

7.0 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to compare impacts of a proposed project to alternatives which could feasibly achieve the objectives of the proposed project (CEQA Article 9, Section 15126[d]). The discussion of alternatives should focus on optional land use strategies which would be capable of reducing some or all of the significant adverse impacts associated with the proposed project to a level of non-significance. The "no project" alternative must also be evaluated.

7.1 *Description of Alternatives*

The CEQA states that the range of alternatives to be addressed in an EIR is governed by the "rule of reason" and requires that the document address only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The key issue in determining the range of alternatives evaluated is whether or not the selection and discussion of alternatives fosters informed decision making and public participation. In this particular case, the identification of alternatives which reduce certain environmental impacts through a redistribution of targeted growth areas is constrained by the need for a balance between localized and regional effects. It should be recognized that land use alternatives which disperse development throughout the City or preclude concentrated development from certain areas because of the desire to decrease adverse local impacts (i.e. land use compatibility issues) may actually accomplish the opposite effect. Increased regional traffic, air quality and noise impacts stemming from increased travel times between local areas and outlying developments would inevitably affect the environmental quality of a particular local area. With this in mind, five alternatives to the proposed Framework Plan were identified and evaluated throughout the Framework Plan development process:

- No Growth;
- Community Plan Buildout (also referred to as "No Project");
- Alternative A1;
- 2010 Market; and
- Theoretical Buildout.

7.1.1 "No Growth" Alternative

Under the No Growth Alternative, an open-ended development moratorium would be adopted by the City, hypothetically preventing any further growth of the City beyond what existed in the base year (1990). Consequently, the ultimate size of the City would be limited to the amount of development in place, and in process, at the time the moratorium became effective. When compared to the proposed General Plan Framework on a citywide basis, the No Growth Alternative would result in:

- 25,229 fewer single family residential dwelling units;
- 240,916 fewer multi-family residential dwelling units;

- 28,389,968 fewer retail square feet;
- 23,140,675 fewer office square feet;
- 91,498 fewer industrial square feet;
- 821,165 fewer persons; and
- 389,414 fewer jobs.

7.1.2 "No Project" Alternative

Under the CEQA-required "No Project" Alternative, the proposed project (i.e. the General Plan Framework) would not be approved nor implemented. As a result, the City's zoning code and each of the land use plans available for the City's 36 communities would remain in effect and would continue to be implemented on into the future. Under the "No Project" Alternative, buildout of the City would result in the following increases beyond what is anticipated under the Framework Plan:

- 316,266 additional Single Family Dwelling Units;
- 326,662 additional Multi-Family Dwelling Units;
- 368,174,862 additional Retail Square Feet;
- 360,554,292 additional Office Square Feet;
- 1,067,898,882 additional Industrial Square Feet;
- 1,884,475 additional persons; and
- 5,765,072 additional jobs.

7.1.3 Alternative A1

Alternative A1 is predicated upon the construction of a comprehensive, citywide transit network and, as such, is based upon the Metropolitan Transit Authority's (MTAs) Thirty Year Plan (soon to be revised and renamed the Long Range Plan). Under this alternative, it is assumed that the transit network (including all funded and proposed lines) will be fully built out. To support the citywide transit network and further the goals of improving air quality, reducing traffic and creating more pedestrian friendly neighborhoods, Alternative A1 clusters development around the planned and proposed transit stations. Unless located in low density suburban locations, these sites are envisioned as mixed use, medium to high density districts that combine residential and commercial uses in close proximity to rail, bus and/or park and ride facilities. Permitted buildout under Alternative A1 would result in the following increases in the amounts of various lands uses relative to the proposed Framework Plan:

- 125,277 additional single family dwelling units;
- 446,924 additional multi-family dwelling units;
- 50,451,994 additional retail square feet;
- 375,313,559 additional office square feet;
- 517,413,421 additional industrial square feet;
- 1,677,217 additional persons;
- 3,109,372 additional jobs.

7.1.4 2010 Market Buildout Alternative

The 2010 Market Buildout Alternative limits buildout of the community plans (represented by the "No Project" Alternative) to development levels anticipated in SCAG's adopted market trends. Because the basis of this alternative's land uses are the City's existing community plans, this alternative results in a different physical distribution of uses than the proposed Framework Plan: there is no concentration of uses around transit opportunities, no mixed use land uses proposed on corridors, and it does not assume that any commercial uses would transition to housing uses as in the Framework Plan. Permitted buildout under the 2010 Market alternative would result in the following differences in the amounts of various lands uses relative to the proposed Framework Plan.

- 3,340 fewer single family dwelling units;
- 3,336 additional multi-family dwelling units;
- 15,428,003 fewer retail square feet;
- 14,354,304 fewer office square feet;
- 0 additional industrial square feet;
- 0 additional persons;
- 191,482 fewer jobs.

7.1.5 Theoretical Buildout Alternative

The Theoretical Buildout Alternative consists of the long-range buildout of the Framework Plan without the land use policies in place for managed development. Under this alternative, there would be no trigger mechanisms available to generate additional review when infrastructure improvements are not able to keep up with the demands of new development. Consequently, the ultimate development potential of the City would be larger than what would realistically be accomplished under the proposed Framework Plan. Permitted buildout under the Theoretical Buildout alternative would result in the following increases in the amounts of various lands uses relative to the proposed Framework Plan:

- 240,694 additional single family dwelling units;
- 743,346 additional multi-family dwelling units;
- 82,669,879 additional retail square feet;
- 461,375,982 additional office square feet;
- 373,582,644 additional industrial square feet;
- 2,884,378 additional persons;
- 3,605,142 additional jobs.

Tables ALT-1A through ALT-1G provide the reader with a comparison of the development potential, population and employment associated with each of the alternatives and the proposed Framework Plan.

TABLE ALT-1A

Alternative Summary By CPA

SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (Dwelling Units)

Community Plan Area	Proposed General Plan Framework (Proposed Project)	"No Growth"	"No Project" CPA Buildout	Alternative A1	2010 Market	Theoretical Buildout
Arlita-Pacoima	15,246	14,579	22,676	17,452	15,619	22,400
Bel Air-Beverly Crest	8,323	7,685	38,079	30,253	8,323	14,614
Boyle Heights	8,301	8,301	196	152	8,305	196
Brentwood-Pacific Palisades	15,989	14,531	48,075	38,312	16,010	23,609
Canoga Park	39,908	36,637	80,579	62,560	39,926	80,475
Central City	50	50	0	0	199	0
Central City North	328	328	0	0	335	0
Chatsworth-Porter Ranch	22,062	18,374	51,285	39,831	22,042	55,228
Encino-Tarzana	16,790	15,492	53,582	40,628	16,781	24,446
Granada Hills	16,917	15,417	38,614	30,291	16,777	38,614
Harbor Gateway	5,758	5,526	5,526	4,658	5,526	5,988
Hollywood	20,480	19,636	35,098	27,504	20,480	35,098
Mission Hills	16,931	15,849	31,607	24,537	17,154	31,417
North Hollywood	15,935	15,568	20,667	15,496	15,798	19,923
Northeast Los Angeles	41,532	39,260	48,797	37,946	39,260	48,782
Northridge	13,385	12,360	32,533	25,304	13,463	32,285
Palms	13,464	13,420	16,943	13,178	13,956	16,943
Port of LA	0	18	0	0	18	0
Reeda-Woodland Hills	20,806	19,756	31,765	24,642	20,806	31,683
San Pedro	12,236	12,089	12,236	9,517	11,636	12,236
Sherman Oaks-Studio City	16,507	15,751	37,916	29,390	15,926	37,606
Silver Lake-Echo Park	10,875	10,875	5,827	4,532	10,865	5,827
South Central Los Angeles	34,802	34,802	18,379	14,197	34,802	18,253
Southeast Los Angeles	31,325	31,325	7,850	6,090	31,172	7,830
Sun Valley	14,385	14,010	28,264	22,273	14,625	28,257
Sunland-Tujunga	16,419	14,724	50,988	40,009	15,829	50,928
Sylmar	14,054	12,625	30,999	24,277	14,032	30,974
Van Nuys-N. Sherman Oaks	18,563	18,227	28,472	21,793	18,901	28,007
Venice	7,222	7,222	3,014	2,330	6,685	3,016
West Adams	24,752	24,752	20,028	15,406	24,752	19,843
West Los Angeles	10,234	10,086	13,292	10,314	10,237	13,260
Westchester	10,391	9,928	14,016	10,811	10,393	13,442
Westlake	2,020	2,020	0	0	2,027	0
Westwood	3,088	3,070	6,315	4,899	3,071	6,271
Wilmington	9,768	9,469	10,470	8,139	9,942	10,465
Wilshire	15,975	15,908	17,237	13,477	15,908	17,699
Citywide Total	544,921	519,692	861,187	670,198	541,181	785,615

TAB E-1B
Alternative Summary By CPA

MULTI FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (Dwelling Units)

Community Plan Area	Proposed General Plan Framework (Proposed Project)	"No Growth"	"No Project" CPA Buildout	Alternative A1	2010 Market	Theoretical Buildout
Arlene-Pacifica	9,518	5,329	9,664	13,434	10,898	14,970
Bel Air-Beverly Crest	922	804	1,174	1,060	942	1,945
Boyle Heights	20,954	14,909	30,970	33,701	20,593	39,913
Brentwood-Pacific Palisades	14,062	11,456	15,450	11,526	14,538	17,663
Canoga Park	33,589	22,510	37,206	44,982	32,806	53,579
Central City	12,098	10,091	19,090	24,492	12,438	11,734
Central City North	7,716	3,715	7,537	5,029	7,806	29,823
Chatsworth-Porter Ranch	15,228	11,402	23,824	35,990	14,829	40,752
Encino-Tarzana	17,917	14,149	20,111	33,910	17,608	30,653
Granada Hills	5,174	4,374	6,000	6,720	4,855	8,205
Harbor Gateway	8,590	5,988	10,663	11,264	9,306	13,718
Hollywood	97,012	80,249	113,183	92,436	94,967	129,389
Mission Hills	28,531	20,471	37,579	42,848	28,072	49,768
North Hollywood	47,047	35,411	62,317	73,321	46,775	87,518
Northeast Los Angeles	47,586	33,337	81,535	93,340	47,987	102,103
Northridge	13,793	9,113	12,581	15,632	13,616	15,653
Palms	40,914	34,679	49,528	45,839	42,381	54,187
Port of LA	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	0
Reseda-Woodland Hills	19,378	13,633	22,634	30,532	20,417	25,463
San Pedro	23,483	17,598	27,686	33,866	23,952	37,689
Sherman Oaks-Studio City	31,455	23,021	33,777	40,204	30,699	54,195
Silver Lake-Echo Park	23,563	17,890	34,651	34,459	22,540	40,223
South Central Los Angeles	62,935	46,923	83,689	93,792	62,217	112,831
Southeast Los Angeles	43,695	32,255	76,001	78,786	41,122	96,440
Sun Valley	12,636	8,147	13,287	16,253	13,496	14,840
Sunland-Tujunga	9,378	5,762	12,258	15,042	9,448	16,865
Sylmar	8,168	4,724	10,148	11,034	9,483	11,627
Van Nuys-N. Sherman Oaks	49,508	38,993	55,530	70,621	52,132	84,874
Venice	17,410	14,622	21,016	21,601	17,542	25,502
West Adams	51,724	40,916	77,292	88,037	53,638	92,741
West Los Angeles	32,643	25,701	45,388	41,816	34,102	54,310
Westchester	18,085	12,674	42,036	37,582	17,851	54,649
Westlake	37,308	32,516	58,126	64,570	36,833	63,702
Westwood	19,602	16,273	30,912	20,147	19,948	25,852
Wilmingon	17,155	12,447	18,130	21,522	19,043	27,557
Wilshire	122,410	98,189	146,876	162,723	119,643	223,660
Citywide Total	1,021,187	780,271	1,347,849	1,468,111	1,024,523	1,764,533

TABLE A11-1C

Alternative Summary By CPA

RETAIL SQUARE FEET

Community Plan Area	Proposed General Plan Framework (Proposed Project)	"No Growth"	"No Project" CPA Buildout	Alternative A1	2010 Market	Theoretical Buildout
Arlita-Pacifica	3,323,132	2,882,000	5,634,268	3,472,298	3,065,394	3,719,131
Bel Air-Beverly Crest	205,823	133,000	0	331,296	171,549	159,321
Boyle Heights	3,257,071	2,687,000	11,853,983	3,651,700	2,892,136	4,190,015
Brentwood-Pacific Palisades	1,610,078	1,402,000	2,633,333	1,843,722	1,513,476	1,886,235
Canoga Park	12,678,476	10,888,000	25,768,172	14,984,829	11,681,332	17,096,799
Central City	17,051,590	14,779,000	30,976,387	31,281,307	15,794,761	41,301,850
Central City North	2,493,243	2,008,000	11,165,953	3,644,251	2,170,693	3,798,101
Chatsworth-Porter Ranch	5,919,898	5,199,000	12,319,196	8,149,393	5,585,660	10,105,550
Encino-Tarzana	3,917,410	3,437,000	9,472,993	5,436,310	3,694,629	5,871,627
Granada Hills	2,054,836	1,850,000	9,008,426	4,264,393	1,958,885	4,324,898
Harbor Gateway	1,128,055	971,000	3,063,793	1,452,138	1,055,048	1,452,138
Hollywood	15,507,623	13,259,000	26,837,098	11,703,309	14,223,126	16,007,298
Mission Hills	7,288,636	6,249,000	17,775,747	8,716,291	6,711,027	8,257,473
North Hollywood	9,073,803	7,967,000	31,967,595	9,508,734	8,454,838	10,171,630
Northeast Los Angeles	8,905,604	7,602,200	36,789,034	13,038,053	8,160,281	15,512,805
Northridge	3,671,810	3,220,000	9,870,914	4,963,836	3,462,289	4,588,785
Palms	4,284,264	3,880,000	10,021,567	5,008,007	4,097,520	4,720,416
Port of LA	0	1,024,000	326,047	1,024,000	1,024,000	1,024,000
Reese-Woodland Hills	5,888,295	5,174,000	13,234,786	6,971,321	5,557,146	7,305,774
San Pedro	4,070,640	3,467,000	3,495,690	4,336,856	3,727,001	4,199,837
Sherman Oaks-Studio City	6,686,756	5,879,000	15,744,109	7,569,508	6,312,312	7,959,109
Silver Lake-Echo Park	3,068,694	2,586,000	8,831,358	3,816,208	2,787,046	4,361,031
South Central Los Angeles	7,743,098	6,599,000	49,400,307	12,648,583	7,082,981	13,568,112
Southeast Los Angeles	7,169,980	6,006,000	36,480,629	8,034,729	6,448,429	10,803,751
Sun Valley	2,833,386	2,480,000	2,341,132	4,574,345	2,669,456	3,855,104
Sunland-Tujunga	2,283,871	1,995,000	9,071,152	2,830,224	2,149,830	3,270,507
Sylmar	2,193,615	1,913,000	6,345,167	3,874,923	2,063,459	3,390,645
Van Nuys-N. Sherman Oaks	10,207,127	9,009,000	25,524,418	11,557,492	9,652,480	11,940,515
Venice	2,088,737	1,911,000	6,105,892	2,247,413	2,005,758	2,124,530
West Adams	8,036,319	7,066,000	30,916,274	8,759,154	7,586,515	10,568,397
West Los Angeles	6,459,476	5,666,000	5,715,290	5,390,289	6,091,514	6,757,158
Westchester	4,146,005	3,464,000	17,049,521	6,460,455	3,738,755	8,712,893
Westlake	5,197,220	4,511,000	33,373,119	11,681,677	4,755,104	9,847,391
Westwood	1,435,539	1,249,000	4,207,866	1,777,292	1,338,296	1,534,880
Wilmington	5,096,964	3,309,000	13,797,194	5,788,187	3,634,449	5,848,518
Wishire	21,691,094	18,577,000	39,534,620	19,242,957	19,922,990	22,017,141
Citywide Total	208,668,168	180,298,200	576,843,030	259,120,162	193,240,165	291,338,047

TABL I-ID

Alternative Summary By CPA

OFFICE SQUARE FEET

Community Plan Area	Proposed General Plan Framework (Proposed Project)	"No Growth"	"No Project" CPA Buildout	Alternative A1	2010 Market	Theoretical Buildout
Arlene-Pacoima	405,467	225,000	7,148,849	515,642	280,030	1,179,648
Bel Air-Beverly Crest	209,847	74,000	1,229,045	121,097	134,528	121,097
Boyle Heights	405,281	273,000	4,946,891	3,315,482	284,381	874,358
Brentwood-Pacific Palisades	2,485,694	2,124,000	3,687,005	3,359,870	2,285,157	1,989,385
Canoga Park	16,139,795	14,134,000	30,726,575	39,998,225	14,883,244	24,949,406
Central City	43,037,431	38,835,000	115,076,808	104,440,327	40,398,288	153,383,472
Central City North	1,070,041	412,000	218,236	7,269,778	616,431	21,369,229
Chatsworth-Porter Ranch	4,586,080	4,107,000	13,925,968	11,194,450	4,320,460	3,927,914
Encino-Tarzana	6,981,645	6,311,000	9,001,674	3,273,882	6,609,814	7,313,789
Granada Hills	1,065,114	878,000	4,315,054	3,183,822	961,371	4,134,933
Harbor Gateway	3,166,365	2,715,000	2,951,408	1,197,776	2,916,111	3,151,726
Hollywood	5,953,229	5,215,000	46,480,916	48,749,869	5,444,069	38,613,109
Mission Hills	3,220,720	2,866,000	15,576,403	12,837,393	2,991,545	9,704,449
North Hollywood	2,504,513	2,080,000	10,128,353	17,041,696	2,227,587	16,845,915
Northeast Los Angeles	1,678,378	1,271,000	10,469,210	25,106,481	1,397,675	33,680,440
Northridge	1,429,274	1,286,000	4,281,730	3,539,206	1,349,837	5,077,506
Palms	2,732,572	2,516,000	3,907,106	4,035,870	2,612,496	2,357,663
Port of LA	0	364,000	0	0	364,000	0
Reseda-Woodland Hills	1,999,086	1,661,000	7,213,536	7,844,198	1,784,904	9,473,342
San Pedro	2,189,450	1,768,000	13,809,609	7,734,753	1,938,138	7,245,117
Sherman Oaks-Studio City	4,065,567	3,462,000	9,988,744	12,967,268	3,730,926	12,218,471
Silver Lake-Echo Park	623,127	533,000	6,034,162	2,430,813	553,880	1,983,505
South Central Los Angeles	1,356,197	1,160,000	8,829,394	5,757,826	1,209,318	4,623,916
Southeast Los Angeles	1,276,072	987,000	6,315,111	12,089,773	1,031,147	9,464,717
Sun Valley	808,769	654,000	9,129,958	2,136,770	722,959	3,341,793
Sunland-Tujunga	366,501	344,000	3,112,798	703,690	354,025	2,392,272
Sylmar	613,649	277,000	3,952,417	2,951,146	426,998	693,649
Van Nuys-N Sherman Oaks	7,240,476	6,495,000	22,039,182	21,998,301	6,827,155	21,338,694
Venice	548,475	394,000	2,055,727	2,568,690	462,828	241,266
West Adams	1,036,851	856,000	10,168,211	9,616,284	936,580	11,572,803
West Los Angeles	19,640,107	17,645,000	22,006,512	23,034,158	18,533,943	37,007,531
Westchester	6,153,413	5,219,000	20,384,177	32,097,831	5,539,554	36,028,019
Westlake	10,147,264	8,604,000	21,638,238	42,095,843	9,134,692	66,728,715
Westwood	5,100,610	4,475,000	4,559,605	4,883,295	4,753,748	6,325,740
Wilmington	1,246,053	522,000	9,425,295	2,184,839	641,420	5,479,129
Wilshire	22,540,562	20,081,000	75,784,060	77,000,990	20,950,132	80,506,939
Citywide Total	183,963,675	160,823,000	544,517,967	559,277,234	169,609,371	645,339,657

TABLE A1-1E

Alternative Summary By CPA

INDUSTRIAL SQUARE FEET

Community Plan Area	Proposed General Plan Framework (Proposed Project)	"No Growth"	"No Project" CPA Buildout	Alternative A1	2010 Market	Theoretical Buildout
Arleta-Pacoima	14,716,100	14,716,100	33,344,962	17,893,315	14,716,100	20,637,595
Bel Air-Beverly Crest	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boyle Heights	13,492,300	13,492,300	52,114,530	24,812,255	13,492,300	24,007,571
Brentwood-Pacific Palisades	162,400	162,400	0	0	162,400	0
Canoga Park	14,684,800	14,684,800	37,135,914	7,083,901	14,684,800	17,099,802
Central City	24,463,431	24,463,431	76,850,294	76,850,294	24,463,431	17,931,735
Central City North	13,855,943	13,855,943	82,530,301	36,117,164	13,855,943	31,541,840
Chatsworth-Porter Ranch	30,020,800	30,020,800	108,634,937	46,647,576	30,020,800	49,801,364
Encino-Tarzana	685,000	685,000	2,277,752	1,062,951	685,000	1,062,951
Granada Hills	118,310	118,309	720,700	336,327	118,310	304,615
Harbor Gateway	14,083,700	14,083,700	110,832,322	31,992,206	14,083,700	30,038,206
Hollywood	7,407,800	7,407,800	20,052,846	8,889,812	7,407,800	8,214,545
Mission Hills	6,940,100	6,940,100	20,510,879	8,631,370	6,940,100	9,185,715
North Hollywood	8,309,200	8,309,200	30,845,054	12,873,722	8,309,200	13,892,765
Northeast Los Angeles	12,404,060	12,404,060	87,292,280	35,285,037	12,404,060	39,640,820
Northridge	5,036,300	5,036,300	13,203,907	4,563,128	5,036,300	6,211,525
Palms	6,509,500	6,509,500	23,550,496	9,389,214	6,509,500	10,132,635
Port of LA	n/a	2,396,200	n/a	120,211,356	2,396,200	N/A
Reseda-Woodland Hills	16,176,300	16,176,300	23,523,053	20,379,023	16,176,300	32,121,492
San Pedro	1,336,400	1,244,900	20,121,453	7,685,509	1,336,400	8,299,922
Sherman Oaks-Studio City	597,500	597,500	2,293,434	1,104,420	597,500	1,104,420
Silver Lake-Echo Park	2,348,200	2,348,200	7,521,287	3,219,345	2,348,200	3,219,345
South Central Los Angeles	4,217,500	4,217,500	18,418,039	7,758,080	4,217,500	7,758,080
Southeast Los Angeles	17,581,426	17,581,426	92,522,093	43,295,896	17,581,426	42,971,461
Sun Valley	28,179,500	28,179,500	117,168,341	52,202,914	28,179,500	57,668,605
Sunland-Tujunga	641,700	641,700	2,090,227	768,398	641,700	768,398
Sylmar	5,474,636	5,474,636	32,839,884	14,191,282	5,474,636	18,222,019
Van Nuys-N. Sherman Oaks	12,899,000	12,899,000	47,794,904	20,919,646	12,899,000	19,782,295
Venice	906,900	906,900	3,017,401	1,408,121	906,900	1,393,121
West Adams	3,721,326	3,721,326	22,800,393	9,236,942	3,721,326	10,116,941
West Los Angeles	5,598,500	5,598,500	17,528,108	4,284,126	5,598,500	4,284,126
Westchester	16,338,200	16,338,200	119,147,490	124,135,328	16,338,200	122,334,209
Westlake	743,600	743,600	3,272,881	693,998	743,600	640,637
Westwood	108,700	108,700	0	0	108,700	0
Wilmington	8,511,300	6,115,100	134,338,387	62,563,181	6,115,100	62,563,181
Wilshire	1,510,500	1,510,500	3,385,265	738,516	1,510,500	411,642
Citywide Total	299,780,932	299,689,434	1,367,679,814	817,194,353	299,780,935	673,363,578

TABLE 1-1F

**Alternative Summary
By CPA**

POPULATION

Community Plan Area	Proposed General Plan Framework (Proposed Project)	"No Growth"	"No Project" CPA Buildout	Alternative A1	2010 Market	Theoretical Buildout
Arlene-Pacoima	115,461	90,958	137,361	133,543	120,581	154,189
Bel Air-Beverly Crest	21,557	19,537	108,012	85,345	21,615	42,907
Boyle Heights	122,092	94,580	128,139	135,291	120,519	153,590
Brentwood-Pacific Palisades	64,619	54,880	161,358	121,817	65,744	97,464
Canoga Park	191,892	150,560	320,556	291,327	189,782	368,113
Central City	27,029	22,374	47,778	61,529	26,656	27,382
Central City North	38,839	19,318	36,481	23,718	37,720	101,333
Chatsworth-Porter Ranch	102,360	79,784	211,570	213,965	101,258	271,785
Encino-Tarzana	79,352	66,487	191,942	194,857	78,620	139,020
Granada Hills	61,630	54,352	126,646	106,106	61,529	133,123
Harbor Gateway	45,951	36,011	52,867	51,059	47,651	62,112
Hollywood	257,033	213,858	348,854	268,043	252,296	397,951
Mission Hills	139,950	109,072	209,280	204,090	139,210	244,301
North Hollywood	156,181	123,410	213,174	231,334	155,208	285,944
Northeast Los Angeles	298,084	237,293	418,725	420,299	291,435	477,629
Northridge	76,308	58,867	128,254	116,039	75,747	136,576
Palms	118,981	103,707	154,795	130,726	122,059	168,113
Port of LA	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	0
Reseda-Woodland Hills	109,678	89,279	151,195	153,603	112,808	159,401
San Pedro	88,927	71,970	101,751	114,348	91,221	130,830
Sherman Oaks-Studio City	86,863	68,221	155,828	152,832	85,959	214,438
Silver Lake-Echo Park	97,048	79,097	115,366	112,050	95,100	131,773
South Central Los Angeles	314,900	257,469	330,780	347,190	312,530	415,632
Southeast Los Angeles	288,156	238,991	315,883	318,207	279,859	373,211
Sun Valley	95,212	76,573	137,512	129,010	98,544	143,071
Sunland-Tujunga	69,032	52,919	177,100	156,442	70,247	190,456
Sylmar	77,683	59,479	132,396	115,328	81,049	137,526
Van Nuys-N. Sherman Oaks	165,973	136,889	213,515	234,677	171,500	296,927
Venice	46,198	40,040	45,745	46,850	46,853	58,089
West Adams	200,981	169,397	262,594	280,235	206,519	307,382
West Los Angeles	83,331	68,062	129,621	109,327	86,097	154,652
Westchester	62,306	48,003	142,263	120,481	61,785	177,347
Westlake	124,040	106,972	179,548	197,398	121,987	196,035
Westwood	49,605	41,297	92,297	57,429	50,770	77,884
Wilmington	92,168	74,073	97,744	98,843	96,272	126,059
Wilshire	337,144	271,620	414,309	449,843	329,833	638,697
Citywide Total	4,306,564	3,485,399	6,191,039	5,983,781	4,306,563	7,190,942

TABLE A11-1G

Alternative Summary By CPA

EMPLOYMENT (Jobs)

Community Plan Area	Proposed General Plan Framework (Proposed Project)	"No Growth"	"No Project" CPA Buildout	Alternative A1	2010 Market	Theoretical Buildout
Arleta-Pacifica	28,360	23,841	114,007	35,029	24,679	45,994
Bel Air-Beverly Crest	6,768	5,578	10,458	6,529	6,242	5,937
Boyle Heights	38,776	33,954	179,270	79,716	34,638	67,113
Brentwood-Pacific Palisades	28,458	23,910	32,407	27,979	26,707	20,580
Canoga Park	129,382	103,084	298,873	240,320	118,077	187,659
Central City	301,686	240,176	892,258	831,042	275,360	978,990
Central City North	41,804	34,668	230,119	130,665	36,091	192,541
Chatsworth-Porter Ranch	76,874	68,656	325,860	152,123	71,534	129,888
Encino-Tarzana	60,998	50,761	90,010	46,186	57,432	65,443
Granada Hills	21,010	18,169	61,194	38,837	19,744	44,027
Harbor Gateway	26,497	21,028	260,131	63,100	23,002	62,839
Hollywood	115,157	96,152	406,488	339,207	106,436	294,060
Mission Hills	44,941	36,692	177,458	102,577	40,933	85,715
North Hollywood	57,053	47,928	227,091	144,840	52,416	148,575
Northeast Los Angeles	85,829	73,877	408,338	276,466	77,730	341,084
Northridge	24,518	20,832	77,964	37,435	22,926	47,861
Palms	40,104	34,814	106,173	53,962	37,835	46,114
Port of LA	0	0	n/a	0	0	NA
Reseda-Woodland Hills	51,127	44,535	119,199	94,013	47,571	133,909
San Pedro	35,290	26,923	165,060	89,722	30,870	87,914
Sherman Oaks-Studio City	55,810	46,508	117,594	104,008	52,215	101,271
Silver Lake-Echo Park	21,075	18,045	79,651	34,065	19,278	33,452
South Central Los Angeles	78,996	68,297	296,826	124,636	73,097	121,375
Southeast Los Angeles	106,384	95,404	403,443	222,533	96,681	216,856
Sun Valley	49,190	45,760	301,001	117,081	46,016	134,022
Sunland-Tujunga	11,968	10,041	53,964	15,291	11,184	26,368
Sylmar	25,371	21,514	130,816	66,589	23,238	63,208
Van Nuys-N. Sherman Oaks	94,586	77,729	317,140	195,875	86,799	190,359
Venice	16,575	14,327	42,190	28,313	15,569	14,417
West Adams	53,933	47,166	220,789	112,731	50,540	131,044
West Los Angeles	110,479	85,931	143,043	110,560	102,254	194,103
Westchester	74,674	61,325	471,854	515,199	67,538	540,078
Westlake	74,226	57,492	239,496	273,565	66,780	407,481
Westwood	72,116	62,147	64,128	56,891	68,421	64,648
Wilmington	33,507	26,443	426,425	177,198	28,892	194,961
Wilshire	197,959	158,360	565,835	456,570	181,284	476,737
Citywide Total	2,291,481	1,902,067	8,056,553	5,400,553	2,099,999	5,896,623

7.2 *Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives*

The environmental impacts of each of the alternatives is discussed below. **Table ALT-2** provides a summary comparison of each alternative's environmental impacts relative to those of the proposed Framework Plan. Please note that the impacts of both the project and the alternatives are analyzed below in their unmitigated condition. However, should an alternative described herein be approved for implementation, mitigation measures would likely be developed to reduce the stated impact. Environmental Impacts associated with each of the alternatives discussed below have already been quantified as part of Tasks IV.20, IV.50 and V.30 of the Framework development process. These tasks are hereby incorporated by reference and are available for review at the Citywide Planning Division of the Planning Department.

7.2.1 "No Growth" Alternative

Land Use

If development were to stop altogether as proposed by this alternative, the current inefficiencies in the City's land use patterns would persist without the possibility of improvement. As a result, the air quality, traffic and noise impacts associated with the land use activity as it exists today would continue to occur. Regional growth outside the City limits would exacerbate these impacts within the City limits because there would be no way of offsetting regional impacts with Citywide land use improvements. Consequently, the No Growth alternative would result in greater land use impacts than the Framework Plan.

Urban Form

If development were to stop altogether as proposed by this alternative, the City's current urban form would be maintained. Where local urban form is a positive asset to a neighborhood or community, the growth moratorium would have no effect. However, in those areas where a lack of cohesiveness is present in the urban form, or in areas which the urban form isolates a community from its surroundings, these negative attributes would persist and continue to exacerbate the current adverse environmental and socioeconomic conditions that may be present there. Therefore, the No Growth Alternative could result in overall greater impacts relative to urban form than the proposed project.

Housing and Population

Under this alternative, the City's population would not directly increase as a result of additional development. However, regional growth outside the City limits and inherent population expansion within the City could result in an un-met housing demand, particularly for low to moderate income households. Given the current lack of low to moderate income housing units in the City, this alternative would exacerbate the situation because the demand for new housing would not be met and

TABLE A11-2

Comparison of Potential Impacts of Proposed Framework Plan and Alternatives¹

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Proposed Project Framework	"No Growth"	"No Project"	Alternative A1	2010 Market	Theoretical Buildout
LAND USE	I	>	>	=	>	>
URBAN FORM	I	>	>	=	>	>
HOUSING AND POPULATION	II	>	<	<	=	<
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT	II	<	>	>	<	>
WASTEWATER RESOURCES	II	<	>	>	<	>
WATER RESOURCES	II	<	>	>	<	>
UTILITIES	II	<	>	>	<	>
FLOOD CONTROL AND DRAINAGE	II	<	>	>	=	>
TRANSPORTATION	II	>	>	>	>	>
FIRE	III	<	>	>	<	>
POLICE SERVICES	II	<	>	>	=	>
EDUCATION	III	<	>	>	=	>
LIBRARIES	III	<	>	>	=	>
RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE	II	<	>	>	=	>
CULTURAL RESOURCES	III	<	>	>	<	>
PUBLIC HEALTH	III	<	>	>	=	>
GEOLOGIC/SEISMIC CONDITIONS	I	<	>	>	=	>
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	III	<	>	=	>	=
AIR QUALITY	II	=	>	>	>	>
NOISE	III	<	>	>	=	>
RISK OF UPSET	III	<	>	>	<	>

* Impact Classification

- I Significant adverse impact which cannot be completely mitigated to less than significance.
 II Significant adverse impact which can be feasibly mitigated.
 III Adverse environmental impact - not considered significant.
 IV Beneficial impact.

¹ The issues addressed in this table are those which were addressed in the EIR for the proposed project.

KEY

- No longer applicable.
 NA - Impact would be greater under this alternative than under the proposed project.
 > - Impact would be less under this alternative than under the proposed project, but class of impact would not change.
 < - Impact would be the same (or similar) under this alternative as under the proposed project.

the costs of the existing housing stock would rise. Thus, this alternative would result in greater housing impacts than the proposed project.

Solid Waste Management

Under this alternative, the prohibition of additional development would dramatically slow the City's potential solid waste generation rate. Although the City's inherent population expansion would increase potential solid waste disposal somewhat, this increase should be offset by successful implementation of the State-mandated Source Reduction and Recycling Element, thereby extending the life of local landfills. Therefore, this alternative should result in lesser solid waste impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Wastewater

Similar to the solid waste issue, the constraint on the City's population growth created by the moratorium on development would result in a much slower rate of increase in wastewater generation. Consequently, the infrastructure improvements needed to serve the growth proposed under the Framework Plan would generally not be necessary under this alternative. However, it should be pointed out that any current wastewater infrastructure deficiencies may persist under this alternative because of the revenue for capital improvements that is normally generated by new development (i.e. sewer connection fees) would not be available. Overall, this alternative is considered to generate lesser wastewater impacts than the proposed plan.

Water Resources

Under this alternative, the City's water demand would increase much slower because the City's population growth would be dramatically reduced and additional commercial and industrial activities would only occur in currently vacant structures. Therefore, this alternative would result in less severe impacts to City's water resources than the proposed Framework Plan.

Utilities

For reasons similar to those discussed above, the City's increasing demand for electric power and natural gas would slow dramatically. Consequently, the development of additional sources of power and natural gas for future use by the City would not be necessary as long as the moratorium was in effect. Therefore, this alternative would result in lesser utility impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Flood Control and Drainage

Under this alternative, the amount of impervious surfaces within the City limits would basically remain at today's levels because no substantial, additional development would be allowed. Consequently, a significant increase in storm flows

generated within the City would not occur under this alternative. However, it should be noted that increased development in areas surrounding the City could affect flood conditions within City limits. Offsetting this indirect impact would be the fact that this alternative would not directly expose additional populations to existing flood areas as may occur with the creation of Targeted Growth Areas under the Framework Plan. The No Growth Alternative, therefore, should result in less flood control impacts overall than those generated by the proposed Framework Plan.

Transportation

Under this alternative, the moratorium on development would mean that traffic increases associated with new development would not occur. However, traffic volumes on roadways and freeways within the City limits would continue to increase because of infill activity of existing development and growth in the surrounding region. Consequently, current adverse traffic conditions would continue to decline further, though at perhaps a slower pace. Furthermore, the land use pattern improvements associated with the Framework Plan would not occur under this alternative. Therefore, the long trip lengths and excessive number of trips generated by City's current pattern of land use would continue, and transit options would continue to be underutilized. Thus, the No Growth Alternative would generate greater traffic impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Fire/EMS

With a moratorium on development under this alternative, the need for new and or expanded fire stations throughout the City would be greatly reduced. Therefore, the impacts to fire protection/EMS are expected to be less under the No Growth Alternative than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Police Services

Under this alternative, the population generation growth rate of the City would be slowed dramatically. As a result, the need for additional sworn police officers would be greatly reduced. Therefore, impacts to police services are expected to be less under the No Growth Alternative than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Education

The City's limited population growth expected under this alternative would result in a slower increase in the student population, reducing the long term demand for additional schools. The No Growth Alternative is expected to generate lesser impacts to public schools than the proposed Framework Plan.

Libraries

Because of the limitation on population growth generated by a development moratorium, the demands for additional library services in the future would be

decreased as compared to those of the proposed Framework Plan. Consequently, the No Growth Alternative would generate lesser impacts to library services than the proposed Framework Plan.

Recreation and Open Space

Because of the limitation on population growth generated by a development moratorium, the demands for additional parkland and park services would be much less than that expected under the proposed Framework Plan. Therefore, the No Growth Alternative is expected to generate lesser impacts to recreation and open space than the proposed Framework Plan. However, it should be noted that areas of the City which are currently underserved in terms of recreational space could expect little improvement because there would be no development-generated revenue to support such improvements.

Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, the likelihood of disturbance or loss of significant cultural or paleontological resources during development construction would be virtually eliminated because of the moratorium on development. Therefore, the No Growth Alternative would result in fewer impacts to cultural resources than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Public Health

With the population growth rate limited through implementation of a development moratorium, the need for additional hospital beds under this alternative would be negligible compared to the Framework Plan. Therefore, the No Growth Alternative would result in lesser impacts to public health than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Geologic /Seismic Conditions

The development moratorium proposed under this alternative would severely limit the number of additional people who would reside or work in the City and thus be exposed to the various geologic and seismic hazards contained within the City. Consequently, the No Growth Alternative is much better than the proposed Framework Plan in limiting the exposure of populations to geologic and seismic conditions.

Biological Resources

Under this alternative, there would be very little additional loss of natural habitat from development, other than what is already permitted. Consequently, the impacts to biological resources from the No Growth Alternative would be less than those generated under the proposed Framework Plan.

Air Quality

The development moratorium proposed under this alternative would effectively place a cap on the current emissions inventory attributable to the City. However, because regional growth outside the City limits would continue, the challenge of improving current air quality conditions in the City could remain problematic. This would be exacerbated by the fact that the current land use patterns within the City would remain and associated traffic congestion would continue. Therefore, the No Growth Alternative would likely result in similar air quality impacts as those of the General Plan Framework.

Noise

Under a development moratorium, ambient noise levels would increase more slowly over time because new traffic noise generated by new development would not occur. Consequently, the No Growth Alternative would result in lesser direct noise impacts than the proposed Framework Plan. It should be noted that a portion of the inevitable ambient noise level increase under this alternative would be attributable to regional growth (and regional traffic increases) in areas outside of the City limits.

Risk of Upset

Under this alternative, the potential for additional development in the City which involves dangerous activities or utilizes hazardous materials would be virtually eliminated. Furthermore, this alternative would limit the exposure of additional persons to existing hazardous conditions by prohibiting additional residential development. Therefore, the No Growth Alternative would result in less of a risk of upset impact than the proposed Framework Plan.

Summary

Under the No Growth Alternative, there would be no increase in the demands for public services and infrastructure, inasmuch as the City is concerned. However, a combination of regional growth outside of the City which would cause impacts in the City limits, and the anticipated lack of revenue available to correct existing adverse situations suggests that, overall, this alternative may not meet the City's planning objectives.

7.2.2 "No Project" (Buildout of the Community Plans) Alternative

Land Use

Under the "No Project" Alternative, the currently adopted land use designations which provide growth in inappropriate areas, or permit more growth than is supportable, would continue to be implemented. Consequently, efforts to manage traffic congestion, air quality and noise would be stymied and current adverse conditions could further deteriorate, resulting in further non-compliance with SCAG and SCAQMD management plans. Consequently, the "No Project"

alternative would generate greater land use impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Urban Form

Under this alternative, the urban form policies developed for the Framework Plan would not be implemented. As a result, buildout under this alternative would cause further fragmentation of existing neighborhoods, less differentiation between distinctive areas of the City and create low-quality developments. Therefore, the "No Project" Alternative would generate greater urban form impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Housing and Population

Under the alternative, the City's buildout population would be greater than the proposed Framework Plan. In terms of affordable housing, this alternative would result in a greater percentage of new rental units being of affordable very low, low and moderate income groups than under the Framework Plan. The percentage of new units for purchase to these groups would be similar to that of the Framework Plan.

Solid Waste Management

Under this alternative, solid waste generation at buildout would be substantially greater than at buildout of the proposed Framework Plan because the development and population potential of this alternative is greater than the proposed Framework Plan. This would translate into a shorter remaining lifespan of the landfills currently in operation, and may also require additional landfills beyond those currently planned for. Therefore the "No Project" Alternative would generate greater solid waste impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Wastewater

Under this alternative, wastewater generation would be substantially higher at buildout than under the proposed Framework Plan because of this alternative's greater development potential. As a result, expansion of the necessary collection lines and treatment plants would have to be on a greater scale than under the proposed Framework Plan. Therefore, the "No Project" Alternative would generate greater wastewater impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Water Resources

For reasons similar to those described above, the additional water demand generated at buildout of this alternative would be greater than the demand generated at buildout of the Framework General Plan. Furthermore, this alternative would not contain any growth management policies which would allow for better tracking of water delivery improvements with future development. Therefore, the water

impacts of the "No Project" Alternative are considered to be greater than those of the proposed Framework Plan.

Utilities

Electric power and natural gas demand generated at buildout of the City under this alternative would be greater than under the proposed Framework General Plan. As a result, additional sources of power and natural gas may be necessary in the future to meet this demand. Therefore, the "No Project" Alternative is considered to generate greater utility impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Flood Control and Drainage

Under this alternative, the greater development potential may mean that there would be incrementally greater areas of impervious surface, resulting in an increase in the volume of storm flows. More importantly, the development that would occur under this alternative may ultimately expose a larger population to existing flooding hazards than would be expected under the proposed Framework Plan, because the proposed mechanisms associated with the Framework which would allow ensure that development was adequately supported by infrastructure improvements would not be put in place. Therefore, the "No Project" Alternative is considered to generate greater flood control and drainage impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Transportation

Because of this alternative's greater development potential, the traffic impacts of this alternative would be greater than the proposed Framework. This impact would be exacerbated by the fact that the transportation policies contained within the proposed Framework which allow for a coordinated improvement of land use pattern, transportation corridors and transit service would not be implemented. Consequently, compliance with SCAG and SCAQMD management plans would not be achieved. As such, the "No Project" Alternative is considered to generate greater transportation impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Fire/EMS

Because of the greater potential for land use intensification throughout the City under this alternative, the need for additional or expanded fire stations would be greater than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Police Services

The greater buildout population that would be generated by this alternative would mean that a greater number of additional sworn police officers would be necessary than under buildout of the proposed Framework Plan. Therefore, the "No Project" Alternative would generate greater impacts on the City's police services than the proposed Framework Plan.

Education

Because this alternative would allow for a larger increase in the housing stock than the proposed Framework Plan, it can be expected that the potential student population of the City would be greater at buildout than under the proposed Framework Plan. Given the current capacity problems of the Los Angeles Unified School District, implementation of the "No Project" alternative would generate greater impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Libraries

Because the population growth associated with this alternative would be greater than under the proposed Framework Plan, the demands on library services would be greater as well. Therefore, the "No Project" alternative would generate greater library impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Recreation and Open Space

Because the population growth associated with this alternative would be greater than under the proposed Framework Plan, the need for additional park land would also be greater. This alternative also would not implement the proposed policies which could limit encroachment into open space areas and enhance open space linkages. Therefore, the recreation and open space impacts of the "No Project Alternative are considered to be greater than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Cultural Resources

The development potential of this alternative would be greater than the proposed Framework Plan. Consequently, there could be greater potential for disturbance of both known and unknown cultural and paleontological resources. Therefore the cultural resource impacts of the "No Project" Alternative are considered to be greater than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Public Health

Under this alternative, the City's population could grow 44 percent larger than under the proposed Framework Plan. Consequently, from a worst case perspective, the need for additional hospital beds would be proportionately greater under this alternative than under the General Plan Framework. Therefore, impacts to public health services are expected to be greater under the "No Project" Alternative than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Geologic /Seismic Conditions

Because the ultimate population size of the City would be greater under this alternative than under the Framework Plan, this alternative would expose a greater number of people to the geologic and seismic hazards of the City. Therefore, the "No Project" Alternative is considered to generate greater geologic and seismic impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Biological Resources

The increased development potential associated with this alternative, combined with a lack of open space protection policies, would result in greater impacts to the remaining biological resources of the City than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Air Quality

This alternative would allow for the greatest development potential of all the alternatives and, consequently, the largest increases in air emissions would be expected as well. Therefore, this impact would be exacerbated by the fact that land use regulations would not sufficiently encourage pedestrian activity or use of the City's expanding transit system. Therefore, the air quality impacts of the "No Project" Alternative are considered to be much greater than those of the proposed Framework Plan.

Noise

Because of the traffic associated with the increased development potential of this alternative, ambient noise levels at Citywide buildout are expected to be much worse than at buildout of the proposed Framework Plan. Therefore, the "No Project" Alternative is expected to generate greater noise impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Risk of Upset

The additional development potential under this alternative means that there would likely be more commercial and industrial developments which involve hazardous materials or activities than under the proposed Framework Plan. Furthermore, this alternative has a greater potential of exposing additional people to existing hazards because the overall population of the City would be greater under this alternative. Therefore, the "No Project" Alternative is expected to generate greater risk of upset impacts than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Summary

Because of the substantial additional development potential of this alternative, it can be considered to generate greater impacts on the environment than the proposed Framework Plan. The impacts would be both direct (i.e. increased demands on public services and infrastructure, increased population exposure to geologic and other hazards) and indirect (i.e. the lack of growth management and urban form policies would allow further fragmentation of existing neighborhoods and further non-compliance with SCAG and SCAQMD management plans). This alternative would also generate greater impacts to Open Space and Biological Resources because there would be no additional policy limits than what exist today through City zoning ordinances on encroachment into these areas.

7.2.3 Alternative A1

Land Use

Under Alternative A1, the land use patterns (i.e. Targeted Growth Areas) associated with the proposed Framework Plan would occur in more locations because this alternative assumes greater implementation of MTA's Thirty Year Plan. Consequently, the beneficial land use impacts associated with placement of intensified, mixed use, pedestrian-oriented development around transit stations would be greater under this alternative than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Urban Form

Under this alternative, the urban form benefits (i.e. quality development with differentiation between distinct areas of the City) associated with the proposed Framework Plan would be possible in more areas. Consequently, the beneficial urban form impacts of this alternative would be greater than the proposed Framework Plan. However, any incompatibilities of scale, and the overall change in character that will likely occur at transit stations would be of greater concern under this alternative than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Housing and Population

Under the alternative, the City's buildout population would be greater than the proposed Framework Plan. In terms of affordable housing, this alternative would result in a greater percentage of new rental units being of affordable very low, low and moderate income groups than under the Framework Plan. The percentage of new units for purchase to these groups would be similar to that of the Framework Plan.

Solid Waste Management

Under this alternative, solid waste generation at buildout would be substantially greater than at buildout of the proposed Framework Plan because the development and population potential of this alternative is greater than the proposed Framework Plan. This would translate into a shorter remaining lifespan of the landfills currently in operation, and may also require additional landfills beyond those currently planned for. Therefore, Alternative A1 would generate greater solid waste impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Wastewater

Under this alternative, wastewater generation would be substantially higher at buildout than under the proposed Framework Plan because of this alternative's greater development potential. As a result, expansion of the necessary collection lines and treatment plants would have to be on a greater scale than under the proposed Framework Plan. Therefore, the Alternative A1 would generate greater wastewater impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Water Resources

For reasons similar to those described above, the additional water demand generated at buildout of this alternative would be greater than the demand generated at buildout of the Framework General Plan. Furthermore, this alternative would not contain any growth management policies which would allow for better tracking of water delivery improvements with future development. Therefore, the water impacts of the Alternative A1 are considered to be greater than those of the proposed Framework Plan.

Utilities

Electric power and natural gas demand generated at buildout of the City under this alternative would be greater than under the proposed Framework General Plan. As a result, additional sources of power and natural gas may be necessary in the future to meet this demand. Therefore, the Alternative A1 is considered to generate greater utility impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Flood Control and Drainage

Under this alternative, the greater development potential may mean that there would be incrementally greater areas of impervious surface, resulting in an increase in the volume of storm flows. More importantly, the development that would occur under this alternative may ultimately expose a larger population to existing flooding hazards than would be expected under the proposed Framework Plan, because the proposed mechanisms associated with the Framework which would allow ensure that development was adequately supported by infrastructure improvements would not be put in place. Therefore, the Alternative A1 is considered to generate greater flood control and drainage impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Transportation

Because of this alternative's greater development potential, the potential traffic impacts of this alternative would be greater than the proposed Framework. This impact would be offset somewhat by the fact that the transportation/land use policies contained within the proposed Framework would occur under this alternative, resulting in appropriate development levels and patterns around an enhanced set of transit system stations. Consequently, some of the potential additional vehicular traffic associated with this alternative would be offset by an increase in transit use and pedestrian activity in the Targeted Growth Areas. Regardless, Alternative A1 is considered to generate somewhat greater transportation impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Fire/EMS

Because of the greater potential for land use intensification throughout the City under Alternative A1, the need for additional or expanded fire stations would be greater than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Police Services

The greater buildout population that would be generated by this alternative would mean that a greater number of additional sworn police officers would be necessary than under buildout of the proposed Framework Plan. Therefore, Alternative A1 would generate greater impacts on the City's police services than the proposed Framework Plan.

Education

Because this alternative would allow for a larger increase in the housing stock than the proposed Framework Plan, it can be expected that the potential student population of the City would be greater at buildout than under the proposed Framework Plan. Given the current capacity problems of the Los Angeles Unified School District, implementation of the Alternative A1 would generate greater impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Libraries

Because the population growth associated with this alternative would be greater than under the proposed Framework Plan, the demands on library services would be greater as well. Therefore, the Alternative A1 would generate greater library impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Recreation and Open Space

Because the population growth associated with this alternative would be greater than under the proposed Framework Plan, the need for additional park land would also be greater. However, the proposed policies of the Framework Plan which limit encroachment into open space areas and enhance open space linkages would also be part of this alternative. Therefore, the recreation and open space impacts of Alternative A1 are considered to be only somewhat greater than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Cultural Resources

The development potential of this alternative would be greater than the proposed Framework Plan. Consequently, there could be greater potential for disturbance of both known and unknown cultural and paleontological resources. Therefore, the cultural resource impacts of Alternative A1 are considered to be greater than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Public Health

Under this alternative, the City's population could grow 39 percent larger than under the proposed Framework Plan. Consequently, from a worst case perspective, the need for additional hospital beds would be proportionately greater under this alternative than under the General Plan Framework. Therefore, impacts to public health services are expected to be greater under Alternative A1 than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Geologic /Seismic Conditions

Because the ultimate population size of the City would be greater under this alternative than under the Framework Plan, this alternative would expose a greater number of people to the geologic and seismic hazards of the City. Therefore, Alternative A1 is considered to generate greater geologic and seismic impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Biological Resources

Although this alternative has greater development potential than the proposed Framework Plan, the placement of the additional targeted growth areas around additional transit stations would not result in a direct increase in impacts to the City's natural habitats. Therefore, Alternative A1's biological impacts are considered to similar to those of the Framework Plan.

Air Quality

Because of the greater development potential of Alternative A1, the emission levels of this alternative would be greater at buildout than under the proposed Framework Plan. However, by providing appropriate densities at all the proposed MTA transit stations, this alternative has a better chance of increasing transit use, thereby decreasing emissions. Therefore, Alternative A1 would result in only slightly greater air quality impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Noise

Because of the traffic associated with the increased development potential of this alternative, ambient noise levels at Citywide buildout are expected to be worse than at buildout of the proposed Framework Plan. Therefore, Alternative A1 is expected to generate greater noise impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Risk of Upset

The additional development potential under this alternative means that there would likely be more commercial and industrial developments which involve hazardous materials or activities than under the proposed Framework Plan. Furthermore, this alternative has a greater potential of exposing additional people to existing hazards because the overall population of the City would be greater

under this alternative. Therefore, Alternative A1 is expected to generate greater risk of upset impacts than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Summary

Because Alternative A1 served as the basis for development of the Framework Plan, the distribution of its buildout is very similar to that of the Framework Plan. However, based upon the fact that this alternative provides for greater development potential, the environmental impacts of this alternative can be considered to be greater than under the Framework Plan.

7.2.4 2010 Market Alternative

Land Use

Under the 2010 Market Alternative, the land use patterns would follow what currently is proposed in the City's 35 community plans. However, under a market-driven scenario, concentrations of development would be more random, and would likely be of lower quality and less pedestrian-oriented than development permitted under the proposed Framework Plan. As such, the City would not likely be able to comply with SCAG and SCAQMD management plans which call for better land use arrangements to reduce vehicular traffic. Therefore, the 2010 Market Alternative would generate greater land use impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Urban Form

This alternative would not place an emphasis on pedestrian districts nor would it encourage quality developments, nor would it adequately differentiate between distinct areas of the City, as would the proposed Framework Plan. Therefore, the urban form impacts of the 2010 Market Alternative would be greater than those of the proposed Framework Plan.

Housing and Population

Under this alternative, the City's buildout population would be similar to that expected under the Framework Plan. In terms of affordable housing, the percentages of both rental units and new units for purchase which are affordable new to very low and moderate income groups would be similar to that expected under the Framework Plan.

Solid Waste Management

Because the overall increase in Citywide development would not be as great as under the proposed Framework Plan, the solid waste generation rate at buildout would be lower than under the Framework Plan. This, in turn, means that the life of the City's landfills would be extended beyond what it anticipated under the Framework Plan. Therefore, the 2010 Market Alternative would generate lesser solid waste impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Wastewater

For similar reasons as stated above, the need for improvements to wastewater collection and treatment systems would not be as great as under the proposed Framework Plan. Therefore, the 2010 Market Alternative would generate lesser wastewater impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Water Resources

For similar reasons as stated above, City's water demand at buildout will likely be less than under the proposed Framework Plan. In addition, water delivery systems may not require the improvements that may be necessary under the proposed Framework Plan. Therefore, the 2010 Market Alternative would generate lesser impacts to the City's water resources than the proposed Framework Plan.

Utilities

The reduced development potential anticipated under this alternative would translate into a reduced demand upon electric power and natural gas. This, in turn, would slow down the need to exploit new energy sources. Therefore, the 2010 Market Alternative would generate less impacts on utilities than the proposed Framework Plan.

Flood Control and Drainage

Under this alternative, the increase in the amount of impervious surfaces would be slightly less than could be expected under the proposed Framework Plan because there would be somewhat less infill development under this alternative. However, this effect would likely be offset by the fact that future land use patterns would not be as regulated as under the proposed Framework Plan, and therefore, there may be more conversion of permeable surfaces (i.e. open space areas) to impermeable ones. Therefore, the overall flood control and drainage impact of the 2010 Market Alternative is considered to be similar to that of the proposed Framework Plan.

Transportation

Under this alternative, the additional traffic volumes generated by new development would not be as great as could potentially occur under the proposed Framework Plan. However, this alternative would not include the land use patterns and policies which encourage shorter trip lengths, use of alternative modes of transportation and pedestrian activity. In short, this alternative may not be able to meet the objectives of the SCAG and SCAQMD congestion management plans. Therefore, the transportation impacts of the 2010 Market Alternative are considered to be greater than those of the proposed Framework Plan.

Fire/EMS

Because this alternative would result in less additional development than the proposed Framework Plan, the need for additional or expanded fire stations is considered to be less than the proposed Framework Plan as well.

Police Services

Because the resident population of the City under this alternative would be roughly the same as under the proposed Framework Plan, it is expected that the demand for additional sworn police officers would be similar. Therefore, the 2010 Market Alternative's impacts on police services are considered to be similar to those of the proposed Framework Plan.

Education

Under this alternative, there would be fewer additional single family units and more multi-family units than the proposed Framework Plan. In terms of the City's future student population, it is expected that this housing stock will generate roughly the same number of students as under the proposed Framework Plan. Given the current school capacity problems within the Los Angeles Unified School District, the impact of the 2010 Market Alternative is considered to be similar to that of the proposed Framework Plan.

Libraries

Because this alternative would result a similar increase in the City's residential population as the proposed Framework Plan, the demands on local library generated by this alternative is likely to be similar to those of the proposed Framework Plan.

Recreation and Open Space

For reasons identified above, this alternative's demand for additional parkland would be similar to that of the proposed Framework Plan. However, open impacts may be greater under the 2010 Market Alternative because the policies which limit encroachment upon, and enhance linkages between, open spaces would not be implemented.

Cultural Resources

Because this alternative would result in less new development than the proposed Framework Plan, the 2010 Market Alternative is expected to generate fewer impacts to known and unknown, cultural and paleontological resources.

Public Health

Given that this alternative would result in a population increase similar to that of the proposed Framework Plan, it is expected that the need for additional hospital

beds would also be similar. Therefore, the 2010 Market Alternative is expected to generate the same public health impacts as the proposed Framework Plan.

Geologic /Seismic Conditions

This alternative would expose a similar number of additional persons to the City's geologic and seismic hazards as the proposed Framework Plan. Therefore, the 2010 Market Alternative is expected to generate generally the same geologic and seismic impacts as the proposed Framework Plan.

Biological Resources

Although this alternative would result in less development potential than the proposed Framework Plan, the land use policies which would limit further major encroachment into natural habitat areas would not be implemented. Therefore, the overall impact of the 2010 Market Alternative is considered to be greater than the proposed Framework Plan.

Air Quality

This alternative would generate slightly higher emission levels than the proposed Framework Plan because this alternative does not address the need for more efficient land use patterns that encourage pedestrian activity and the use of alternative transportation modes. Therefore, the 2010 Market Alternative is expected to generate greater air quality impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Noise

This alternative would likely generate similar overall noise impacts to those of the proposed Framework Plan. Even though there would be less development under this alternative, the lack of transit and pedestrian-oriented land use patterns would mean that vehicular traffic noise would continue to increase relatively unabated.

Risk of Upset

Under this alternative, the amount of additional industrial development would be similar to that allowed under the proposed Framework Plan. Consequently, the increase in risk of upset often associated with industrial and manufacturing facilities would be roughly the same as the proposed Framework Plan. Furthermore, the similar population increase suggests that the exposure of additional persons to existing hazardous conditions would be about the same.

Summary

Although the 2010 Market Alternative results in more multi-family dwelling units than the Framework Plan, it permits fewer single family dwelling units, fewer square feet of office and retail space and, most importantly, fewer jobs. This alternative may cause fewer impacts overall with respect to long-range environmental impacts; however, it does not offer the solutions for traffic

congestion management, air quality improvement and infrastructure management as does the proposed Framework Plan.

7.2.5 Theoretical Buildout Alternative

Land Use

Under the Theoretical Buildout Alternative, the land use map proposed under the Framework Plan would be implemented. However, the growth management policies which regulate development to the provision of adequate infrastructure would not be included. As such, this alternative would result in similar land use compatibility impacts as the proposed Framework Plan but greater impacts in terms of the relationship between development of Targeted Growth Areas and provision of adequate infrastructure. Therefore, the Theoretical Buildout Alternative is considered to generate greater land use impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Urban Form

The beneficial impacts to urban form (i.e. quality development, creation of distinctive areas and pedestrian districts) that are attributable to the Framework Plan would also be associated with this alternative. Therefore, the Theoretical Buildout Alternative would generate similar urban form impacts to those of the proposed Framework Plan.

Housing and Population

Under the alternative, the City's buildout population would be greater than the proposed Framework Plan. In terms of affordable housing, this alternative would result in a greater percentage of new rental units being of affordable very low, low and moderate income groups than under the Framework Plan. The percentage of new units for purchase to these groups would be similar to that of the Framework Plan.

Solid Waste Management

Under this alternative, solid waste generation at buildout would be substantially greater than at buildout of the proposed Framework Plan because the development and population potential of this alternative is greater than the proposed Framework Plan. This would translate into a shorter remaining lifespan of the landfills currently in operation, and may also require additional landfills beyond those currently planned for. Therefore, the Theoretical Buildout Alternative would generate greater solid waste impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Wastewater

Under this alternative, wastewater generation would be substantially higher at buildout than under the proposed Framework Plan because of this alternative's greater development potential. As a result, expansion of the necessary collection lines and treatment plants would have to be on a greater scale than under the

proposed Framework Plan. Therefore, the Theoretical Buildout Alternative would generate greater wastewater impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Water Resources

For reasons similar to those described above, the additional water demand generated at buildout of this alternative would be greater than the demand generated at buildout of the Framework General Plan. Furthermore, this alternative would not contain any growth management policies which would allow for better tracking of water delivery improvements with future development. Therefore, the water impacts of the Theoretical Buildout Alternative are considered to be greater than those of the proposed Framework Plan.

Utilities

Electric power and natural gas demand generated at buildout of the City under this alternative would be greater than under the proposed Framework General Plan. As a result, additional sources of power and natural gas may be necessary in the future to meet this demand. Therefore, the Theoretical Buildout Alternative is considered to generate greater utility impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Flood Control and Drainage

Under this alternative, the greater development potential may mean that there would be incrementally greater areas of impervious surface, resulting in an increase in the volume of storm flows. More importantly, the development that would occur under this alternative may ultimately expose a larger population to existing flooding hazards than would be expected under the proposed Framework Plan, because the proposed mechanisms associated with the Framework which would allow ensure that development was adequately supported by infrastructure improvements would not be put in place. Therefore, the Theoretical Buildout Alternative is considered to generate greater flood control and drainage impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Transportation

Because of this alternative's greater development potential, the potential traffic impacts of this alternative would be greater than the proposed Framework. This impact may be exacerbated by the fact that there would be no policies which link development to provision of adequate infrastructure. As a result, development and associated traffic increases could occur without alternative transportation modes readily available. Therefore, the Theoretical Buildout Alternative would generate greater transportation impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Fire/EMS

Because of the greater potential for land use intensification throughout the City under the Theoretical Buildout Alternative, the need for additional or expanded fire

stations would be greater than under the proposed Framework Plan. Because this alternative would not contain the Framework policies which would link new development to the provision of adequate public services, the Fire/EMS impact of the Theoretical Buildout Alternative would be greater than the proposed Framework Plan.

Police Services

The greater buildout population that would be generated by this alternative would mean that a greater number of additional sworn police officers would be necessary than under buildout of the proposed Framework Plan. Furthermore, this alternative would not include policies which link development to provision of adequate public service. Therefore, the Theoretical Buildout Alternative would generate greater impacts on the City's police services than the proposed Framework Plan.

Education

Because this alternative would allow for a larger increase in the housing stock than the proposed Framework Plan, it can be expected that the potential student population of the City would be greater at buildout than under the proposed Framework Plan. Given the current capacity problems of the Los Angeles Unified School District, implementation of the Theoretical Buildout Alternative would generate greater impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Libraries

Because the population growth associated with this alternative would be greater than under the proposed Framework Plan, the demands on library services would be greater as well. Furthermore, this alternative would not include policies which link new development to the provision of public services. Therefore, the Theoretical Buildout Alternative would generate greater library impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Recreation and Open Space

Because the population growth associated with this alternative would be greater than under the proposed Framework Plan, the need for additional park land would also be greater. However, this alternative would implement the proposed policies of the Framework Plan which would limit encroachment into open space areas and enhance open space linkages. Therefore, the recreation and open space impacts of the Theoretical Buildout Alternative are considered to be only somewhat greater than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Cultural Resources

The development potential of this alternative would be greater than the proposed Framework Plan. Consequently, there could be greater potential for disturbance of

both known and unknown cultural and paleontological resources. Therefore, the cultural resource impacts of the Theoretical Buildout Alternative are considered to be greater than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Public Health

Under this alternative, the City's population could grow 67 percent larger than under the proposed Framework Plan. Consequently, from a worst case perspective, the need for additional hospital beds would be proportionately greater under this alternative than under the General Plan Framework. Therefore, impacts to public health services are expected to be greater under the Theoretical Buildout Alternative than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Geologic /Seismic Conditions

Because the ultimate population size of the City would be greater under this alternative than under the Framework Plan, this alternative would expose a greater number of people to the geologic and seismic hazards of the City. Therefore, the Theoretical Buildout Alternative is considered to generate greater geologic and seismic impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Biological Resources

Although this alternative has greater development potential than the proposed Framework Plan, there would be no change in the location of the targeted growth areas, thereby limiting direct impacts to those described for the proposed Framework Plan. Therefore, the Theoretical Buildout's biological impacts are considered to be similar to those of the Framework Plan.

Air Quality

The air emission levels associated with implementation of this alternative would be substantially greater than the proposed Framework Plan because of the increased development. However, this increase is offset somewhat by the fact that the creation of Targeted Growth Areas around transit stations would still occur, and thus increased pedestrian activity and use of alternative transportation modes would help to reduce emissions.

Noise

Because of the traffic associated with the increased development potential of this alternative, ambient noise levels at Citywide buildout are expected to be worse than at buildout of the proposed Framework Plan. Therefore, the Theoretical Buildout Alternative is expected to generate greater noise impacts than the proposed Framework Plan.

Risk of Upset

The additional development potential under this alternative means that there would likely be more commercial and industrial developments which involve hazardous materials or activities than under the proposed Framework Plan. Furthermore, this alternative has a greater potential of exposing additional people to existing hazards because the overall population of the City would be greater under this alternative. Therefore, the Theoretical Buildout Alternative is expected to generate greater risk of upset impacts than under the proposed Framework Plan.

Summary

The Theoretical Buildout Alternative can be considered to generate greater impacts on the environment than the proposed Framework Plan. The impacts would be both direct (i.e. increased demands on public services and infrastructure, increased population exposure to geologic and other hazards) and indirect (i.e. the lack of infrastructure-based development policies).

7.3 Environmentally Superior Alternative

In addition to the discussion and comparison of the alternative's impacts to the proposed project, CEQA requires that an "environmentally superior" alternative be selected and the reasons for such selection disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative which would be expected to generate the fewest adverse environmental impacts. According to CEQA Guidelines, if the "No Project" alternative is considered to be environmentally superior, then a second-best alternative must be identified.

As **Table ALT-2** indicates, Alternative A1, the "No Project" Alternative and the Theoretical Buildout Alternative result in greater impacts than the proposed Framework Plan due to their greater development potential. However, the "No Growth" Alternative and the 2010 Market Alternative would generate fewer impacts than the proposed Framework Plan and the other alternatives because, hypothetically, the demand on public services and infrastructure would be much less under these alternatives.

With regard to the "No Growth" Alternative, realistically it can be expected that population growth within the City would continue to occur, generating increased demands which could not be accommodated through the restricted tax revenue base. If sufficient revenue normally generated by an expanding economy is not available, the result could be a further decline in services and infrastructure and, ultimately, a decline in the quality of life. Furthermore, existing adverse transportation and air quality conditions would have little hope of improvement. Therefore, it can be argued that the "No Growth" Alternative may not actually be environmentally superior in the long term.

With regard to the 2010 Market Alternative, this alternative would generate greater impacts than the proposed Framework Plan in the most important environmental issues of concern (land use, urban form, transportation and air quality). Furthermore, this alternative would not adequately manage new development to ensure that adequate infrastructure and public services are available. Therefore, this alternative does not meet the objectives of the proposed project, and thus would not be selected as environmentally superior.

In conclusion, there are significant disadvantages associated with pursuing the two alternatives which are ostensibly environmentally superior. Secondly, it is unlikely that an alternative which provides a substantially better balance between economic expansion, environmental protection and provision of public services/infrastructure, can be identified at this time. Therefore, the conclusion of this analysis is that the proposed General Plan Framework is preferable to any other land use planning option available.