

VII. ALTERNATIVES

The *CEQA Guidelines* require analysis of a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the project's basic objectives and avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.¹ The Baseball Stadium in the Diridon/Arena Area project has been described and analyzed in the previous chapters with an emphasis on significant impacts and recommended mitigation measures to avoid these impacts. The following discussion is intended to inform the public and decision-makers of feasible alternatives to the proposed project.

The objectives of the proposed project are an important part of the context for evaluating alternatives to the proposed project. The project's objectives are restated here for reference:

- An open-air stadium of 45,000 seats and associated facilities meeting major league standards for size and quality of improvements expected in modern stadiums;
- a site that is at least 14 acres, located within the Greater Downtown area of San Jose, and of a configuration capable of accommodating the above-described stadium and associated facilities;
- a site that is readily accessible (within ¾ mile) by substantial public transportation opportunities, especially regional transit;
- a site that offers potential for using a high number of existing parking facilities (within ¾ mile) and offers the potential for dedicating up to 150 spaces on-site for exclusive use by the stadium ;
- a site that possesses views of the Downtown San Jose skyline and the sense of Silicon Valley between the Santa Cruz and Diablo Mountain Ranges;
- the ability to use the stadium's seating capacity for occasional major civic and entertainment events;
- the ability to convert the ballpark's infield area during the off-season to a small enclosed temporary amphitheater with a capacity of 5,000 to 15,000 seats for music, concerts and entertainment; and
- a site that can provide an appropriate context for designing a modern structure in the architectural tradition of old ballparks.

This chapter discusses a total of seven alternatives to the proposed Project:

The **No Development** alternative would involve the multi-parcel site remaining physically as it presently is. The multiple-block site would maintain its commercial, light industrial, transportation, utility and office uses. The fire training center south of Park Avenue would continue to operate in its cur-

¹ *CEQA Guidelines*, 2006, Section 15126.6.

rent location. Autumn Street would maintain its current alignment, and Otterson and Montgomery Streets would not be vacated.

The **Existing Plan** alternative would involve the development of the site in accordance with the development outlined in the Diridon/Arena Strategic Development Plan, the Midtown Specific Plan and the Burbank/Del Monte Neighborhood Improvement Plan. The project site north of Park Avenue would be developed with transit oriented mixed use development. The project site south of Park Avenue would be developed with a public park.

The **Submerged Stadium** alternative would involve the excavation of the site by 24 to 28 feet to submerge the stadium and achieve a consequent reduction in overall height by the same 24 to 28 feet. The parking garage would also be submerged to a similar level. Pedestrian access to the interior of the stadium facilities would vary from the proposed (at-grade) concept, but this alternative assumes that the remainder of the project's characteristics would not change.

Over the past several years the City of San Jose has considered many locations for a baseball stadium. **Alternate Locations Considered and Rejected** summarizes locations that have been considered by the City, but which do not meet the basic size requirements or other critical project objectives, or which have other fatal flaws.

In order to most clearly distinguish the trade-off in potential impacts—both *beneficial* and *adverse*—several alternate locations for the project have been selected.

The **FMC/Coleman Avenue Location** alternative evaluates the same development program as the proposed project, but at another location within the City of San Jose. The FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative is an approximately 92.5-acre site bounded by Coleman Avenue to the northeast, Newhall Street to the southeast, Southern Pacific Railroad lines to the southwest and the jurisdictional boundary of the City of Santa Clara to the northwest. This site was analyzed (for another type of development project) in the EIR prepared for the FMC/Coleman Avenue Planned Development Rezoning (July 2003).

The **Del Monte Location** alternative evaluates the same development program as the proposed project, but at another location within the City of San Jose. The Del Monte Location alternative is an approximately 17.5-acre site at 801 Auzerais Street, generally south of W. San Carlos Street, west of Los Gatos Creek, north of W. Home Street and east of Sunol Street and the Vasona LRT line. This site was analyzed (for another type of development project) in the EIR prepared for the KB Home Monte Vista Residential Planned Development Zoning Project (March 2005).

The **Berryessa Flea Market Location** alternative evaluates the same development program as the proposed project, but at another location within the City of San Jose. The Berryessa Flea Market Location alternative is an approximately 120-acre site at 1590 Berryessa Road, generally south of Chessington Drive and Bellemade Street, north of Maybury Street, west of Caltrain tracks and east of Coyote Creek. This site was analyzed (for another type of development project) in the EIR prepared for the San Jose Flea Market General Plan Amendment (November 2002).

The **Reed and Graham Location** alternative evaluates the same development program as the proposed project, but at another location within the City of San Jose. The Reed and Graham Location

alternative is an approximately 16-acre site at 854 Savaker Avenue, generally bounded by Los Gatos Creek to the west, I-280 to the south, railroad lines to the west and Savaker Avenue to the north. This site was analyzed as an alternative in the EIR prepared for the KB Home Monte Vista Residential Planned Development Zoning Project (March 2005).

Each alternative is compared to the proposed project, and discussed in terms of its various mitigating or adverse effects on the environment. Analysis of the alternatives follows the same topical order as for the proposed project in Chapter V, and focuses on those topics for which significant adverse impacts would result from the proposed project.

A. NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

1. Description of No Development Alternative

The No Development alternative is the circumstance under which the project does not proceed, and the comparison involves the effects of the property remaining in its existing state versus the effects which would occur if the project were implemented. The multiple-block site would maintain its commercial, light industrial, transportation, utility and office uses. The fire training center south of Park Avenue would continue to operate in its current location. None of the 17 buildings on the project site would be demolished. Autumn Street would maintain its current alignment, and Otterson and Montgomery Streets would not be vacated.

2. Analysis of No Development Alternative

To maintain the project site as it is today would avoid each of the significant and unavoidable impacts that would result from the proposed project.

- The use of fireworks as part of the baseball stadium on the site would not present a hazard to the safe operation of the San Jose International Airport.
- It would not lead to exacerbated transportation level-of-service impacts at impacted intersections, nor would development here add to the congestion on the select segments of SR 87 and I-280.
- The No Development alternative would also avoid the contribution made by the proposed project to regional air pollution as well as short-term, localized air pollution from fireworks.
- There would be no air quality or noise impacts related to construction.
- There would be no noise impacts as a result of increased traffic in the area.
- There would be no noise impacts as a result of baseball games, concerts or fireworks.
- The No Development alternative would avoid the loss of ordinance size trees and the potential disturbance of nesting hawks and other raptors.
- No new structures would be exposed to or damaged by seismically-induced groundshaking, expansive soils, differential settlement or soil liquefaction.
- Local drainage patterns would not be altered.
- Water quality would not be impacted during construction or operation of a proposed development, and dewatering the site with the risk of exposing construction workers to contaminants would not occur.

- The No Development alternative would not expose construction workers or the public to hazards materials in soil and groundwater during construction activities.
- There would be no risk of improper use or transport of hazardous materials.
- There would be no risk to construction workers or the public associated with the demolition of buildings that may contain lead based paint and/or asbestos.
- Future land uses on the project site would not be subject to the hazards posed by the electrical substation.
- There would be no demolition of a structure that appears to be a Candidate for City Landmark and appears eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. There would be no impacts to a cultural resource adjacent to the project site.
- There would be no disturbance to potential prehistoric archaeological, historic archaeological, paleontologic resources or human remains.
- The No Development alternative would not impact visual resources through the removal of ordinance sized trees.
- The No Development alternative would not increase light and glare which could be a nuisance to surrounding land uses and interfere with the safe operation of the San Jose International Airport.
- The No Development alternative would not impact visual resources through the removal of ordinance sized trees.
- There would be no reduction in water pressure for surrounding land uses.
- There would be generation of solid waste as a result of demolition, land clearing and construction that could interfere with waste diversions goals mandated by the California Integrated Waste Management Act.
- The existing PG&E substation on the northwest corner of the project site would not need to be relocated to the southern end of the project site.

While this alternative would be environmentally superior in the technical sense that these aforementioned impacts would not occur, it would also fail to achieve any of the project's objectives summarized at the beginning of this chapter. The creation of a baseball stadium in this area, in the greater downtown area, with access to public transit as well as existing parking, and on a site that could be readily assembled and secured, would be foregone.

B. EXISTING PLAN ALTERNATIVE

1. Description of Existing Plan Alternative

The Existing Plan alternative would involve the development of the site in accordance with the development outlined in the Diridon/Arena Strategic Development Plan, the Midtown Specific Plan and the Burbank/Del Monte Neighborhood Improvement Plan. The project site north of Park Avenue would be developed with transit oriented mixed use development. Transit Oriented Mixed Use in the Diridon/Arena Strategic Development Plan is adopted from the Midtown Specific Plan and is defined as follows:

The primary use is high-density residential – up to 150 dwelling units per acre. Residential units can be combined with office, retail, restaurant, child care, and public/quasi-public, and entertainment uses. Ground floor pedestrian oriented uses are encouraged, with emphasis on uses that support area residents. Neighborhood park space should be developed to support the residential uses.

The development area north of Park Avenue would be approximately 14.5 acres. The Existing Plan Alternative would not include the relocation of the PG&E substation and would not include residential or office or commercial development east of S. Autumn Street. Up to 725 dwelling units, 700,000 square feet of office, 200,000 square feet of retail, and 300 hotel rooms would be developed on the site as part of this alternative.

A public park would be developed between S. Autumn Street and Los Gatos Creek.

That portion of the project site located south of Park Avenue, currently the location of the Fire Training Facility, would be developed with a neighborhood park and playing fields.

2. Analysis of Existing Plan Alternative

a. Land Use. Development of up to 725 dwelling units and 900,000 square feet of office and retail uses on the project site would change the land use from commercial, light industrial, transportation, utility and office uses to residential, office, and retail uses, unlike the proposed project, development of the Existing Plan alternative would require rezoning. Similar to the proposed project, residential, office and commercial uses on this site would not divide an established community or introduce new land uses that would conflict with established or proposed land uses. If the height of structures on the project site would exceed the FAA's imaginary surface standards, both the proposed project and the Existing Plan Alternative would be required to receive a Determination of No Hazard prior to development permit approval.

b. Population, Employment and Housing. Similar to the proposed project, the Existing Plan alternative would not displace housing or people that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The City of San Jose has an average of 3.15 persons per household.² The construction 725 dwelling units would increase the population by approximately 2,280 people. This increase in population is consistent with the vision of the area. This alternative would generate approximately 2,700 jobs, approximately 900 more jobs than the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, the Existing Plan alternative would benefit the City's overall current and long term jobs-to-housing balance.

c. Transportation, Circulation and Parking. Development of residential and commercial uses proposed under the Existing Plan alternative would generate a substantial number of AM and PM peak hour trips on a daily basis to the areas surround the project site. The plan would however, reduce the total PM peak hour period traffic when compared to the peak hour of traffic from a stadium event. The Existing Plan alternative would also substantially increase the off-peak period effect on intersection congestion and freeway segments. Transit service and bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be impacted to a lesser extent than during a stadium event scenario. The Existing Plan alternative would

² ABAG. Projections 2005. December 2004. San Jose Household Population 2005: 930,686 divided by San Jose Households 2005: 309,020 equals 3.15 persons per household.

have a greater impact on transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities on a daily basis and during off-peak periods when compared to the proposed project.

d. Air Quality. Construction and operation of the Existing Plan alternative would have a greater impact on air quality than development of the proposed project. While the Existing Plan alternative would generate fewer trips daily than the proposed project events, it would increase the number of trips to and from the site over existing conditions over time as stadium events are limited to a select number of days and nights annually. While the proposed stadium would exceed the daily emission standards established by the BAAQMD, it would not exceed the standard established for annual emissions. The Existing Plan alternative would operate on a daily basis and would generate annual emissions that would likely exceed the BAAQMD emission standards.

e. Noise. The noise effects caused by construction and traffic associated with the Existing Plan alternative would be similar to those generated by the proposed project. Existing Plan alternative noise levels traffic would impact the surrounding areas similar to the proposed project. The Existing Plan alternative would not include the noise of baseball games, concerts or fireworks and as such it would expose the surrounding uses to less of these types of noise than the proposed project. Noise impacts related to smaller discrete construction projects within the Existing Plan alternative could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels; construction noise from the proposed project would be significant unavoidable.

f. Biological Resources. The Existing Plan alternative would develop the majority of the project site and, similar to the proposed project, would include setbacks from Los Gatos Creek. Impacts to biological resources would be similar or slightly reduced under the Existing Plan alternative. Up to 45 ordinance-size trees would be removed, and their removal would be mitigated with implementation of a landscape plan which includes replacement of ordinance-size trees at a ratio of 4:1 in the project area. The implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan would reduce potential impacts to water quality in Los Gatos Creek and related habitat to less-than-significant levels. With preconstruction surveys and other mitigation, impacts to nesting hawks and other raptors would be less-than-significant.

g. Geology, Soils and Seismicity. Construction and operation of the Existing Plan alternative would have similar impacts on geology, soils and seismicity as the proposed project. Implementation of commonly used mitigation measures including the preparation of a design-level geotechnical investigation, following the recommendations presented in the *Guidelines for Evaluating Seismic Hazards in California*, and following the mitigation measures, design criteria, and specifications set forth in the geotechnical and soils report could reduce geology, soils and seismicity impacts to less-than-significant levels.

h. Hydrology and Water Quality. Construction and operation of the Existing Plan alternative would have similar impacts on hydrology and water quality as the proposed project. Implementation of commonly used mitigation measures including a detailed hydraulic analysis that demonstrates that implementation of the proposed drainage plan would be in compliance with City standards as well as the County NPDES permit, compliance with the City's Post Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy, the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and inclusion of Best Management Practices in the project design could reduce hydrology and water quality impacts to less-than-significant levels.

i. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Historical and current land uses on the project site have resulted in onsite soils contamination. With mitigation, potential impacts of hazardous materials could be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of the following commonly used mitigation measures prior to demolition could reduce hazards impacts to less-than-significant levels: preparation of Phase I site assessments for the site; preparation of Phase II assessments as recommended; preparation of Human Health Risk assessments as recommended; preparation and implementation of Construction Risk Management Plans; and, if lead-based paint and asbestos are determined to be present, removal in accordance with the appropriate regulations. Under the Existing Plan alternative, the PG&E substation would not be relocated and potential hazards associated with that component of the proposed project would be avoided.

j. Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Construction of the Existing Plan alternative would have similar impacts on Cultural and Paleontological Resources as the proposed project. Ground disturbing activities could impact historic or prehistoric archaeological resources and/or disturb buried human remains. With mitigation, these potential impacts could be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Redevelopment of the project site would require the demolition of one structure that appears to be a Candidate for City Landmark and appears eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, the KNTV Broadcast Facility, 645 Park Avenue. Demolition of this resource would be significant and unavoidable. The proposed project would impact a cultural resource adjacent to the project site, the Diridon Train Station, and it is assumed that the Existing Plan alternative could avoid this impact.

k. Visual Resources. Both the Existing Plan alternative and the proposed project would have less-than-significant impacts on scenic vistas, existing views, existing visual character, and neighborhood integrity. However, the Existing Plan alternative would contribute to the overall aesthetic quality of the project area in ways that would be more consistent with the vision for the area that has been set forth to date, in various planning documents. The removal of ordinance sized trees associated with the redevelopment of the project site would substantially damage scenic resources; with mitigation this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

l. Shade/Shadow and Light/Glare. Construction and operation of the Existing Plan alternative would generate fewer impacts on shade and shadow than the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, the individual structures of the Existing Plan alternative would have less than significant shade and shadow impacts, with the possible exception of impacts to Diridon Station. This alternative would not include light and glare associated with the nighttime operation of a stadium that could present a nuisance to surrounding land uses, or interfere with operation of the Lick Observatory, or the safe operation of the San Jose International Airport. It would, however, create light and glare that is typical of recent commercial and residential development in downtown San Jose.

m. Utilities. Construction and operation of the Existing Plan alternative would lead to an increase in demand for utilities. As described for the proposed project, the site is within an area currently urbanized and served by providers of electricity, natural gas, telecommunications and cable. These utility providers monitor the plans and growth patterns in the areas they serve and in doing so maintain adequate infrastructure to serve new development. The Existing Plan alternative would demand

less water and wastewater than the proposed project.³ Consistent with General Plan policies related to water and wastewater, the City would review individual development proposals to ensure that the project could be adequately served by the City's water supply and Water Pollution Control Plant prior to the approval of any specific development plan. Redevelopment of the project site under the Existing Plan alternative would generate waste during demolition, land clearing, and construction and, similar to the proposed project, would require the preparation of a waste management plan to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. This alternative would not relocate the PG&E substation on the project site.

n. Public Services and Facilities. Construction and operation of the Existing Plan alternative would lead an increase in demand for public facilities and services, including police and fire services. While the gradual introduction of a greater number of residents, employees, and built space in the area would require periodic operational and capital improvement choices, such a development pattern would not lead to significant environmental impacts. Unlike the proposed project, the Existing Plan alternative would increase demand for school services; impacts to the provision of school services and facilities would be less than significant. The Existing Plan alternative would require the relocation of the Fire Training Center but would not require the consideration of opportunity site for parks in the project area. Similar to the proposed project, impacts to park and recreation facilities would be less than significant.

o. Energy. Construction and operation of the Existing Plan alternative would lead an increase in demand for energy. However, similar to the proposed project, it is not anticipated that this alternative would substantially increase demand or use energy in a wasteful manner.

C. SUBMERGED STADIUM ALTERNATIVE

1. Description of Submerged Stadium Alternative

The Submerged Stadium alternative would involve the excavation of 75 to 80 percent of the site by 24 to 28 feet to submerge the stadium and achieve a consequent reduction in overall height by the same 24 to 28 feet. The parking garage would also be submerged to a similar level. Pedestrian access to the interior of the stadium facilities would vary from the proposed (at-grade) concept, but this alternative assumes that the remainder of the project's characteristics would not change.

³ Assuming a residential water demand of 0.081 gallons per day (gpd) per square foot, and assuming an average residence size of 1,000 square feet, the residential component of the Existing Plan alternative would demand approximately 21.5 million gallons per year (gpy) (725 residences x 1,000 square feet x 0.081 gallons per square foot per day x 365 days per year = 21,434,625 gpy). Assuming an office water demand of 0.014 gpd/sf; office use would demand approximately 3.6 million gpy. Assuming a retail water demand of 0.073 gpd/sf; retail use would demand approximately 5.3 million gpy. The proposed project is estimated to demand approximately 30.4 million gpy. Wastewater is typically 85 percent of potable water. It is assumed that if water demand is less than that estimated for the proposed baseball stadium, than wastewater is less as well.

With the below grade design, approximately 556,600 additional cubic yards of soil would need to be removed from the project site.

2. Analysis of Submerged Stadium Alternative

a. Land Use. Similar to the proposed project, the Submerged Stadium alternative would not divide an established community and it would not substantially conflict with established or proposed uses surrounding the project site. Under this alternative the stadium and associated structures would continue to exceed the FAA's imaginary surface standards by as much as 100 feet; however, they would not present a hazard to the safe operation to the airport as appropriate. FAA clearance would be obtained prior to project approval. Similar to the proposed project, the implementation of mitigation measures, the hazards that fireworks could present to the safe operation of the San Jose International Airport would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

b. Population, Employment and Housing. The proposed project and the Submerged Stadium alternative would have the same, less-than-significant impacts to population, employment and housing. Each would remove one existing house next to Patty's Inn and approximately 320 jobs from the site. Each would create 1,500 to 1,800 new jobs.

c. Transportation, Circulation and Parking. The Submerged Stadium alternative would have similar traffic impacts to those associated with the proposed project. Each alternative would generate the same number of trips during a stadium event. However, the Submerged Stadium alternative would require the off-haul of approximately 556,600 additional cubic yards of soil. This translates to approximately 37,000 additional truck trips during project construction. If this additional excavation were to require three months to accomplish, the rate of trucks departing from the site would be approximately two per minute over the course of each 12-hour day. The impact of additional truck trips on the roadways would be less than impacts identified for opening day of the proposed project.

d. Air Quality. In terms of pollutant emissions, the Submerged Stadium alternative impacts would be similar to the proposed project. Operational emissions would exceed BAAQMD daily emission thresholds and would be considered significant. The additional excavation required for this alternative would require the use of trucks for hauling excavated material from the site. The use of diesel trucks for this process would increase the amount of toxic air pollutants for project construction over the proposed project. The Submerged Stadium alternative would also be subject to the mitigation measures required by the BAAQMD, which would reduce construction impacts to a less than significant level.

e. Noise. Similar to the proposed project, increased traffic noise on surrounding roadways would be significant and unavoidable. Baseball game events could result in noise impacts on adjacent residential uses; mitigations related to the P.A. system, stadium design and noise attenuation measures for affected property owners would reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Noise impacts from concerts and fireworks displays at the stadium would also be significant and unavoidable. Similar to the proposed project, standard mitigation measures would address noise impacts during construction; however, given the extent and duration of construction activities, this impact is designated significant and unavoidable. Noise impacts during construction would be greater for this alternative due to the increased excavation and off-haul.

f. Biological Resources. The Submerged Stadium alternative would develop the majority of the project site and, similar to the proposed project, would include setbacks from Los Gatos Creek. Impacts to biological resources would be similar under the Submerged Stadium alternative. Up to 45 ordinance-size trees would be removed, and their removal would be mitigated with implementation of a landscape plan which includes replacement of ordinance-size trees at a ratio of 4:1 in the project area. The implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan would reduce potential impacts to water quality in Los Gatos Creek and related habitat to less-than-significant levels. With preconstruction surveys and other mitigation, impacts to nesting hawks and other raptors would be less-than-significant.

g. Geology, Soils and Seismicity. Construction and operation of the Submerged Stadium alternative would have similar or slightly increased impacts on geology, soils and seismicity than the proposed project. Implementation of commonly used mitigation measures including the preparation of a design-level geotechnical investigation, following the recommendations presented in the *Guidelines for Evaluating Seismic Hazards in California*, and following the mitigation measures, design criteria, and specifications set forth in the geotechnical and soils report could reduce geology, soils and seismicity impacts to less-than-significant levels.

h. Hydrology and Water Quality. Construction and operation of the Submerged Stadium alternative would have similar or slightly increased impacts on hydrology and water quality as the proposed project. Implementation of commonly used mitigation measures including a detailed hydraulic analysis that demonstrates that implementation of the proposed drainage plan would be in compliance with City standards as well as the County NPDES permit, compliance with the City's Post Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy, the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and inclusion of Best Management Practices in the project design could reduce hydrology and water quality impacts to less-than-significant levels. The Submerged Stadium alternative would include construction approximately 10 feet below area ground water levels and design and construction of this alternative would require additional engineering systems to pump water as necessary.

i. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Historical and current land uses on the project site have resulted in soil contamination. With mitigation, potential impacts of hazardous materials could be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of the following commonly used mitigation measures prior to demolition could reduce hazards impacts to less-than-significant levels: preparation of Phase I site assessments for the site; preparation of Phase II assessments as recommended; preparation of Human Health Risk assessments as recommended; preparation and implementation of Construction Risk Management Plans; and, if lead-based paint and asbestos are determined to be present, removal in accordance with the appropriate regulations. The Submerged Stadium alternative would require the off-haul of approximately 556,600 additional cubic yards of soil. This additional excavation and off-haul, would require additional soil and groundwater sampling, a Construction Risk Management Plan for a larger area, and the potential for increased disposal and transport of hazardous materials during construction activities.

j. Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Construction of the Submerged Stadium alternative would have similar impacts on Cultural and Paleontological Resources as the proposed project. Ground disturbing activities could impact historic or prehistoric archaeological resources and/or disturb buried human remains. With mitigation, these potential impacts could be reduced to less-than-

significant levels. Redevelopment of the project site would require the demolition of one structure that appears to be a Candidate for City Landmark and appears eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources; demolition of this resource would be significant and unavoidable. The Diridon Train Station, a City Landmark and listed in the National Register, would sustain indirect impacts due to the change in character in the area; this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

k. Visual Resources. Both the Submerged Stadium alternative and the proposed project would have less-than-significant impacts on scenic vistas, existing views, existing visual character, and neighborhood integrity. However, as the Submerged Stadium alternative would be approximately 25 feet lower than the proposed project, its impacts would be slightly less. The removal of ordinance sized trees associated with the redevelopment of the project site would substantially damage scenic resources; with mitigation this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

l. Shade/Shadow and Light/Glare. Construction and operation of the Submerged Stadium alternative would generate slightly reduced shade and shadow impacts than the proposed project. The Submerged Stadium alternative would reduce the shade and shadow cast on the historic San Jose Diridon Station; this impact would remain a significant unavoidable impact. It would include light and glare associated with the nighttime operation of a stadium that could present a nuisance to surrounding land uses, potentially interfere with operation of the Lick Observatory, and/or the safe operation of the San Jose International Airport. Potential impacts to the surrounding neighborhood and Lick Observatory remain significant unavoidable impacts, impacts to the airport could be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

m. Utilities. The construction and operation of the Submerged Stadium alternative would lead to increases in demand for utilities at a level similar of that of the proposed project. Potentially significant utility impacts relate to water pressure, compliance with California Integrated Waste Management Act, and the relocation of the PG&E substation. With mitigation these impacts would all be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

n. Public Services and Facilities. The construction and operation of the Submerged Stadium alternative would lead an increase in demand for public facilities and services, including police and fire services at a level similar to that of the proposed project. Opportunity sites for a future park would need to be explored and the Fire Training Facility would be relocated. Similar to the proposed project, these impacts would be less than significant.

o. Energy. Construction and operation of the Submerged Stadium alternative would lead an increase in demand for energy similar to the proposed project. It is not anticipated that this alternative would substantially increase demand or use energy in a wasteful manner.

D. ALTERNATE LOCATIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

Over the past several years the City of San Jose has considered many locations for a baseball stadium. Some of the locations that have been considered by the City simply do not meet the basic size requirements or other critical project objectives, or which have other fatal flaws. These locations are discussed below.

1. San Jose Water Company, Delmas Avenue and W. Santa Clara Street (8.9 acres)

This site is located on both sides of Delmas Avenue, between Santa Clara and San Fernando Streets, immediately west of State Route 87. It has close proximity to mass transit with a light rail station immediately south of the property. Being located within three blocks of the Caltrain station, it is conveniently located near to existing mass transit and a future BART station. However, the site is only 8.9 acres in size. Because it is bordered by the Los Gatos Creek and the Guadalupe River to the west and east, respectively, and the Vasona light rail line to the south, there is no potential for site expansion to the 14-acre minimum necessary to accommodate the ballpark facilities program. Due to the properties insufficient size, this site would not be a feasible alternative location.

2. Arcadia Property, 2218 Quimby Road (81.77 Acres)

The Arcadia property is an 81-acre site that is located just south of the Eastridge Shopping Mall. The site is bounded by Quimby Road on the north, commercial uses and Capitol Expressway on the east, Meadowfair Park and LeyVa Middle School on the south, and single-family residences on the west. The privately-owned site is currently undeveloped. With the exception of the Eastridge Shopping Center, there is no substantial inventory of publicly accessible parking in the vicinity.

The Arcadia property is located approximately 2,600 feet south of Reid-Hillview Airport. Land use conflicts associated with airports typically center on the issues of noise and safety. The Arcadia property is located outside of the Reid-Hillview noise impact area, as defined by both the existing and future (2007) 60-dB noise contours. A 12-acre portion of the site is located within one of the Airport's designated safety zones. As with the proposed Diridon site, nighttime lighting associated with a ballpark at the Arcadia site would have the potential for such lighting to interfere with aircraft operations because this location is under the final approach flight path for nearby Reid-Hillview Airport. This type of lighting – without proper design - could potentially interfere with pilots' vision during a critical phase of aircraft operations. Additionally, the ALUC height limitation for the Arcadia property at the most restrictive location is approximately 280 feet above mean sea level (msl). Since the elevation of the property is approximately 140 feet msl, total building height could not exceed 140 feet, which would restrict the proposed ballpark height.

The entire 81-acre site is also nesting and foraging habitat for the burrowing owl, a California Species of Concern. Development of the site with a ballpark could result in the abandonment of active burrowing owl nests and/or direct mortality to individual burrowing owls, as well as the loss of important owl habitat. For all of these reasons, this site would not be a feasible alternative location.

3. Old Landfill, north of Story Road, east of 12 Street, south of I-280 (44 acres)

This City-owned site is the former location of a public dump and a brick factory. It contains 44 acres, which is of sufficient size for both a ballpark and parking. Parking could be accommodated in a combination of surface and structured facilities. It is conveniently located immediately south of Interstate 280 (I-280), west of the McLaughlin and east of the 10th and 11th Street exits. The site would lend itself to a high visibility location being directly adjacent to I-280. While the site has nearby bus service, there is no existing or planned expansion of light or heavy rail near the site. Since the site was a former dump site, site preparation, including removal of all existing landfill material would be very costly, complex, and time-consuming. Access through 10th and 11th Streets would route traffic through a residential area containing a combination of single and multiple family housing. Due to the

potentially significant hazardous materials cleanup for a site previously used as a landfill, and its lack of proximity to mass transit, this site would not be a feasible alternative location.

4. County Parking/National Guard, 950 N. San Pedro (29 acres)

This property is under the ownership of the federal government, State of California, and Santa Clara County. The site has good freeway access from Highway 87, I-880 and US 101, and is served by light rail transit and bus lines, but is too far north of Downtown to support Downtown revitalization efforts. Because this site is owned by other governmental entities, it is not considered available to the City of San Jose for development as a ballpark and therefore infeasible.

5. Municipal Stadium, 588 E. Alma Avenue (11.6 acres)/Central Service Yard, 1660 Center Road (22 acres)

This site is the potential combination of two adjacent City-owned properties: the Municipal Stadium and the City Central Service Yard. The Muni Stadium, located on the east side of Senter Road, south of Alma Avenue and near the San Jose State University Spartan Stadium, currently is home to the minor league San Jose Giants baseball team and, at 11.6 acres, is too small for a major league baseball stadium. There may be an opportunity to expand the site by the acquisition of an adjacent to railroad right of way. The site is served by nearby bus routes and, due to the fact that the surrounding neighborhood is primarily light and heavy industrial, this site is not planned for future mass transit. The site could possibly be expanded by incorporating some or all of the City Central Service Yard located immediately south of this site, which is 22 acres in size. However, the City has made substantial investment in developing the Central Service Yard, and is continuing to invest in a new phase of development at the site that will facilitate the planned consolidation of facilities and activities currently located at the City's 6th Street Corporation Yard in Japantown to allow development of that site with a mixed-use project consistent with the Japantown Redevelopment Plan and the Jackson-Taylor Residential Strategy. Due to its lack of proximity to mass transit and the inadequate size of the Municipal Stadium, this site is not considered feasible.

E. ALTERNATE LOCATION – FMC/COLEMAN AVENUE

1. Description of FMC/Coleman Avenue Location Alternative

In order to most clearly distinguish the trade-off in potential impacts—both *beneficial* and *adverse*—several alternate locations for the project have been selected. The **FMC/Coleman Avenue Location** alternative evaluates the same development program as the proposed project, but at another location within the City of San Jose. The FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative is an approximately 92.5-acre site, located at 1125 Coleman Avenue, bounded by Coleman Avenue to the northeast, Newhall Street to the southeast, Southern Pacific Railroad lines to the southwest and the jurisdictional boundary of the City of Santa Clara to the northwest (see Figure VII-1). Surrounding land uses include industrial uses to the southwest and northwest, the San Jose International Airport to the northeast and mixed industrial/residential uses to the southeast. This site was analyzed (for another type of development project) in the EIR prepared for the FMC/Coleman Avenue Planned Development Rezoning (July 2003).⁴

⁴ City of San Jose. 2003. Final Environmental Impact Report for FMC/Coleman Avenue Planned Development Rezoning (PDC98-104). July.

Figure VII-1: Alternate Project Locations

8x11, B/W

This alternate location would not include the relocation of the PG&E Substation.

2. Analysis of FMC/Coleman Avenue Location Alternative

a. Land Use. Development of the baseball stadium and parking structure on the FMC/Coleman Avenue site would change the land use from industrial and manufacturing. Similar to the proposed project, the FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative would not divide an established community and it would not substantially conflict with established or proposed uses surrounding the project site. The location alternative is adjacent to the San Jose International Airport; the baseball stadium would have a maximum height of 165 feet, with scoreboards approximately 200 feet and lights approximately 235 feet above finished grade. Depending on projects siting, elements greater than 160 feet may exceed the aviation easement elevation. Similar to the proposed project location, elements in this area would not present a hazard to the safe operation to the airport appropriate FAA clearance would be obtained prior to project approval. It is assumed no buildings would be proposed for the southeast corner of the site which is located within the ALUC Safety Zone for Airport Runway 11-29. With the implementation of mitigation measures, the hazards that fireworks could present to the safe operation of the San Jose International Airport would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

b. Population, Employment and Housing. The proposed project and the FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative would have the similar, less than significant impacts to population, employment and housing. This site is developed with approximately 1.1 million square feet of manufacturing, office, storage and testing facilities; however, the majority of the buildings are currently vacant or utilized. Under this alternative no residences would be displaced and jobs from the existing businesses on the site would be lost or relocated. Each location for stadium development would create 1,500 to 1,800 new jobs.

c. Transportation, Circulation and Parking. Based on the findings presented in the FMC/ Coleman Avenue Planned Development Rezoning EIR, to reduce impacts of a maximum of 3 million square feet of office/research and development (R&D) space or a baseball stadium, improvements to the City of San Jose intersections of Coleman Avenue and Taylor Street, Coleman Avenue and Hedding Street, and Coleman and Aviation Way would have to be made. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts at these intersections to less-than-significant levels. The proposed project would impact freeway segments in the area and impacts to these segments would be significant and unavoidable.

The FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative is located along several bus lines, but it is not adjacent to light rail transit or Caltrans facilities. On a 92.5-acre site, stadium parking could be accommodated; however the proposed project location could utilize existing parking facilities in the Downtown area for less cost, less construction costs and less land use opportunity costs. Similar to the proposed project, a future BART station is planned in the vicinity of the FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative.

d. Air Quality. Similar to the proposed project, mitigation measures required by the BAAQMD would address air quality impacts during construction. Additional mitigation measures recommended by the BAAQMD for projects that exceed standards established for ozone precursor emissions would address emissions resulting from increased vehicle trip generation.

e. Noise. The FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative is adjacent to the San Jose International Airport. Aircraft noise exposure contours indicate noise levels on the site and surrounding uses to be 60 to 75 dBA CNEL. The Noise Element of the San Jose 2020 General Plan considers arenas for outdoor spectator sports to be compatible with an CNEL of up to 75. Therefore, the noise levels on the project site would be acceptable for the proposed project.

The closest residential structures are located 150 feet from the southern boundary of the project site. Similar to the proposed project, increased traffic noise on surrounding roadways would be significant and unavoidable. Baseball game events could result in noise impacts on nearby residential uses; mitigations related to the P.A. system, stadium design and noise attenuation measures for affected property owners would reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Noise impacts from concerts and fireworks displays at the stadium would also be significant and unavoidable. Similar to the proposed project, standard mitigation measures would address noise impacts during construction; however, given the extent and duration of construction activities, this impact will be designated significant and unavoidable.

f. Biological Resources. Development of the proposed project site would require the removal of 45 ordinance-sized trees and may impact nesting hawks and other raptors on the project site. Development of the entire 92-acre FMC/Coleman Avenue site may require the removal of 147 ordinance sized trees and may impact Burrowing Owls, a California Species of Special Concern. Similar to the proposed location, with mitigation, impacts to biological resources could be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

g. Geology, Soils and Seismicity. Construction and operation of the FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative would have similar impacts on geology, soils and seismicity than the proposed project. Implementation of commonly used mitigation measures including the preparation of a design-level geotechnical investigation, following the recommendations presented in the *Guidelines for Evaluating Seismic Hazards in California*, and following the mitigation measures, design criteria, and specifications set forth in the geotechnical and soils report could reduce geology, soils and seismicity impacts to less-than-significant levels.

h. Hydrology and Water Quality. Construction and operation of the FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative would have similar impacts on hydrology and water quality as the proposed project. Implementation of commonly used mitigation measures including a detailed hydraulic analysis that demonstrates that implementation of the proposed drainage plan would be in compliance with City standards as well as the County NPDES permit, compliance with the City's Post Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy, the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and inclusion of Best Management Practices in the project design could reduce hydrology and water quality impacts to less-than-significant levels.

i. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Similar to the proposed location, historical and current land uses on the FMC/Coleman Avenue location have resulted in soil and groundwater contamination. With mitigation, potential impacts of hazardous materials could be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of the following commonly used mitigation measures prior to demolition could reduce hazards impacts to less-than-significant levels: preparation of Phase I site assessments for the site; preparation of Phase II assessments as recommended; preparation of Human Health Risk assessments as recommended; preparation and implementation of Construction Risk Management

Plans; and, if lead-based paint and asbestos are determined to be present, removal in accordance with the appropriate regulations.

j. Cultural and Paleontological Resources. No prehistoric, historic, or architectural resources have been identified within or immediately adjacent to the FMC/Coleman Avenue site. While no indicators of archaeological resources are present on the site, the general area is considered to be moderately to highly sensitive for buried cultural resources; implementation of an archaeological monitoring program would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Impacts to cultural resources on the FMC/Coleman Avenue site would be less than those on the proposed project site. Redevelopment of the FMC/Coleman Avenue site would not require the demolition of a structure that appears to be a Candidate for City Landmark and appears eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, and would not impact an adjacent historic resource. Impacts to historic cultural resources would be significant and unavoidable under the proposed Diridon project site.

k. Visual Resources. Both the FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative and the proposed project would have less-than-significant impacts on scenic vistas, existing views, existing visual character, and neighborhood integrity. The removal of ordinance sized trees associated with the redevelopment of the project site would substantially damage scenic resources; with mitigation this impact would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

l. Shade/Shadow and Light/Glare. Construction and operation of the FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative would generate slightly fewer shade and shadow impacts than the proposed project. Similar to the proposed location, it is not near any major open space. Unlike the proposed site, this location is not adjacent to a creek corridor or other open space. The FMC/Coleman Avenue Location would not increase the shade and shadow cast on a historic structure, such as the San Jose Diridon Station. Both locations would include light and glare associated with the nighttime operation of a stadium that could present a nuisance to surrounding land uses, potentially interfere with operation of the Lick Observatory, and/or the safe operation of the San Jose International Airport. Potential impacts to the surrounding neighborhood and Lick Observatory remain significant unavoidable impacts, impacts to the airport could be reduced to less than significant levels.

m. Utilities. The construction and operation of the FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative would lead to increases in demand for utilities at a level similar of that of the proposed project. Water pressure is not an issue that has been identified for the FMC/Coleman Avenue site. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to compliance with California Integrated Waste Management Act to less-than-significant levels. This alternative would not relocate the PG&E substation on the proposed Diridon project site.

n. Public Services and Facilities. The construction and operation of the FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative would lead to an increase in demand for public facilities and services, including police and fire services at a level similar to that of the proposed project. Opportunity sites for a future park would not need to be explored and the Fire Training Facility would not be relocated as part of the proposed project.

o. Energy. Construction and operation of the FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative would lead an increase in demand for energy similar to the proposed project. It is not anticipated that this alternative would substantially increase demand or use energy in a wasteful manner.

F. ALTERNATE LOCATION – DEL MONTE

1. Description of Del Monte Location Alternative

The **Del Monte Location** alternative evaluates the same development program as the proposed project, but at another location within the City of San Jose. The Del Monte Location alternative is an approximately 17.5-acre site at 801 Auzerais Street, generally south of W. San Carlos Street, west of Los Gatos Creek, north of W. Home Street and east of Sunol Street and the Vasona LRT line (see Figure VII-1). Surrounding land uses include industrial uses to the north, south and east, and commercial, industrial and residential uses to the west, across Los Gatos Creek. This site was analyzed (for another type of development project) in the EIR prepared for the KB Home Monte Vista Residential Planned Development Zoning Project (March 2005).⁵

This alternate location would not include the relocation of the PG&E Substation.

2. Analysis of Alternate Location Alternative

a. Land Use. Development of the baseball stadium and parking structure on the Del Monte site would change the land use from industrial and manufacturing. Similar to the proposed project, the Del Monte Location alternative would not divide an established community and it would not substantially conflict with established or proposed uses surrounding the project site. The location alternative is adjacent to industrial and commercial uses to the north, south and west. Los Gatos Creek forms the site boundary to the east. This location is approximately two miles south of the San Jose International Airport; the heights of proposed baseball stadium and associated structures may be subject to FAA limitations. Similar to the proposed project location, elements in this area would not present a hazard to the safe operation to the airport appropriate FAA clearance would be obtained prior to project approval. With the implementation of mitigation measures, the hazards that fireworks could present to the safe operation of the San Jose International Airport would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

b. Population, Employment and Housing. The proposed project and the Del Monte Location alternative would have the similar, less than significant impacts to population, employment and housing. Under this alternative no residences would be displaced and jobs from the existing businesses on the site would be lost or relocated. Each location for stadium development would create 1,500 to 1,800 new jobs.

c. Transportation, Circulation and Parking. Based on the findings presented in the KB Home Monte Vista Residential Planned Development Zoning Project EIR, development of residential land use or a baseball stadium would result in additional transportation impacts. Current level of service operations is acceptable. The addition of vehicle trips associated with the proposed baseball stadium would likely require similar roadway improvements to those identified for the proposed Diridon pro-

⁵ City of San Jose. 2005. Final Environmental Impact Report, KB Home Monte Vista Residential Planned Development Zoning Project (Del Monte Plant #3 Site). PDC 03-071. March.

ject site. Similar to the proposed project site, the Del Monte site is located near a future station of the Vasona LRT line, which would reduce number of total vehicle trips from the proposed project. The site is also accessible to pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Therefore, transportation impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project.

d. Air Quality. Similar to the proposed project, mitigation measures required by the BAAQMD would address air quality impacts during construction. Additional mitigation measures recommended by the BAAQMD for projects that exceed standards established for ozone precursor emissions would address emissions resulting from increased vehicle trip generation.

e. Noise. The Del Monte location is a site that currently has noise levels ranging from 64 dBA to 74 dBA L_{dn} . The Noise Element of the San Jose 2020 General Plan considers arenas for outdoor spectator sports to be compatible with a CNEL or L_{dn} of up to 75. Therefore, the noise levels on the project site would be acceptable for the proposed project.

Similar to the proposed project, increased traffic noise on surrounding roadways would be significant and unavoidable. Baseball game events could result in noise impacts on nearby residential uses; mitigations related to the P.A. system, stadium design and noise attenuation measures for affected property owners would reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Noise impacts from concerts and fireworks displays at the stadium would also be significant and unavoidable. Similar to the proposed project, standard mitigation measures would address noise impacts during construction; however, given the extent and duration of construction activities, this impact will be designated significant and unavoidable.

Noise impacts associated with locating a stadium adjacent to heavily used railroad tracks would be less significant due to existing noise environment. The net noise impacts associated with this alternative would be less than the proposed site due to the existing noise environment.

f. Biological Resources. The Del Monte site is an industrial site adjacent to the Los Gatos Creek. Development of this alternate location site would require the removal of several ordinance-sized trees and may impact nesting hawks and other raptors on the project site. Similar to the proposed location, with mitigation, impacts to biological resources could be reduced to less-than-significant levels. The demolition of the cannery building on the Del Monte site could impact roosting special-species bats during construction if they were to move on site; this impact could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels.

g. Geology, Soils and Seismicity. Construction and operation of the Del Monte Location alternative would have similar impacts on geology, soils and seismicity than the proposed project site. Implementation of commonly used mitigation measures including the preparation of a design-level geotechnical investigation, following the recommendations presented in the *Guidelines for Evaluating Seismic Hazards in California*, and following the mitigation measures, design criteria, and specifications set forth in the geotechnical and soils report could reduce geology, soils and seismicity impacts to less-than-significant levels.

h. Hydrology and Water Quality. Construction and operation of the Del Monte Location alternative would have similar impacts on hydrology and water quality as the proposed project site. Implementation of commonly used mitigation measures including a detailed hydraulic analysis that

demonstrates that implementation of the proposed drainage plan would be in compliance with City standards as well as the County NPDES permit, compliance with the City's Post Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy, the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and inclusion of Best Management Practices in the project design could reduce hydrology and water quality impacts to less-than-significant levels.

i. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Similar to the proposed location, historical and current land uses on the Del Monte location have resulted in soil and groundwater contamination. With mitigation, potential impacts of hazardous materials could be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of the following commonly used mitigation measures prior to demolition could reduce hazards impacts to less-than-significant levels: preparation of Phase I site assessments for the site; preparation of Phase II assessments as recommended; preparation of Human Health Risk assessments as recommended; preparation and implementation of Construction Risk Management Plans; and, if lead-based paint and asbestos are determined to be present, removal in accordance with the appropriate regulations.

j. Cultural and Paleontological Resources. Buildings on the Del Monte site were constructed over a period of 100 years; demolition of the historic cannery buildings would result in a significant unavoidable impact. Similar to the proposed Diridon project site, development of the Del Monte site may disturb prehistoric or historic archaeological resources, or paleontological resources. Implementation of a monitoring program would reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

k. Visual Resources. Both the Del Monte Location alternative and the proposed Diridon project site would have less-than-significant impacts on scenic vistas, existing views, existing visual character, and neighborhood integrity. The removal of ordinance sized trees associated with the redevelopment of the Del Monte site or the proposed project site would substantially damage scenic resources; with mitigation this impact would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. The removal of historic structures on the Del Monte site would substantially damage scenic resources; this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

l. Shade/Shadow and Light/Glare. Similar to the proposed project location, the Del Monte site is not near any major open space but is adjacent to the Los Gatos Creek corridor. The creek corridor in this area, similar to the proposed project location appear to be heavily vegetated and impacts from increased shade and shadow would be less than significant. The Del Monte Location alternative would not increase the shade and shadow cast on a historic structure, such as the San Jose Diridon Station. Both locations would include light and glare associated with the nighttime operation of a stadium that could present a nuisance to surrounding land uses, potentially interfere with operation of the Lick Observatory, and/or the safe operation of the San Jose International Airport. Potential impacts to the surrounding neighborhood and Lick Observatory remain significant unavoidable impacts, impacts to the airport could be reduced to less than significant levels.

m. Utilities. The construction and operation of the Del Monte Location alternative would lead to increases in demand for utilities at a level similar of that of the proposed project. Water pressures is not an issue that has been identified for the Del Monte site. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to compliance with California Integrated Waste Management Act to less-than-significant levels. This alternative would not include the relocation of a PG&E substation.

- n. Public Services and Facilities.** The construction and operation of the Del Monte Location alternative would lead an increase in demand for public facilities and services, including police and fire services at a level similar to that of the proposed project. Opportunity sites for a future park planned at the Fire Training Facility would not need to be explored and the Fire Training Facility would not be relocated as part of the proposed project. However, the park planned on the south side of Auzerais Avenue west of Los Gatos Creek as part of the KB Homes Del Monte residential development would not occur.
- o. Energy.** Construction and operation of the Del Monte Location alternative would lead an increase in demand for energy similar to the proposed project. It is not anticipated that this alternative would substantially increase demand or use energy in a wasteful manner.

G. ALTERNATE LOCATION – BERRYESSA FLEA MARKET

1. Description of Berryessa Flea Market Location Alternative

The **Berryessa Flea Market Location** alternative evaluates the same development program as the proposed project, but at another location within the City of San Jose. The Berryessa Flea Market Location alternative is an approximately 120-acre site at 1590 Berryessa Road, generally south of Chessington Drive and Bellemade Street, north of Mabury Street, west of the Caltrain tracks and east of Coyote Creek (see Figure VII-1). Surrounding land uses include industrial uses to the east, west and south, and residential uses to the north. This site was analyzed (for another type of development project) in the EIR prepared for the San Jose Flea Market General Plan Amendment (November 2002).⁶

2. Analysis of Berryessa Flea Market Location Alternative

- a. Land Use.** Development of the baseball stadium and parking structure on the Berryessa Flea Market Location site would change the land use from retail (flea market). Similar to the proposed project, the Berryessa Flea Market Location alternative would not divide an established community and it would not substantially conflict with established or proposed uses surrounding the project site. The location alternative is adjacent to industrial uses to the south, east and west. There are residential uses to the north. This location is approximately two miles east of the San Jose International Airport; the heights of proposed baseball stadium and associated structures may be subject to FAA limitations. Similar to the proposed project location, elements in this area would not present a hazard to the safe operation to the airport. Appropriate FAA clearance would be obtained prior to project approval. With the implementation of mitigation measures, the hazards that fireworks could present to the safe operation of the San Jose International Airport would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.
- b. Population, Employment and Housing.** The proposed project and the Berryessa Flea Market Location alternative would have similar, less than significant impacts to population, employment and housing. Under this alternative no residences would be displaced, although future high density housing planned near a future BART station would not occur. Jobs from the existing flea market on the site would be lost or relocated. Each location for stadium development would create 1,500 to 1,800 new jobs.

⁶ City of San Jose. 2002. Final Environmental Impact Report for San Jose Flea Market General Plan Amendment (GP02-04-02). November.

c. Transportation, Circulation and Parking. Based on the findings presented in the San Jose Flea Market General Plan Amendment EIR, a maximum of 10,000 square feet of retail, 925,250 square feet of office/industrial, and 3,904 housing on the project site or a baseball stadium, would increase the City of San Jose segments of northbound Charcot, Brokaw, and US 101, east of North 10th Street would operate at deficient levels of service as well as the segments east of North 10th Street: westbound US 101, westbound Hedding, and westbound Taylor Street. Mitigation measures consisting of a BART extension and implementation of City of San Jose General Plan Policies would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. Should the project site be built prior to completion of BART, it would result in significant unavoidable traffic impacts.

The Berryessa Flea Market Location alternative is located near several bus lines, but it is not adjacent to light rail transit or Caltrans facilities. On a 120-acre site, stadium parking could be accommodated – approximately 8,000 parking spaces currently exist on surface lots associated with the Flea Market; however the proposed Diridon project location could utilize existing parking facilities in the Downtown area for less cost, less construction costs and less land use opportunity costs.

d. Air Quality. Similar to the proposed project, mitigation measures required by the BAAQMD would address air quality impacts during construction. Additional mitigation measures recommended by the BAAQMD for projects that exceed standards established for ozone precursor emissions would address emissions resulting from increased vehicle trip generation.

e. Noise. Similar to the proposed project, the Berryessa Flea Market Location alternative would increase traffic noise on surrounding roadways would be significant and unavoidable. Baseball game events could result in noise impacts on adjacent residential uses; mitigations related to the P.A. system, stadium design and noise attenuation measures for affected property owners would reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Noise impacts from concerts and fireworks displays at the stadium would also be significant and unavoidable. Similar to the proposed project, standard mitigation measures would address noise impacts during construction; however, given the extent and duration of construction activities, this impact will be designated significant and unavoidable.

f. Biological Resources. With the exception of the Penitencia Creek corridor south of Berryessa Road, the entire 120-acre site is paved for use as the flea market. The Coyote Creek corridor is adjacent to the project site on the west. It is assumed for this alternative, the proposed development would be set back 100 feet from the top of bank given the site's size, shape and location. The Berryessa Flea Market Location alternative would require the removal of a few ordinance-sized trees may impact nesting hawks and other raptors on the project site. Similar to the proposed location, with mitigation, impacts to biological resources could be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

g. Geology, Soils and Seismicity. Construction and operation of the Berryessa Flea Market Location alternative would have similar impacts on geology, soils and seismicity than the proposed project. Implementation of commonly used mitigation measures including the preparation of a design-level geotechnical investigation, following the recommendations presented in the *Guidelines for Evaluating Seismic Hazards in California*, and following the mitigation measures, design criteria, and specifications set forth in the geotechnical and soils report could reduce geology, soils and seismicity impacts to less-than-significant levels.

- h. Hydrology and Water Quality.** Construction and operation of the Berryessa Flea Market Location alternative would have similar impacts on hydrology and water quality as the proposed project. Implementation of commonly used mitigation measures including a detailed hydraulic analysis that demonstrates that implementation of the proposed drainage plan would be in compliance with City standards as well as the County NPDES permit, compliance with the City's Post Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy, the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and inclusion of Best Management Practices in the project design could reduce hydrology and water quality impacts to less-than-significant levels.
- i. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** The Berryessa Flea Market site was used for various agricultural and business purposes until the 1960's when the San Jose Flea Market was founded. The Flea Market itself is classified as a large quantity generator of hazardous waste. Although no leaks or accidental releases are known to have occurred, the possibility of on-site contamination from this or a previous use cannot be precluded. Similar to the proposed location, with mitigation, potential impacts of hazardous materials could be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of the following commonly used mitigation measures prior to demolition could reduce hazards impacts to less-than-significant levels: preparation of Phase I site assessments for the site; preparation of Phase II assessments as recommended; preparation of Human Health Risk assessments as recommended; preparation and implementation of Construction Risk Management Plans; and, if lead-based paint and asbestos are determined to be present, removal in accordance with the appropriate regulations.
- j. Cultural and Paleontological Resources.** While there are no known prehistoric or historic archaeological resources on the Berryessa Flea Market site, the project is situated in an area of high archaeological sensitivity; implementation of an archaeological monitoring program would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. The site is the location of the San Jose Flea Market, a major cultural and economic site within the region, which was established in 1960. While only 46 years old, this facility may be eligible for the California Register. Without additional research the removal of this potential resource is considered significant unavoidable. Redevelopment of the proposed Diridon project site would require the demolition of one structure that appears to be a Candidate for City Landmark and appears eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, and would impact the Diridon Train Station. Impacts to historic cultural resources would be significant and unavoidable under the proposed Diridon project site.
- k. Visual Resources.** Both the Berryessa Flea Market Location alternative and the proposed project would have less-than-significant impacts on scenic vistas, existing views, existing visual character, and neighborhood integrity. The removal of ordinance sized trees associated with the redevelopment of the Berryessa Flea Market site or the proposed project site would substantially damage scenic resources; with mitigation this impact would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. The removal of the potential historic Flea Market on this site could substantially damage scenic resources; this impact would be significant and unavoidable.
- l. Shade/Shadow and Light/Glare.** Similar to the proposed project location, the Berryessa Flea Market site it is not near any major open space. While the Berryessa Flea Market site is near not one but two creek corridors, they both appear to be heavily vegetated and impacts from increased shade and shadow would be less than significant. The Berryessa Flea Market Location alternative would not increase the shade and shadow cast on a historic structure, such as the San Jose Diridon Station. Both locations would include light and glare associated with the nighttime operation of a stadium that

could present a nuisance to surrounding land uses, potentially interfere with operation of the Lick Observatory, and/or the safe operation of the San Jose International Airport. Potential impacts to the surrounding neighborhood and Lick Observatory remain significant unavoidable impacts. Impacts to the airport could be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

m. Utilities. The construction and operation of the Berryessa Flea Market Location alternative would lead to increases in demand for utilities at a level similar of that of the proposed project. Water pressure is not an issue that has been identified for the Berryessa Flea Market site. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to compliance with California Integrated Waste Management Act to less-than-significant levels. This alternative location would not relocate the PG&E substation on the project site.

n. Public Services and Facilities. The construction and operation of the Berryessa Flea Market Location alternative would lead to an increase in demand for public facilities and services, including police and fire services at a level similar to that of the proposed project. Opportunity sites for a future park would not need to be explored and the Fire Training Facility would not be relocated as part of the proposed project.

o. Energy. Construction and operation of the Berryessa Flea Market Location alternative would lead an increase in demand for energy similar to the proposed project. It is not anticipated that this alternative would substantially increase demand or use energy in a wasteful manner.

H. ALTERNATE LOCATION – REED AND GRAHAM

1. Description of Reed and Graham Location Alternative

The **Reed and Graham Location** alternative evaluates the same development program as the proposed project, but at another location within the City of San Jose. The Reed and Graham Location alternative is an approximately 16-acre site at 854 Savaker Avenue, generally bound by Los Gatos Creek to the west, I-280 to the south, railroad lines to the west and Savaker Avenue to the north (see Figure VII-1). Surrounding land uses include industrial uses to the north, south and east, and residential uses to the west, across Los Gatos Creek. This site was analyzed as an alternative in the EIR prepared for the KB Home Monte Vista Residential Planned Development Zoning Project (March 2005).⁷

The alternate location would not include the relocation of the PG&E Substation.

2. Analysis of Reed and Graham Location Alternative

a. Land Use. Development of the baseball stadium and parking structure on the Reed and Graham site would change the land use from industrial and manufacturing. Similar to the proposed project, the Reed and Graham Location alternative would not divide an established community and it would not substantially conflict with established or proposed uses surrounding the project site. The location alternative is adjacent to industrial uses to the north and west. Los Gatos Creek forms the site boundary to the east and I-280 forms the boundary to the south. This location is approximately 2.25 miles

⁷ City of San Jose. 2005. Final Environmental Impact Report, KB Home Monte Vista Residential Planned Development Zoning Project (Del Monte Plant #3 Site). PDC 03-071. March.

south of the San Jose International Airport; the heights of proposed baseball stadium and associated structures may be subject to FAA limitations. Similar to the proposed project location, elements in this area would not present a hazard to the safe operation to the airport. Appropriate FAA clearance would be obtained prior to project approval. With the implementation of mitigation measures, the hazards that fireworks could present to the safe operation of the San Jose International Airport would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

b. Population, Employment and Housing. The proposed project and the Reed and Graham Location alternative would have the similar, less-than-significant impacts to population, employment and housing. Under this alternative no residences would be displaced and jobs from the existing businesses on the site would be lost or relocated. Each location for stadium development would create 1,500 to 1,800 new jobs.

c. Transportation, Circulation and Parking. Based on the findings presented in the KB Home Monte Vista Residential Planned Development Zoning Project EIR, development residential land use or a baseball stadium would result in additional transportation impacts. The site is located near existing or future transit stations, although a further distance than the proposed Diridon project site. In addition, the Reed and Graham site is further from existing and planned parking facilities that would serve the stadium.

d. Air Quality. Similar to the proposed project, mitigation measures required by the BAAQMD would address air quality impacts during construction. Additional mitigation measures recommended by the BAAQMD for projects that exceed standards established for ozone precursor emissions would address emissions resulting from increased vehicle trip generation.

e. Noise. The Reed and Graham location is a site that currently is within the 65 dB CNEL noise contour. The Noise Element of the San Jose 2020 General Plan considers arenas for outdoor spectator sports to be compatible with a CNEL of up to 75. Therefore, the noise levels on the project site would be acceptable for the proposed project.

Similar to the proposed project, increased traffic noise on surrounding roadways would be significant and unavoidable. Baseball game events could result in noise impacts on nearby residential uses; mitigations related to the P.A. system, stadium design and noise attenuation measures for affected property owners would reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Noise impacts from concerts and fireworks displays at the stadium would also be significant and unavoidable. Similar to the proposed project, standard mitigation measures would address noise impacts during construction; however, given the extent and duration of construction activities, this impact will be designated significant and unavoidable.

Noise impacts associated with locating a stadium adjacent to a freeway are often less significant due to existing traffic noise. The net noise impacts of the project on its surroundings with this alternative would be less than the proposed site due to the existing noise environment.

f. Biological Resources. The Reed and Graham site is an industrial site adjacent to the Los Gatos Creek. Development of this alternate location site would require the removal of several ordinance-sized trees and may impact nesting hawks and other raptors on the project site. Similar to the pro-

posed location, with mitigation, impacts to biological resources could be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

g. Geology, Soils and Seismicity. Construction and operation of the Reed and Graham Location alternative would have similar impacts on geology, soils and seismicity than the proposed project site. Implementation of commonly used mitigation measures including the preparation of a design-level geotechnical investigation, following the recommendations presented in the *Guidelines for Evaluating Seismic Hazards in California*, and following the mitigation measures, design criteria, and specifications set forth in the geotechnical and soils report could reduce geology, soils and seismicity impacts to less-than-significant levels.

h. Hydrology and Water Quality. Construction and operation of the Reed and Graham Location alternative would have similar impacts on hydrology and water quality as the proposed project site. Implementation of commonly used mitigation measures including a detailed hydraulic analysis that demonstrates that implementation of the proposed drainage plan would be in compliance with City standards as well as the County NPDES permit, compliance with the City's Post Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy, the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and inclusion of Best Management Practices in the project design could reduce hydrology and water quality impacts to less-than-significant levels.

i. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Similar to the proposed location, historical and current land uses on the Reed and Graham location have resulted in soil and groundwater contamination. With mitigation, potential impacts of hazardous materials could be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of the following commonly used mitigation measures prior to demolition could reduce hazards impacts to less-than-significant levels: preparation of Phase I site assessments for the site; preparation of Phase II assessments as recommended; preparation of Human Health Risk assessments as recommended; preparation and implementation of Construction Risk Management Plans; and, if lead-based paint and asbestos are determined to be present, removal in accordance with the appropriate regulations.

j. Cultural and Paleontological Resources. There are no known prehistoric or historic archaeological resources, or paleontological resources have been identified within or immediately adjacent to the Reed and Graham site. Implementation of a monitoring program would reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. There are no known historic structures on or adjacent to the Reed and Graham site. Redevelopment of the Reed and Graham site would not require the demolition of a structure that appears to be a Candidate for City Landmark and appears eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, and would not impact an adjacent historic resource. Impacts to historic cultural resources are significant and unavoidable under the proposed Diridon project site.

k. Visual Resources. Both the Reed and Graham Location alternative and the proposed project site would have less-than-significant impacts on scenic vistas, existing views, existing visual character, and neighborhood integrity. The removal of ordinance sized trees associated with the redevelopment of the Reed and Graham site or the proposed project site would substantially damage scenic resources; with mitigation this impact would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

l. Shade/Shadow and Light/Glare. Similar to the proposed project location, the Reed and Graham site it is not near any major open space but is adjacent to the Los Gatos Creek corridor. The

creek corridor in this area, similar to the proposed project location, appears to be heavily vegetated and impacts from increased shade and shadow would be less than significant. The Reed and Graham Location alternative would not increase the shade and shadow cast on a historic structure, such as the San Jose Diridon Station. Both locations would include light and glare associated with the nighttime operation of a stadium that could present a nuisance to surrounding land uses, potentially interfere with operation of the Lick Observatory, and/or the safe operation of the San Jose International Airport. Potential impacts to the surrounding neighborhood and Lick Observatory remain significant unavoidable impacts, impacts to the airport could be reduced to less than significant levels.

m. Utilities. The construction and operation of the Reed and Graham Location alternative would lead to increases in demand for utilities at a level similar of that of the proposed project. Water pressure is not an issue that has been identified for the Reed and Graham site. Mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to compliance with California Integrated Waste Management Act to less-than-significant levels. This alternative would not include the relocation of a PG&E substation.

n. Public Services and Facilities. The construction and operation of the Reed and Graham Location alternative would lead to an increase in demand for public facilities and services, including police and fire services at a level similar to that of the proposed project. Opportunity sites for a future park would not need to be explored and the Fire Training Facility would not be relocated as part of the proposed project.

o. Energy. Construction and operation of the Reed and Graham Location alternative would lead an increase in demand for energy similar to the proposed project. It is not anticipated that this alternative would substantially increase demand or use energy in a wasteful manner.

I. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Designation of the environmentally superior alternative can be a complicated task for an in-fill project, proposed for development on a historically urbanized site. The complications revolve around the very definitions of “impacts” as well as the likelihood that some impacts would occur, or continue to occur, if they are already present in the existing condition. Some impacts are forecast to occur under baseline future conditions, with or without the proposed project. Such is the case with the stadium project.

The No Development alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative in the strict sense that its implementation would result in the smallest number of and least noticeable environmental impacts of all the scenarios examined (including the proposed project). To maintain the project site as it is today would avoid each of the significant and unavoidable impacts that would result from the proposed project.

In cases like this where the No Development alternative is technically the environmentally superior alternative, CEQA requires that the second most environmentally superior alternative be identified. Comparison of the environmental impacts associated with each alternative as described above, indicates that each of the other “build” alternatives (i.e., Existing Plan, Alternate Location) would lead to a complex mix of impacts that would be greater and/or lesser than the proposed project, depending on the topic.

The Submerged Stadium alternative would generally represent the next-best alternative in terms of the fewest impacts. The Submerged Stadium alternative would have greater short-term impacts than the proposed project related to: construction traffic, noise and air quality; hydrology and water quality; hazards and hazardous materials; and cultural resources. The Submerged Stadium alternative would have reduced long-term impacts related to: land use; operational noise; visual resources; shade/shadow and light/glare. It would meet the City's objectives to the same extent as the proposed project (as expressed in bulleted form at the beginning of this chapter).

The Existing Plan alternative would come close to the Submerged Stadium alternative in terms of the fewer impacts. The Existing Plan alternative would have greater impacts than the proposed project related to traffic and air quality, but it would have fewer impacts related to: land use; population, employment and housing; noise; visual resources; shade/shadow and light/glare. However, it would not meet the City's objectives for the proposed project, which is to develop an open-air stadium of 45,000 seats and associated facilities (as expressed in bulleted form at the beginning of this chapter).

Among the alternative locations, the FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative would generally lead to the fewest impacts. The FMC/Coleman Avenue Location alternative would not have any greater impacts than the proposed project, and it would have fewer impacts related to: land use; noise; biological resources; cultural resources; visual resources; shade/shadow and light/glare. However, the FMC/Coleman Avenue Location adjacent to the International Airport would subject stadium attendees to an unpleasant level and frequency of noise, possibly falling short of the public's expectations for such a facility and in that way, ultimately failing to achieve other basic objectives for the project.