plan, but would still result in significant cumulative air quality impacts.

This Alternative would significantly reduce the short-term construction emissions of Carbon Monoxide, ROC, and NO<sub>x</sub> relative to the proposed project, but would increase the Alternative’s contribution to the long-term significant unavoidable impacts due to operational emissions. Thus, the Adaptive Reuse Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project.

### **Noise**

The Adaptive Reuse Alternative would result in a reduction of the length of the construction period due to the reduction in overall development intensity. However, mitigation measures would still be required; moreover, even with mitigation, construction noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Also, this Alternative would result in an increase in mobile-source noise levels compared to the proposed project commensurate with the increase in traffic. Mitigation measures would be required to reduce mobile noise impacts to less than significant. Also, noise impacts to existing homes along 5th Street would remain significant and unavoidable.

Because noise impacts would increase under this Alternative, the Adaptive Reuse Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

### **Historic Resources**

The Adaptive Reuse Alternative, by retaining all designated and eligible historic structures, would limit impacts to less than significant levels. Existing historic buildings would be repaired and restored to original historic appearances, with some limited modifications, as needed, to incorporate current access, fire safety, and utility requirements. New ground level construction would provide architecture that is compatible with the various historic facades. Uses within the historic buildings would be modified as necessary to be compatible with the new tenants and new uses within the project site.

By eliminating the significant impacts to all historic buildings within the project site, the Adaptive Reuse Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project.



### 6.3.3 ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

This Alternative's ability meet each of the proposed project's objectives is summarized below. The discussion cites the objective, which is shown in italicized text, and if the Alternative meets the intent of the objective.

- *Encourage the revitalization of underutilized commercial properties through development of high-quality, mixed-use development consistent with the Downtown Specific Plan.*

This Alternative would bring new uses to the project site and add residential units in the downtown area. However, as this Alternative would provide less than one-half of the residential units that would be provided by the proposed project, this Alternative would not achieve this objective to the same extent as the proposed project.

- *Implement smart growth principles to improve the quality of life for City residents and to reduce urban sprawl.*

This project would increase development intensity within the project site and bring new shopping and retail uses to downtown but would not maximize residential densities in the Downtown core, a key component of smart growth.

- *Encourage high-quality mixed-use development to significantly increase residential presence in the Raincross District.*

This Alternative would result in an increase in the number of residential units within the Raincross District at a density of approximately 45 units per acre. As the proposed project provides approximately 115 units per acre, this Alternative does not provide a significant increase and therefore fails to meet the objective.

- *Encourage the establishment of a vibrant mix of uses that will serve the needs of both residents and visitors and will help create a vibrant daytime, evening, and weekend environment.*

This Alternative would bring new retail and restaurant opportunities to downtown and could assist in creating a vibrant environment. However, given that high residential density is required to create a vibrant 24-hour environment downtown, this Alternative would not achieve this objective to the degree made possible by the proposed project.



- *Maintain a continuity of pedestrian activity through active retail and restaurant ground level uses along Mission Inn Avenue and Market Street.*

This Alternative would provide for a continuity of pedestrian activity along all streets adjacent to the project site.

- *Provide current and prospective residents with increased variety of housing options.*

By providing only less than one-half of the residential units planned in the proposed Fox Plaza project, the range of options and supply of housing would be substantially reduced under this option. This Alternative does not fully meet this project objective.

- *Increase supply of parking for proposed land uses, while eliminating surface parking lots and minimizing, or completely screening, the visibility of above-ground parking structures.*

This Alternative eliminates existing surface parking lots, but does provide a new parking structure on Block C that would be very visible. This Alternative fails to meet this objective of reducing the visibility of above ground parking structures.

- *Construct a public parking structure that will provide 400 public parking spaces available for use by the Fox Theater, as well as other uses in the area.*

This Alternative, while providing the requisite number of parking spaces, would not allow these spaces to be located in proximity to the Fox Theater. This separation diminishes the functionality of these spaces for the Fox Theater and, as such, this Alternative fails to meet this objective.

- *Allow for higher density residential uses at underutilized in-town locations where residents will have access to transit and supportive commercial services.*

This Alternative would provide additional housing units in the downtown core, but less than one-half of the density that would occur under the proposed project. This Alternative fails to satisfy this objective.

- *Improve the visual character of the City's built environment.*

This Alternative would retain the historic buildings, restoring them to original appearance, and would provide new construction consistent with the design guidelines of the *Downtown Specific Plan*, all of which would result in an improvement of the visual character of the area. The above ground parking structure on Block C would be more visible than the proposed garage and this would present a negative visual impact compared to the proposed structure.



- *Enhance the public streetscape.*

This Alternative would allow for the improvement of the public streetscape and would therefore meet this objective.

- *Encourage quality design that enhances the overall appearance of Downtown Riverside.*

This Alternative would provide for the restoration of the historic buildings to original appearance and would provide new construction consistent with the design guidelines of the Downtown Specific Plan. Therefore this Alternative would meet this objective.

- *Reduce commutes to Downtown by adding new residential units near existing employment opportunities.*

This Alternative would add new residential units in the downtown core and would therefore meet this objective, but not to the same extent as the proposed project.

- *Reinforce the character of Downtown by providing high-quality building designs with pedestrian amenities.*

This Alternative would provide for the restoration of the historic buildings to original appearance and would provide construction consistent with the design guidelines of the Downtown Specific Plan and would therefore meet this objective.

- *Provide a project that has substantial market value and/or reasonable uses within the Downtown Core.*

A structural and rehabilitation analysis was prepared. It reviewed each of the buildings, assuming typical improvements and reuse of the buildings with uses desired in this area by the *Downtown Specific Plan*. This analysis has determined that the adaptive reuse of these buildings, individually, would result in a residual land value between \$2.00 and \$47.00, reflective of the level of rehabilitation and anticipated building uses. According to the report, the current market value indicates sales of comparable buildings of \$80.00 to \$85.00 per square foot of land. With the maximum residual land value only 55 percent of the average value, the adaptive reuse of these buildings is not considered economically feasible.

Policies LU-4, H-1-1, and H-1-5 of the *Downtown Specific Plan* call for the addition of high density housing in the Raincross District. At 35 units per acre, compared with the permitted density of 60 units per acre and the proposed Fox Plaza Density of 90 units per acre, allowable through the Conditional Use Permit process, this Alternative consumes a significant amount of land in the downtown core without maximizing the



redevelopment of the site. The lower density proposed as a part of this Alternative represents a density permitted for condominiums and apartments in more suburban settings and is not appropriate in the central core of an active and thriving downtown. As such, this does not qualify as a reasonable use of the site.

The Adaptive Reuse Alternative provides approximately one-half of the new development as the proposed project. Given the reduction in retail, restaurant, and that fewer housing opportunities would be provided in the Downtown area, the Adaptive Reuse Alternative would fail to maximize the development potential of the site per the *Downtown Specific Plan*. The Adaptive Reuse Alternative would not provide expanded retail opportunities and it would also not meet the commute reduction goal to the degree that the proposed project does. Therefore, a majority of the project objectives identified in [Section 3.6, Project Objectives](#), would not be met under the Adaptive Reuse Alternative.

## **6.4 ALTERNATIVE THREE: MIXED PRESERVATION AND OFF-SITE DEVELOPMENT**

### **6.4.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE**

The Mixed Preservation and Off-Site Development Alternative was analyzed in response to public comments. It involves retention of the historic buildings located at 3510 and 3650 Fairmount Boulevard, and retention of the facades of seven historic buildings and demolition of all non-historic structures. Existing vacant sites and newly created development sites would be developed with a new project similar to Fox Plaza, although at a reduced intensity, with 230 residential units, 44,663 square-feet of retail and restaurant space, and 630 parking spaces. Building heights would range between three and four stories throughout the project site. This option also involves construction of a two-story, 400-space parking structure to serve the Fox Theater. Under this Alternative, the proposed location for this structure is at existing joint Greyhound Bus and Riverside Transit Agency facility south of the intersection of Fairmount Boulevard and Mission Inn Avenue. Access to Block A would be limited to Fairmount Boulevard. Access to Block B would be limited to Market and 6th Streets. Access to Block C would be limited to the alley on the east side of the block. Access to Block D would be limited to the alley on the east side of the block and 6th Street.

### **6.4.2 IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

#### **Traffic**

Development under this Alternative would be similar in land use types to that of the proposed project, although with increased retail and restaurant areas and decreased residential units. As



such, it is anticipated that the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a reduction in traffic, approximately 4,820 average daily trips compared to the 6,767 average daily trips of the proposed project. Impacts to the public transit system and State highways would also be reduced under this Alternative, but would remain significant given current traffic volumes.

Despite the reduction in project size with this Alternative, it is anticipated that the four mitigation measures for the Forecast Years 2009 and 2025 scenarios would still be necessary, which include improvements at 1) Market Street/6th Street, 2) Lime Street/9th Street-SR-91 Westbound On-Ramp, 3) Market Street/Mission Inn Avenue, and 4) Main Street/SR-60 Westbound Ramps. Even with the imposition of Mitigation Measures TR-1 through TR-4, however, significant unavoidable impacts would occur under this Alternative.

The Mixed Preservation and Off-Site Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project as it would substantially lessen the traffic levels or traffic facilities relative to the proposed project, and it would reduce the Alternative’s contribution to the significant unavoidable impacts.

**Air Quality**

*Table 6-3, Alternative Three Projected Air Quality Emissions*, provides a comparison of the anticipated air quality emissions associated with Alternative Three and with the proposed project.

**Table 6-3  
Alternative Three Projected Air Quality Emissions**

Alternative	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	CO2
Mixed Preservation	62.48/ 103.00	73.33/ 89.82	594.75/ 677.36	0.51/ 0.71	82.83/ 98.28	16.43/ 31.30	49,645/ 52,243
Fox Plaza	125.51/ 136.09	142.70/ 171.69	1,149.27/ 1,121.07	0.98/ 0.84	160.40/ 160.57	31.78/ 31.95	103,676/ 97,918
Values represent sum of Daily Area Source and Operational Emissions (summer day/winter day)							

Short-term construction impacts would be reduced under this Alternative, given that less than half of the proposed project is anticipated under this Alternative. However, NOx and PM10 construction emissions would still exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds, resulting in significant short-term air quality impacts, even with the implementation of mitigation measures.

However, operational emissions would be reduced under this Alternative, and therefore Carbon Monoxide, ROC, and NOx emissions would no longer exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds, eliminating a significant long-term operational air quality impact resulting from the proposed project. Further, while the Mixed Preservation and Off-Site



Development Alternative would result in fewer new mobile-source greenhouse gas emissions, it would not implement smart growth strategies, that may assist in reducing overall greenhouse gas emissions, to the same degree as the proposed project.

As with the proposed project, this Alternative would exceed localized thresholds for NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations, but would not result in Carbon Monoxide “hot spots.” Given the reduction in development intensity relative to the proposed project, this Alternative would also be consistent with the regional air quality management plan, but would still result in significant cumulative air quality impacts.

The Mixed Preservation and Off-Site Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project as it would significantly reduce the short-term construction emissions of Carbon Monoxide, ROC, and NO<sub>x</sub> relative to the proposed project, and it would reduce the Alternative’s contribution to the long-term significant unavoidable impacts. However, impacts resulting from NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions would still be significant and unavoidable.

### **Noise**

Development of the Mixed Preservation and Off-Site Development Alternative would result in a reduction of the length of the construction period due to the reduction in overall development intensity. However, mitigation measures would still be required to reduce construction noise impacts, and even then impacts would remain significant. Also, while this Alternative would result in a reduction of mobile-source noise levels compared to the proposed project, mitigation measures would be required to reduce mobile noise impacts to less than significant.

Because no new significant noise impacts would occur under this Alternative, and traffic and on-site noise impacts would be reduced in relation to the proposed project, the Mixed Preservation and Off-Site Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

### **Historic Resources**

The Mixed Preservation and Off-Site Development Alternative would retain 3510 and 3650 Fairmount Boulevard, and retention of the facades of seven remaining historic buildings, which would reduce impacts by saving building facades, but would not completely eliminate significant impacts to historic resources. The buildings at 3510 and 3650 Fairmount Boulevard would be repaired and restored to original historic appearances, as would the preserved facades, with some limited modifications, as needed, to incorporate current access, fire safety and utility requirements. New ground level construction would provide architecture that is compatible with the various historic facades. Uses within the historic buildings would be



modified as necessary to be compatible with the new tenants and new uses within the project site.

By reducing, but not completely eliminating, the significant impacts to all historic buildings within the project site, the Mixed Preservation and Off-Site Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project.

### 6.4.3 ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

This Alternative's ability meet each of the proposed project's objectives is summarized below. The discussion cites the objective, which is shown in italicized text, and if the Alternative meets the intent of the objective.

- *Encourage the revitalization of underutilized commercial properties through development of high-quality, mixed-use development consistent with the Downtown Specific Plan.*

This Alternative would bring new uses to the project site and add residential units in the downtown area. However, as the project provides only one-half of the planned retail and less than one-half of the residential units, this Alternative does not maximize the potential of the site and minimize opportunity costs of development of this site.

- *Implement smart growth principles to improve the quality of life for City residents and to reduce urban sprawl.*

This Alternative would increase development intensity within the project site and bring new shopping and retail uses to downtown, but would not maximize residential densities in the Downtown core, a key component of smart growth.

- *Encourage high-quality mixed-use development to significantly increase residential presence in the Raincross District.*

This Alternative would result in an increase the number of residential units within the Raincross District at a density of approximately 45 units per acre. As the proposed project provides approximately 115 units per acre, this Alternative does not provide a significant increase and therefore fails to meet with objective.

- *Encourage the establishment of a vibrant mix of uses that will serve the needs of both residents and visitors and will help create a vibrant daytime, evening, and weekend environment.*

This Alternative would bring new retail and restaurant opportunities to downtown and could assist in creating a vibrant environment. However, given that high residential



density is required to create a vibrant 24-hour environment downtown, this Alternative would not achieve this objective to the degree made possible by the proposed project.

- *Maintain a continuity of pedestrian activity through active retail and restaurant ground level uses along Mission Inn Avenue and Market Street.*

This Alternative would provide for a continuity of pedestrian activity along all streets adjacent to the project site.

- *Provide current and prospective residents with increased variety of housing options.*

By providing only less than one-half of the residential units planned in the proposed Fox Plaza project, the range of options and supply of housing would be substantially reduced under this Alternative. This Alternative does not fully meet this project objective.

- *Increase supply of parking for proposed land uses, while eliminating surface parking lots and minimizing, or completely screening, the visibility of above-ground parking structures.*

This Alternative eliminates existing surface parking lots, but does provide a new parking structure off-site. However, given the length of time required to relocate existing uses from the proposed parking structure site, a significant temporary parking shortage would result. Therefore, this Alternative fails to meet this objective.

- *Construct a public parking structure that will provide 400 public parking spaces available for use by the Fox Theater, as well as other uses in the area.*

Given the timing involved in selecting relocation sites, clearing the existing site and constructing the new parking structure, the proposed alternative location for the Fox Theater parking structure on a site currently occupied by Greyhound and the Riverside Transit Agency would fail to satisfy this objective because this parking structure is needed to serve the Fox Theater, which is planned to be in operation in 2009.

- *Allow for higher density residential uses at underutilized in-town locations where residents will have access to transit and supportive commercial services.*

This Alternative would provide additional residential units within the downtown core, but not to the extent that the proposed project does. Because it fails to maximize the number of residential units added in the downtown core, this Alternative does not satisfy this objective.



- *Improve the visual character of the City's built environment.*

This Alternative would provide for the restoration of the historic buildings to original appearance and would provide construction consistent with the design guidelines of the *Downtown Specific Plan* and would therefore meet this objective.

- *Enhance the public streetscape.*

This Alternative would allow for upgrades to the public streetscape and would therefore meet this objective.

- *Encourage quality design that enhances the overall appearance of Downtown Riverside.*

This Alternative would comply with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the rehabilitation of the historic buildings and all new construction would comply with the design guidelines of the *Downtown Specific Plan*, all of which would result in a project that would enhance the appearance of Downtown, and would therefore meet this objective.

- *Reduce commutes to Downtown by adding new residential units near existing employment opportunities.*

This Alternative would add new residential units in the downtown core and would therefore meet this objective but not to same extent as the proposed project.

- *Reinforce the character of Downtown by providing high-quality building designs with pedestrian amenities.*

This Alternative would comply with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the rehabilitation of the historic buildings and all new construction would comply with the design guidelines of the *Downtown Specific Plan*, all of which would result in a project that would enhance the appearance of Downtown, and would therefore meet this objective.

- *Provide a project that has substantial market value and/or reasonable uses within the Downtown Core.*

A structural and rehabilitation analysis of 3650 Fairmount Boulevard, which is planned to be adaptively reused in this Alternative, assuming typical improvements and reuse of the buildings with uses desired in this area by the *Downtown Specific Plan* was prepared. This analysis has determined that the adaptive reuse of this building would result in a residual land and building value between \$15.00 and \$20.00 per square foot. According



to the report, the current market value indicates sales of comparable buildings of \$80.00 to \$85.00 per square foot of land. With the maximum residual land value only 20 percent of the current market rate, the adaptive reuse of this building is not considered economically feasible.

For those areas of new construction, the lower project density reduces the possible revenue. However, the need to provide full parking for all project uses on-site requires structured parking. The reduced project revenue does not support financing for the total construction costs and therefore makes this Alternative economically infeasible.

Policies LU-4, H-1-1, and H-1-5 of the Downtown Specific Plan call for the addition of high density housing in the Raincross District. At 40 units per acres, compared with the permitted density of 60 units per acre and the proposed Fox Plaza Density of 90 units per acre, allowable through the Conditional Use Permit process, this Alternative consumes a significant amount of land in the downtown core without maximizing the redevelopment of the site. The lower density proposed as a part of this Alternative represents a density permitted for condominiums and apartments in more suburban settings and is not appropriate in the central core of an active and thriving downtown. As such, this does not qualify as a reasonable use of the site.

The Mixed Preservation and Off-Site Development Alternative provides less than one-half of the new development as the proposed project. Given the reduction in retail, restaurant, and that fewer housing opportunities would be provided in the Downtown area, this Alternative would fail to maximize the development potential of the site per the *Downtown Specific Plan*.

The inability to construction the Fox Theater parking structure in a timely manner to would present significant adverse impacts to theater operations and create a significant, though temporary, parking shortage.

The Mixed Preservation and Off-Site Development Alternative would not add retail and restaurant space or residential units, or meet the commute reduction goal to the degree that the proposed project does. Therefore, a majority of the project objectives identified Section 3.6, Project Objectives, would not be met under this Alternative.



## **6.5 ALTERNATIVE FOUR: REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE**

### **6.5.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE**

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be similar to the proposed project in terms of land use types, but would reduce the Fox Plaza proposed land use intensities by 50 percent. As such, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in the development of up to approximately 38,000 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, 266 residential dwelling units, and 652 parking spaces. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would preserve all historic building facades. Existing gaps in the street wall would be filled in with new construction. The overall reduction of proposed uses would correspond to a reduction in structural heights throughout the project site, although the combined footprints of proposed and adapted, existing structures would not be changed relative to the proposed project. Consequently, this Alternative would result in a maximum building height of three to four stories above ground. This Alternative would also greatly limit the ability to provide underground parking, as the historic buildings would remain in place and complete excavation under the buildings to create underground parking would require extensive shoring to support the buildings during construction. Surface parking, in interior courtyards or in small-scale parking structures, would be provided to allow the project to still meet City parking requirements, although the use of surface areas for parking would reduce the amount of ground floor retail provided within the project. The planned 400 space parking structure would remain as proposed in Block A. Access to Block A would be limited to Fairmount Boulevard. Access to Block B would be limited to Market and 6th Streets. Access to Block C would be limited to the alley on the east side of the block. Access to Block D would be limited to the alley on the east side of the block and 6th Street.

### **6.5.2 IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

#### **Traffic**

Development under this Alternative would be similar in land use types to that of the proposed project, but overall intensity would be reduced by 50 percent. As such, it is anticipated that the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a 50-percent reduction in traffic, approximately 3,167 average daily trips compared to the 6,767 average daily trips of the proposed project. Impacts to the public transit system and State highways would also be reduced under this Alternative, but would remain significant.

Despite the reduction in project size with this Alternative, it is anticipated that the four mitigation measures for the Forecast Years 2009 and 2025 scenarios would still be necessary, which include improvements at 1) Market Street/6th Street, 2) Lime Street/9th Street-SR-91



Westbound On-Ramp, 3) Market Street/Mission Inn Avenue, and 4) Main Street/SR-60 Westbound Ramps. Even with the imposition of Mitigation Measures TR-1 through TR-4, however, significant unavoidable impacts would occur under this Alternative.

The Reduced Intensity Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project as it would substantially lessen the traffic levels or traffic facilities relative to the proposed project, and it would reduce the Alternative’s contribution to the significant unavoidable impacts.

### Air Quality

*Table 6-4, Alternative Four Projected Air Quality Emissions*, provides a comparison of the anticipated air quality emissions associated with Alternative Four and with the proposed project.

**Table 6-4  
Alternative Four Projected Air Quality Emissions**

Alternative	ROG	NOx	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>
Reduced Intensity	63.26/	71.51/	578.39/	0.49/	80.36/	15.95/	51,974/
	109.95	88.00	676.72	0.79	98.23	33.15	51,867
Fox Plaza	125.51/	142.70/	1,149.27/	0.98/	160.40/	31.78/	103,676/
	136.09	171.69	1,121.07	0.84	160.57	31.95	97,918

Values represent sum of Daily Area Source and Operational Emissions (summer day/winter day)

Short-term construction impacts would be reduced under this Alternative, given that 50 percent of the proposed project is anticipated under this Alternative. However, NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> construction emissions would still exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds, resulting in significant short-term air quality impacts, even with the implementation of mitigation measures.

However, operational emissions would be reduced under this Alternative, and therefore Carbon Monoxide, ROC, and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions would no longer exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds, eliminating a significant long-term operational air quality impact resulting from the proposed project. Further, while the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in fewer new mobile-source greenhouse gas emissions, it would not implement smart growth strategies, that may assist in reducing overall greenhouse gas emissions, to the same degree as the proposed project.

As with the proposed project, this Alternative would exceed localized thresholds for NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations, but would not result in Carbon Monoxide “hot spots.” Given the reduction in development intensity relative to the proposed project, this Alternative would also be consistent



with the regional air quality management plan, but would still result in significant cumulative air quality impacts.

The Reduced Intensity Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project as it would significantly reduce the short-term construction emissions of Carbon Monoxide, ROC, and NO<sub>x</sub> relative to the proposed project, and it would reduce the Alternative's contribution to the long-term significant unavoidable impacts. However, impacts resulting from NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions would still be significant and unavoidable.

### **Noise**

Development of this Alternative would result in a reduction of the length of the construction period due to the reduction in overall development intensity. However, mitigation measures would still be required to reduce construction noise impacts to less than significant levels. Also, while this Alternative would result in a reduction of mobile-source noise levels compared to the proposed project, mitigation measures would be required to reduce mobile noise impacts to less than significant.

Because no new significant noise impacts would occur under this Alternative, and traffic and on-site noise impacts would be reduced in relation to the proposed project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard.

### **Historic Resources**

The Reduced Intensity Alternative, by designing all new construction in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards, would reduce impacts by saving building facades, but would not completely eliminate significant impacts to historic resources. Existing historic facades would be repaired and restored to original historic appearances, with some limited modifications, as needed, to incorporate current access, fire safety and utility requirements. New ground level construction would provide architecture that is compatible with the various historic facades.

With the 50 percent reduction in development intensity of new construction, the Reduced Intensity Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project, as it retains all of the historic building facades, thereby reducing, but not eliminating, significant unavoidable impacts to eligible and designated historic resources.



### 6.5.3 ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

This Alternative's ability meet each of the proposed project's objectives is summarized below. The discussion cites the objective, which is shown in italicized text, and if the Alternative meets the intent of the objective.

- *Encourage the revitalization of underutilized commercial properties through development of high-quality, mixed-use development consistent with the Downtown Specific Plan.*

This Alternative would involve construction of new retail and restaurant spaces along the entire project site and would allow for the addition of new uses within these areas. This Alternative would also allow for the construction of high-quality mixed use development and would therefore generally meet this projective.

- *Implement smart growth principles to improve the quality of life for City residents and to reduce urban sprawl.*

This Alternative would add new residential units and new restaurant and retail uses in the downtown core, which already provides residential amenities and proximity to employment and retail opportunities, which meets smart growth principles, but not to the degree of the proposed project.

- *Encourage high-quality mixed-use development to significantly increase residential presence in the Raincross District.*

While this Alternative does provide housing in the Raincross District, it fails to provide the level of residential units that are permitted by the *Downtown Specific Plan* and can be accommodated by the site. As this Alternative fails to maximum the development of the site, in a manner consistent with the *Downtown Specific Plan*, it fails to meet this objective.

- *Encourage the establishment of a vibrant mix of uses that will serve the needs of both residents and visitors and will help create a vibrant daytime, evening, and weekend environment.*

As this Alternative provides restaurant and retail space, it is possible for this Alternative to meet this objective through the proper selection and location of tenants. However, given that high residential density is required to create a vibrant 24-hour environment downtown, this Alternative would not achieve this objective to the degree made possible by the proposed project.



- *Maintain a continuity of pedestrian activity through active retail and restaurant ground level uses along Mission Inn Avenue and Market Street.*

This Alternative would provide for a continuous street wall of retail and restaurant spaces and would therefore meet this objective.

- *Provide current and prospective residents with increased variety of housing options.*

By providing only less than one-half of the residential units planned in the proposed Fox Plaza project, the range of options and supply of housing would be substantially reduced under this Alternative. This Alternative does not fully meet this project objective.

- *Increase supply of parking for proposed land uses, while eliminating surface parking lots and minimizing, or completely screening, the visibility of above-ground parking structures.*

This Alternative would not be able to provide underground parking and would instead provide parking in interior courtyards and surface parking lots. While these could be generally screened from outside the project, they would still be visible from within the projects and therefore this Alternative would not fully meet this objective.

- *Construct a public parking structure that will provide 400 public parking spaces available for use by the Fox Theater, as well as other uses in the area.*

This Alternative would provide the necessary parking structure for the Fox Theater and would therefore meet this objective.

- *Allow for higher density residential uses at underutilized in-town locations where residents will have access to transit and supportive commercial services.*

This Alternative provides new residential units within the downtown core, but only one-half of the units that are provided by the proposed project. This Alternative does not provide the density of development that the project site is capable of accommodating without deviations from the *Downtown Specific Plan* development standards. As such, this Alternative is considered to fail to satisfy this objective.

- *Improve the visual character of the City's built environment.*

This Alternative would provide for new construction that is consistent with the design guidelines of the *Downtown Specific Plan* and would therefore improve the appearance of this site and thus meets this objective.



- *Enhance the public streetscape.*

This Alternative would allow for enhancement of the public rights of way surrounding the project site and therefore meets this objective.

- *Encourage quality design that enhances the overall appearance of Downtown Riverside.*

This Alternative would provide for new construction that is consistent with the design guidelines of the *Downtown Specific Plan* and would therefore improve the appearance of this site and thus meets this objective.

- *Reduce commutes to Downtown by adding new residential units near existing employment opportunities.*

This Alternative provides new residential units within the downtown core, but only one-half of the units that are provided by the proposed project. This Alternative does not provide the density of development that the project site is capable of accommodating without deviations from the *Downtown Specific Plan* development standards. Commutes would be reduced but not to the maximum degree possible through basic compliance with the *Downtown Specific Plan*. As such, it is considered to fail to satisfy this objective.

- *Reinforce the character of Downtown by providing high-quality building designs with pedestrian amenities.*

This Alternative would provide for new construction that is consistent with the design guidelines of the *Downtown Specific Plan* and would therefore improve the appearance of this site and thus meets this objective.

- *Provide a project that has substantial market value and/or reasonable uses within the Downtown Core.*

The lower project density planned in this Alternative reduces the possible revenue. However, the need to provide full parking for all project uses on-site requires structured parking. The reduced project revenue does not support financing for the total construction costs and therefore makes this Fox Plaza alternative economically infeasible.

Policies LU-4, H-1-1, and H-1-5 of the *Downtown Specific Plan* call for the addition of high density housing in the Raincross District. At 45 units per acres, compared with the permitted density of 60 units per acre and the proposed Fox Plaza Density of 90 units per acre, allowable through the Conditional Use Permit process, this Alternative



consumes a significant amount of land in the downtown core without maximizing the redevelopment of the site. The lower density proposed as a part of this Alternative represents a density permitted for condominiums and apartments in more suburban settings and is not appropriate in the central core of an active and thriving downtown. As such, this does not qualify as a reasonable use of the site.

The Reduced Intensity Alternative provides only 50 percent of the new development as compared to the proposed project. Given the reduction in retail, restaurant, and that fewer housing opportunities would be provided in the Downtown area, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would fail to maximize the development potential of the site per the *Downtown Specific Plan*. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would not provide expanded retail opportunities and it would also not meet the commute reduction goal to the degree that the proposed project does. Therefore, a majority of the project objectives identified Section 3.6, Project Objectives, would not be met under the Reduced Intensity Alternative.

## 6.6 ALTERNATIVE FIVE: STALDER FAÇADE ALTERNATIVE

### 6.6.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

Alternative Five (Stalder Façade Alternative) would be similar to the proposed project in terms of land use types and intensities, but would retain the historic Stalder Building facade. The Stalder Façade Alternative would:

- Demolish and remove all other on-site structures, as well as a majority of the Stalder Building,
- Preserve the façade of the Stalder Building and incorporate this design feature into the proposed project, and
- Provide a ten-foot setback between the historic façade and proposed new construction.
- Reduce the size of the underground parking structure on Block D through the elimination of all planned parking spaces under the Stalder Building façade.
- Retain the same residential unit counts, retail space and parking spaces as the proposed project.

As such, this Alternative would result in the development of up to approximately 76,000 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, up to 532 residential dwelling units, and up to 1,693 parking spaces. It is anticipated that the floor area dedicated to preserving the Stalder Building façade, along the ten-foot setback facing Mission Inn Avenue, would be incorporated elsewhere in the development, generally maintaining the overall project massing and heights. The building on



Block D would remain six-stories as proposed, and the buildings on Blocks B and C would be increased in height from six to eight stories, with maximum building heights of no more than 100 feet. Access to each block in this Alternative is identical to the access proposed by the Fox Plaza project.

## 6.6.2 IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

### Traffic

Development under this Alternative would be similar in land use types and intensities to that of the proposed project, but would preserve the historic Stalder Building façade. As such, it is anticipated that the Stalder Façade Alternative would result in the same traffic generation and associated traffic impacts compared to the proposed project. Impacts to the public transit system and State highways would also be comparable under this Alternative and would remain less than significant.

Consequently, the four mitigation measures for the Forecast Years 2009 and 2025 scenarios would still be necessary, which include improvements at 1) Market Street/6th Street, 2) Lime Street/9th Street-SR-91 Westbound On-Ramp, 3) Market Street/Mission Inn Avenue, and 4) Main Street/SR-60 Westbound Ramps. Even with the imposition of Mitigation Measures TR-1 through TR-4, however, significant unavoidable impacts would occur under this Alternative.

The Stalder Façade Alternative is considered neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed project as it would result in the same impacts as the proposed project, and it would not reduce the Alternative’s contribution to the significant unavoidable impacts.

### Air Quality

*Table 6-5, Alternative Five Projected Air Quality Emissions*, provides a comparison of the anticipated air quality emissions associated with Alternative Five and with the proposed project.

**Table 6-5  
Alternative Five Projected Air Quality Emissions**

Alternative	ROG	NOx	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>
Stalder Façade	125.51/	142.70/	1,149.27/	0.98/	160.40/	31.78/	103,676/
	136.09	171.69	1,121.07	0.84	160.57	31.95	97,918
Fox Plaza	125.51/	142.70/	1,149.27/	0.98/	160.40/	31.78/	103,676/
	136.09	171.69	1,121.07	0.84	160.57	31.95	97,918

Values represent sum of Daily Area Source and Operational Emissions (summer day/winter day)



Short-term construction impacts would be the greater under this Alternative than the proposed project, as greater excavation would be required for the below-grade parking structures, resulting in greater construction traffic as well as additional air emissions during the excavation construction phase. All other construction phases would be the same as the proposed project. NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions would still exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds during construction activities, resulting in significant short-term air quality impacts, even with the implementation of mitigation measures. Operational emissions would be comparable under this Alternative, and therefore Carbon Monoxide, ROC, and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions would still exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds, which would remain a significant long-term operational air quality impact. As with the proposed project, this Alternative would result in significant unavoidable impacts with regard to localized NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations, but less than significant impacts with regard to Carbon Monoxide “hot spots.” Given the similarity in development intensity compared to the proposed project, this Alternative would also be consistent with the regional air quality management plan, and would still result in significant cumulative air quality impacts.

The Stalder Façade Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project as it would result in the greater construction impacts than the proposed project, and it would not reduce the Alternative’s contribution to the significant unavoidable impacts.

### **Noise**

Development of this Alternative would generally require the same amount of construction on generally the same construction schedule as the proposed project, although the displaced excavation would be close to the residential neighborhood and therefore would increase noise impacts in this location. Consequently, mitigation measures would still be required to reduce construction noise impacts; however, those impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. This Alternative would result in similar mobile source noise levels compared to the proposed project, and therefore mitigation measures would still be required to reduce mobile noise impacts to less than significant. Also, noise impacts to existing homes along 5th Street would remain significant and unavoidable. Given the increase in noise impacts resulting from additional excavations closer to the residential areas, this project is considered inferior.

### **Historic Resources**

As with the proposed project, the Stalder Façade Alternative would result in significant direct impacts to on-site historic resources, but would substantially lessen that impact by retaining the historic Stalder Building façade as part of the project design. However, this Alternative would demolish other features of the Stalder building, such as the wood trusses and roof structures of the Glenwood Mission Garage that are still intact. Additionally, this Alternative would still result in demolition of eligible historic resources (3583, 3595, and 3601-3623 Market Street, and



3610 Fairmount Boulevard), along with the cumulative impacts to historic resources in the Downtown area.

Despite the removal of all other on-site eligible historic resources and the similarity in development intensity of new construction, the Stalder Façade Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed project in this regard, but only with regard to Block D. Significant unavoidable impacts to all other eligible and designated historic buildings would still occur on Blocks A and B. Overall, though, with the preservation of the façade of the most significant historic resource, this Alternative is considered environmentally superior compared to the proposed project.

### 6.6.3 ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

This Alternative's ability meet each of the proposed project's objectives is summarized below. The discussion cites the objective, which is shown in italicized text, and if the Alternative meets the intent of the objective.

- *Encourage the revitalization of underutilized commercial properties through development of high-quality, mixed-use development consistent with the Downtown Specific Plan.*

This Alternative provides the same number of residential units and retail space, in a high-quality mixed use project, as the proposed project and thus meets this objective.

- *Implement smart growth principles to improve the quality of life for City residents and to reduce urban sprawl.*

This Alternative provides the same number of residential units and retail space, in a high-quality mixed use project, as the proposed project and thus meets this objective.

- *Encourage high-quality mixed-use development to significantly increase residential presence in the Raincross District.*

This Alternative provides the same number of residential units and retail space, in a high-quality mixed use project, as the proposed project and thus meets this objective.

- *Encourage the establishment of a vibrant mix of uses that will serve the needs of both residents and visitors and will help create a vibrant daytime, evening, and weekend environment.*

This Alternative could meet this objective as it would provide ground floor retail and restaurant opportunities that could serve the Downtown area throughout the day, evening and weekends.



- *Maintain a continuity of pedestrian activity through active retail and restaurant ground level uses along Mission Inn Avenue and Market Street.*

This Alternative could meet this objective as it would provide ground floor retail and restaurant opportunities.

- *Provide current and prospective residents with increased variety of housing options.*

This Alternative provides the same number and range of housing units as the proposed project and therefore meets this objective.

- *Increase supply of parking for proposed land uses, while eliminating surface parking lots and minimizing, or completely screening, the visibility of above-ground parking structures.*

This Alternative would provide the same number of parking spaces as the proposed project, in generally the same locations and with the same level of screening for the aboveground structure on Block C. This Alternative meets this objective.

- *Construct a public parking structure that will provide 400 public parking spaces available for use by the Fox Theater, as well as other uses in the area.*

This Alternative would provide for the construction of the planned parking structure and would therefore meet this project objective.

- *Allow for higher density residential uses at underutilized in-town locations where residents will have access to transit and supportive commercial services.*

This Alternative would provide the same number of residential units as the proposed project and maximizes the density at this location, while still generally complying with the standards of the *Downtown Specific Plan*. This Alternative meets this objective.

- *Improve the visual character of the City's built environment.*

This Alternative would be able to meet this objective as all new construction would be subject to compliance with the design guidelines of the *Downtown Specific Plan*.

- *Enhance the public streetscape.*

This Alternative would be able to meet this objective as all new construction would be subject to compliance with the design guidelines of the *Downtown Specific Plan*.



- *Encourage quality design that enhances the overall appearance of Downtown Riverside.*

This project would be able to meet this objective as all new construction would be subject to compliance with the design guidelines of the Downtown Specific Plan.

- *Reduce commutes to Downtown by adding new residential units near existing employment opportunities.*

This Alternative would provide the same number of residential units as the proposed project and would also fully meet this objective.

- *Reinforce the character of Downtown by providing high-quality building designs with pedestrian amenities.*

This Alternative would be able to meet this objective as all new construction would be subject to compliance with the design guidelines of the *Downtown Specific Plan*.

- *Provide a project that has substantial market value and/or reasonable uses within the Downtown Core.*

A structural analysis of the Stalder façade concluded that extensive shoring and stabilization measures would be required to retain the façade in place during excavations to construct the underground parking and to preserve the façade following completion of all new construction. The proposed Fox Plaza project provides approximately 32 feet of depth for the ground floor retail spaces. With the required permanent shoring to preserve the façade, the depth of the ground floor retail spaces would be reduced to approximately 16 feet, which is substandard per current market trends for commercial building leasing practices. This is therefore an infeasible option to consider as it would prevent the incorporation of the types of uses explicitly desired by the *Downtown Specific Plan* and would prevent the full use of the important Mission Inn Avenue street frontage and prevent the attraction of tenants that would reinforce the revitalization of Downtown.

While this Alternative would provide the same type and intensity of new development as the proposed project, and would still remove existing underutilized commercial uses, preserving a significant historic feature of an existing resource would require increasing building heights, and construction costs, to a degree that would make implementation of the project infeasible.

Therefore, the project objectives identified Section 3.6, Project Objectives, would not be met under the Stalder Façade Alternative.



## **6.7 ALTERNATIVE SIX: RETAIL/OFFICE ONLY ALTERNATIVE**

### **6.7.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE**

The Retail/Office Only Alternative would redevelop the project site with only retail and office uses, consistent with the provisions of the *Downtown Specific Plan*, and would not include residential uses. Under the Retail/Office Only Alternative, all on-site structures, including historic buildings, would be demolished and removed from the project site, and the site would be developed with new office and retail uses, as well as associated parking and other improvements. Based on the development standards contained in the *Downtown Specific Plan*, this Alternative would result in the development of up to 75,000 square feet of retail and 675,000 square feet office uses, with a maximum floor-area ratio of 3.5 to 1. Building heights would be comparable to the proposed project and would not exceed 100 feet in any location. Underground parking, circulation, landscaping, and other improvements would also be provided under this Alternative. Access to Block A would be limited to Fairmount Boulevard. Access to Block B would be limited to Market and 6th Streets. Access to Block C would be limited to the alley on the east side of the block. Access to Block D would be limited to the alley on the east side of the block and 6th Street.

### **6.7.2 IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

#### **Traffic**

The intensity of development under this Alternative would be increased compared to that of the proposed project, and would provide a combination of only retail and office uses. As such, it is anticipated that the Retail/Office Only Alternative would result in a substantial increase in traffic, over 10,600 average daily trips compared to the 6,767 average daily trips of the proposed project. Impacts to the public transit system and State highways would also be increased under this Alternative, but are expected to remain significant.

Mitigation measures would still be required to address project-related impacts for the Forecast Years 2009 and 2025 scenarios for this Alternative: improvements at 1) Market Street/6th Street, 2) Lime Street/9th Street-SR-91 Westbound On-Ramp, 3) Market Street/Mission Inn Avenue, and 4) Main Street/SR-60 Westbound Ramps. And even with the imposition of Mitigation Measures TR-1 through TR-4, significant unavoidable impacts would occur under this Alternative. In addition, there is the potential for additional intersections to be impacted under this Alternative beyond those already identified for the proposed project, and additional mitigation measures would need to be identified. The Retail/Office Only Alternative does not reduce the significant



unavoidable impacts associated with the proposed project, but instead has the potential to create additional significant unavoidable impacts.

Because significant unavoidable traffic impacts would be exacerbated under this Alternative, the Retail/Office Only Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

**Air Quality**

*Table 6-6, Alternative Six Projected Air Quality Emissions*, provides a comparison of the anticipated air quality emissions associated with Alternative Six and with the proposed project.

**Table 6-6  
Alternative Six Projected Air Quality Emissions**

Alternative	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	CO2
Office/Retail	145.26/	206.43/	1,686.47/	1.45/	236.60/	46.86/	148,125/
	161.70	245.79	1,645.13	1.23	236.58	46.84	135,276
Fox Plaza	125.51/	142.70/	1,149.27/	0.98/	160.40/	31.78/	103,676/
	136.09	171.69	1,121.07	0.84	160.57	31.95	97,918

Values represent sum of Daily Area Source and Operational Emissions (summer day/winter day)

Short-term construction impacts would be increased under this Alternative with development of a greater intensity of urban uses (750,000 square feet of office and retail space) on-site. As a result, NOx and PM10 construction emissions would still exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds, resulting in significant short-term air quality impacts, even with implementation of mitigation measures. Additionally, operational emissions would be increased under this Alternative, and therefore Carbon Monoxide, ROC, and NOx emissions would still exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds, which would exacerbate a significant long-term operational air quality impact. As with the proposed project, this Alternative would result in significant unavoidable impacts with regard to localized NOx concentrations and could also create significant impacts with regard to Carbon Monoxide “hot spots.” Despite the increase in development intensity compared to the proposed project, this Alternative would also be consistent with the regional air quality management plan, given that it is consistent with growth anticipated in the *Downtown Specific Plan*, but would still result in significant cumulative air quality impacts due to project traffic from the intensity of office and retail uses. Because significant unavoidable air quality impacts would be exacerbated under this Alternative, the Retail/Office Only Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project in this regard.



## Noise

Development of this Alternative would result in a longer construction period due to the increased development intensity on-site. Consequently, mitigation measures would still be required to reduce construction noise impacts; however, those impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. This Alternative would result in increased mobile source noise levels compared to the proposed project due to the higher intensity of uses, and therefore mitigation measures would still be required to reduce mobile noise impacts to less than significant levels. As with the proposed project, significant noise impacts to existing residences may occur under this Alternative, as overall noise impacts would be increased since the higher intensity of office and retail uses would generate more trips and consequently more noise. Impacts to the residents of the project could be mitigated through the mitigation measures described for the proposed project. Thus, the Retail/Office Only Alternative is considered environmentally inferior to the proposed project in this regard.

## Historic Resources

As with the proposed project, the Retail/Office Only Alternative would result in direct impacts to on-site designated historical resources, since demolition and removal of all on-site structures still would occur under this Alternative. In addition, this Alternative would still result in impacts to eligible historic resources, along with the cumulative impacts to historic resources in the Downtown area.

Despite the substantial increase in development intensity of new construction, the Retail/Office Only Alternative results in the same significant unavoidable impacts to designated historic resources, and eligible historic resources. Thus, this Alternative is considered neither environmentally inferior nor superior to the proposed project in this regard, as this Alternative does not reduce or eliminate the significant unavoidable impacts of the proposed project.

### 6.7.3 ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

This Alternative's ability meet each of the proposed project's objectives is summarized below. The discussion cites the objective, which is shown in italicized text, and if the Alternative meets the intent of the objective.

- *Encourage the revitalization of underutilized commercial properties through development of high-quality, mixed-use development consistent with the Downtown Specific Plan.*

This Alternative, by providing no residential component, fails to meet the definition of a mixed use project and therefore fails to meet this objective.



- *Implement smart growth principles to improve the quality of life for City residents and to reduce urban sprawl.*

Construction of a non-mixed use project in the core of Downtown Riverside, while providing new employment, shopping and dining opportunities, does not assist in the reduction of urban sprawl, as it does not provide for any new housing opportunities close to existing employment, shopping and dining opportunities.

- *Encourage high-quality mixed-use development to significantly increase residential presence in the Raincross District.*

This Alternative provides for no new residential units and therefore fails to meet this objective.

- *Encourage the establishment of a vibrant mix of uses that will serve the needs of both residents and visitors and will help create a vibrant daytime, evening, and weekend environment.*

This Alternative could partially meet this objective as it would provide ground floor retail and restaurant opportunities that could serve the Downtown area throughout the day, evening and weekends. However, given that high residential density is required to create a vibrant 24-hour environment downtown, this Alternative would not achieve this objective to the degree made possible by the proposed project.

- *Maintain a continuity of pedestrian activity through active retail and restaurant ground level uses along Mission Inn Avenue and Market Street.*

This Alternative could meet this objective as it would provide ground floor retail and restaurant opportunities.

- *Provide current and prospective residents with increased variety of housing options.*

This Alternative provides no housing options and therefore fails to meet this objective.

- *Increase supply of parking for proposed land uses, while eliminating surface parking lots and minimizing, or completely screening, the visibility of above-ground parking structures.*

This Alternative would allow for increased parking above current levels and all parking facilities would be underground. This Alternative fully meets this objective.

- *Construct a public parking structure that will provide 400 public parking spaces available for use by the Fox Theater, as well as other uses in the area.*



This Alternative would provide for the construction of the planned parking structure and would therefore meet this project objective.

- *Allow for higher density residential uses at underutilized in-town locations where residents will have access to transit and supportive commercial services.*

This Alternative would not result in the creating of any new residential units in the Downtown area and therefore fails to meet this objective.

- *Improve the visual character of the City's built environment.*

This Alternative would be able to meet this objective as all new construction would be subject to compliance with the design guidelines of the *Downtown Specific Plan*.

- *Enhance the public streetscape.*

This Alternative would be able to meet this objective as all new construction would be subject to compliance with the design guidelines of the *Downtown Specific Plan*.

- *Encourage quality design that enhances the overall appearance of Downtown Riverside.*

This Alternative would be able to meet this objective as all new construction would be subject to compliance with the design guidelines of the *Downtown Specific Plan*.

- *Reduce commutes to Downtown by adding new residential units near existing employment opportunities.*

This Alternative would not result in the creating of any new residential units in the Downtown area and therefore fails to meet this objective.

- *Reinforce the character of Downtown by providing high-quality building designs with pedestrian amenities.*

This Alternative would be able to meet this objective as all new construction would be subject to compliance with the design guidelines of the *Downtown Specific Plan*.



- *Provide a project that has substantial market value and/or reasonable uses within the Downtown Core.*

This Alternative provides uses designated as permitted and desirable in the downtown core and would result in a substantial increase in centralized employment opportunities near existing and planned housing. However, the significant parking requirement, both in above and below-ground structures, makes this project economically infeasible due to structured parking construction costs.

However, while this Alternative provides substantial new employment and retail opportunities, it fails to provide any housing, as called for by the *Downtown Specific Plan* and is necessary to fully support development costs. This lack of mixed use development in the core of downtown does nothing to ensure support for evening and weekend activities. As such, it is not considered a reasonable use for this site as it precludes the development of housing on two blocks directly adjacent and a third block within proximity to the Main Street where the Downtown Specific has identified that it is needed.

This Alternative would provide new development that would provide economic benefits and improve the visual character and design of Downtown Riverside while removing existing underutilized commercial uses. However, it would not achieve the objectives of providing a mixed use retail/restaurant/residential development that increases housing options in the downtown area and encourages pedestrian mobility and public transit usage. The proposed retail space would provide opportunities for nighttime uses, but not to the full extent and not as fully supported by adjacent housing as proposed in the full project. Additionally, the Retail/Office Only Alternative would entail demolition of all historic resources on-site.

As such, the Retail/Office Only Alternative would not meet the residential components of the project's objectives, and would not provide transit-oriented development to the same extent as that of the proposed project. Although this Alternative would meet some of the objectives of the project, it would not provide the mixed use development or downtown housing options as the proposed project. This Alternative is not environmentally superior as traffic and air quality impacts would significantly increase. Therefore, this Alternative would be environmentally inferior and only some of the project objectives identified *Section 3.6, Project Objectives*, would be met under the Retail/Office Only Alternative.

## 6.8 COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW OF ALTERNATIVES

*Table 6-7, Comparison of Alternative Environmental Impacts with Proposed Project*, provides an overview of the alternatives analyzed in this section and a comparison of each alternative's impact in relation to the proposed project.



**Table 6-7  
Comparison of Alternative Environmental Impacts with Proposed Project**

Issue	No Project/No Development	Adaptive Reuse	Mixed Preservation	Reduced Intensity	Stalder Façade	Office/Retail Only
Traffic	*	■	*	*	=	■
Reduces Significant Unavoidable Traffic Impacts	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Eliminates Significant Unavoidable Traffic Impacts	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Air Quality	*	■	*	*	■	■
Reduces Significant Unavoidable Air Quality Impacts	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Eliminates Significant Unavoidable Air Quality Impacts	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Noise	*	■	*	*	■	■
Reduces Significant Unavoidable Noise Quality Impacts	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Eliminates Significant Unavoidable Noise Impacts	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Historic Resources	*	*	*	*	*	=
Reduces Significant Unavoidable Historic Resources Impacts	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Eliminates Significant Unavoidable Historic Resources Impacts	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Ability to Meet All or Most Project Objectives	No	Not All Identified Objectives	Not All Identified Objectives	Not All Identified Objectives	Not All Identified Objectives	Not All Identified Objectives
= Indicates an impact that is equal to the proposed project (neither environmentally superior or inferior). ■ Indicates an impact that is greater than the proposed project (environmentally inferior). * Indicates an impact that is less than the proposed project (environmentally superior).						



## 6.9 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6 indicates that if the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

The context of an environmentally superior alternative for this EIR is based on the consideration of several factors including the project's objectives, as described in Section 3.6, Project Objectives, and earlier in this Section, and the alternative's ability to fulfill the objectives with minimal impacts to the surrounding environment.

### 6.9.1 NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

The No Project/No Development Alternative would reduce impacts to traffic; parking; air quality; and noise and eliminate impacts to historic resources. However, this Alternative would result in comparable impacts to aesthetics, light, and glare. This Alternative would completely eliminate the significant and unavoidable impacts for traffic and air quality.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not implement the overall objectives of the proposed project. Under this Alternative, the proposed retail, restaurant, and residential uses would not be developed, and the existing underutilized commercial uses would remain on-site. Therefore, none of the project objectives identified in Section 3.6, Project Objectives, would be met under the No Project/No Development Alternative.

### 6.9.2 ADAPTIVE REUSE ALTERNATIVE

The Adaptive Reuse Alternative provides only 40 percent of the residential units, but provides an additional 20,000 square feet of restaurant and retail spaces compared to the proposed project. As such, the Adaptive Reuse Alternative would not provide the same benefits as that of the proposed project in terms of providing increased housing opportunities in the Downtown area. Additionally, the Adaptive Reuse Alternative would fail to maximize the development potential of the site per the Downtown Specific Plan by providing lower residential densities. The Adaptive Reuse Alternative would not meet the commute reduction goal to the degree that the proposed project does. Therefore, a majority of the project objectives identified in Section 3.6, Project Objectives, would not be met under the Adaptive Reuse Alternative.



### **6.9.3 MIXED PRESERVATION AND OFF-SITE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE**

The Mixed Preservation and Off-Site Development Alternative provides approximately 50 percent of the new development as the proposed project. As such, this Alternative would not provide the same benefits as that of the proposed project, given the reduction in retail, restaurant, and that fewer housing opportunities would be provided in the Downtown area. Additionally, this Alternative would fail to maximize the development potential of the site per the Downtown Specific Plan.

The inability to construction the Fox Theater parking structure in a timely manner to would present significant adverse impacts to theater operations and is, therefore, not feasible.

The Mixed Preservation and Off-Site Development Alternative do not add retail and restaurant space or meet the commute reduction goal to the degree that the proposed project does. Therefore, a majority of the project objectives identified Section 3.6, Project Objectives, would not be met under this Alternative.

### **6.9.4 REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE**

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce impacts to traffic; air quality; noise; aesthetics, light, and glare and historic resources. However, this Alternative would result in comparable impacts to parking. Significant and unavoidable impacts would still occur relative to air quality and traffic under this Alternative.

However, this Alternative would provide half of the new development as the proposed project, while retaining the facades of the site's historical structures including the Stalder Building. As such, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not provide the same benefits that the proposed project would, given the reduction in retail and restaurant uses, and that fewer housing opportunities would be provided in the Downtown area. The Reduced Intensity Alternative also would fail to maximize the development potential of the site as it would not entail construction to the maximum allowed level of *Downtown Specific Plan*. This Alternative would not provide expanded retail opportunities, it would not meet the project objective to reduce commuting by adding housing units in the downtown to the degree proposed by the Fox Plaza project.

Although this Alternative would generally meet some objectives of the project, it would not provide the amount of commercial uses and housing units as the proposed project. Therefore, some of the project objectives identified Section 3.6, Project Objectives, would be partially met under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, but not to the same extent as the proposed project.



### 6.9.5 STALDER FAÇADE ALTERNATIVE

The Stalder Façade Alternative would reduce impacts to historic resources and aesthetics, light, and glare but would result in greater construction-related air quality and noise impacts. This Alternative would result in comparable impacts to traffic and parking. Significant and unavoidable impacts would still occur relative to air quality, traffic and historic resources under this Alternative, though preservation of the Stalder Building Façade would reduce the latter impact, but not to a less than significant level.

This Alternative would provide a similar type and intensity of new development as the proposed project, while still removing existing underutilized commercial uses, but would preserve the façade of the most significant historic feature of existing resources. However, this Alternative would result in a project that is significantly more costly to construct than the proposed project, and therefore would be financially infeasible, as discussed above. As a result, this Alternative would fail to meet project objectives, as it would not be cost effective to construct. Therefore, the project objectives identified Section 3.6, Project Objectives, would not be met under the Stalder Façade Alternative.

### 6.9.6 RETAIL/OFFICE ONLY ALTERNATIVE

The Retail/Office Only Alternative would increase impacts to traffic; air quality; noise; aesthetics, light, and glare. However, this Alternative would result in comparable impacts to parking and historic resources. This Alternative would entail demolition of the historic resources on-site. Significant and unavoidable impacts would still occur relative to air quality, traffic and historic resources under this Alternative, and would be exacerbated compared to the proposed project.

While this Alternative would provide new development that would provide economic benefits and improve the visual character and design of Downtown Riverside while removing existing underutilized commercial uses, it would not achieve the objectives of providing a mixed use retail/restaurant/residential development, increasing housing options in the downtown area. Additionally, this Alternative is not environmentally superior as traffic and air impacts would significantly increase.

As such, the Retail/Office Only Alternative would not provide a residential component as stated in the project's objectives, and would not provide pedestrian- and transit-oriented development to the same extent as that of the proposed project. Although this Alternative would meet some of the objectives of the project, it would not provide the mixed use development or downtown housing options as the proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would be environmentally inferior and only some of the project objectives identified Section 3.6, Project Objectives, would be met under the Retail/Office Only Alternative.



## 6.9.7 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

An EIR must identify an “environmentally superior” alternative and where the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify as environmentally superior an alternative from among the others evaluated.

As noted above, the determination of an environmentally superior alternative is based on the consideration of how the alternative fulfills the project objectives and how the alternative either reduces significant, unavoidable impacts or substantially reduces the impacts to the surrounding environment.

The No Project/No Development Alternative completely eliminates the significant unavoidable traffic, air quality, and historic resource impacts. However, this Alternative meets none of the objectives established for the proposed project. In consideration of the factors noted above, Alternative Four (Reduced Intensity Alternative) is selected as the Environmentally Superior Alternative to the proposed project.

Alternative Four (Reduced Intensity Alternative) results in less development, and thus reduces all impacts. Although air quality impacts would be reduced, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable due to proximity to sensitive receptors and intensity of daily construction activities. However, this Alternative would provide less than 50 percent of the new development as the proposed project, while retaining the facades of the site’s historical structures including the Stalder Building. As such, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not provide the same benefits that the proposed project would, given the reduction in retail and restaurant uses, and that fewer housing opportunities would be provided in the Downtown area. The Reduced Intensity Alternative also would fail to maximize the development potential of the site as it would not entail construction to the maximum allowed level of *Downtown Specific Plan*. This Alternative would not provide expanded retail opportunities, it would not meet the commute reduction goal specified in the project objectives.

Although this Alternative would generally meet some objectives of the project, it would not provide the amount of commercial uses and housing units as the proposed project. Therefore, some of the project objectives identified Section 3.6, Project Objectives, would be partially met under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, but not to the same extent as the proposed project.