

6 ALTERNATIVES

6.1 INTRODUCTION TO ALTERNATIVES

Section 15126.6(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to describe “...a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives that are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.” This section of CEQA also provides guidance regarding what the alternatives analysis should consider. Subsection (b) further states the purpose of the alternatives analysis, as follows:

Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21002.1), the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.

The State CEQA Guidelines further require that the alternatives be compared to the project’s environmental impacts and that the “no project” alternative be considered (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[d] [e]).

In defining “feasibility” (e.g., “... feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project...”), State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f) (1) states, in part:

Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent). No one of these factors establishes a fixed limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives.

In determining what alternatives should be considered in the EIR, it is important to acknowledge the objectives of the project, the project’s significant effects, and unique project considerations. These factors are crucial to the development of alternatives that meet the criteria specified in Section 15126.6(a). Although, as noted above, EIRs must contain a discussion of “potentially feasible” alternatives, the ultimate determination as to whether an alternative is feasible or infeasible is made by the lead agency’s decision-making body, here the Napa County Board of Supervisors. (See PRC Section 21081[a] [3].)

6.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

In identifying potentially feasible alternatives to the project, the ability of alternatives to meet most of the project's objectives were considered. The County has developed the following objectives for the project:

- ▲ develop a cost-effective and state of the art jail facility that provides adequate and efficient inmate housing, programming, medical, and mental health space in compliance with relevant requirements;
- ▲ provide for the efficient and timely transportation of inmates to and from court appearances;
- ▲ address the goals of the *Napa County Adult Correctional System Master Plan*;
- ▲ accommodate 366 beds in the near term, with possible expansion to 526 beds in the future;
- ▲ assist in meeting the goals outlined in the County's approved community correction partnership plan; and
- ▲ ensure the jail is compatible with its neighborhood context and incorporates sustainable design features to the maximum extent feasible.

6.3 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THIS EIR

6.3.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

The following alternatives are under consideration for this project:

- ▲ No Project (No Development) Alternative - Under this alternative, the existing jail in downtown Napa would continue to be used without expansion of capacity.
- ▲ Mitigated Design Alternative - Alter building design and area of disturbance on the project site to reduce the significant impacts of the project.
- ▲ Downtown Site Alternative - Expand the existing jail to accommodate a single 398-bed jail on the existing site in downtown Napa.

Alternatives considered and removed from further consideration are summarized in Section 6.4, including locating a new jail near the airport, splitting jail operations between two sites, and avoiding the construction of a new jail by using alternatives to incarceration.

6.3.2 SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS

Impacts associated with implementation of the County Jail Project are evaluated in Chapters 3, "Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures," and 4, "Cumulative Impacts," of this DEIR. As identified in Table ES-1, "Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures," construction and/or operation of the County Jail Project would have the potential to cause the following significant but mitigable environmental impacts:

- ▲ Impact 3.3-1, Short-term Construction-Generated Emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}
- ▲ Impact 3.5-1, Exposure of Construction Workers and the Environment to Hazardous Materials
- ▲ Impact 3.5-2, Impacts From Implementation Of Or Physical Interference With An Adopted Emergency Response Plan Or Emergency Evacuation Plan
- ▲ Impact 3.6-2, Increase in Surface Runoff Potentially Exceeding the Capacity of Existing or Planned Stormwater Drainage Systems
- ▲ Impact 3.9-1, Existing Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Impacts (SR 221/Main Access)
- ▲ Impact 3.9-2, Future Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Impacts (SR 221/Main Access, SR 221/Magnolia Drive-College Way, and SR 221/Kaiser Road)

- ▲ Impact 3.9-3, Construction-Related Traffic Impacts
- ▲ Impact 3.9-4, Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Facilities Impacts
- ▲ Impact 3.9-5, Access and Circulation Impacts
- ▲ Impact 3.9-7, Safety Impacts
- ▲ Impact 3.10-2, Wastewater Collection, Conveyance, and Treatment Infrastructure

In addition, the following impacts associated with the proposed project would remain significant and unavoidable, or potentially unavoidable, following implementation of available mitigation measures:

- ▲ Impact 3.4-1, Generation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- ▲ Impact 3.9-1, Existing Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Impacts (Soscol Avenue-SR 221/SR 121-Imola Avenue, and SR 221-Soscol Ferry Road/SR 29)
- ▲ Impact 3.9-3, Future Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Impacts (Soscol Avenue-SR 221/SR 121-Imola Avenue, SR 221-Soscol Ferry Road/SR 29, and Soscol Avenue/Silverado Trail)

6.3.3 NO PROJECT (NO DEVELOPMENT) ALTERNATIVE

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) (1) requires that the no project alternative be described and analyzed “to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts of not approving the project.” The no project analysis is required to discuss “the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published...as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services” (Section 15126.6[e][2]).

Under this alternative, Napa County would continue to use the existing jail in downtown Napa without any major upgrades or changes to capacity. Industrial use of the project site (the Pacific Coast and Boca parcels) would continue similar to existing conditions. Any future use of the project site under this alternative would be too speculative, and, thus, is not described here. This alternative would not meet the objectives identified in Section 6.2, “Project Objectives.”

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

AESTHETICS

No change in existing visual conditions would occur on the project site because existing dilapidated buildings would remain on-site. The existing jail would also remain unchanged in visual appearance. Therefore, no significant aesthetic impacts would occur under this alternative. By comparison, the project under either design option or site location would remove existing dilapidated buildings from the site and would organize views of the site from off-site areas. Further, proposed lighting would be minimal and would not result in significant light or glare impacts. Nonetheless, the No Project Alternative would not result in lighting changes at the site and overall aesthetic impacts would be less. (*Less, but no significant reduction*)

AIR QUALITY

This alternative would not include any new development, and thus would not generate new construction or operations-related air emissions. Development of the project could generate construction-related and operational emissions that would exceed applicable thresholds. However, implementation of mitigation would reduce potential impacts associated with development of the project to less-than-significant levels. Nonetheless, because this alternative would avoid all air quality impacts, this alternative would result in less impact. (*Less*)

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

This alternative would not include any new development, and thus would not generate any GHG emissions. By comparison, the project would result in new development and associated construction and operational emissions of GHGs would exceed applicable threshold, which would be a significant impact. While mitigation was recommended that would implement GHG-reduction measures, these measures would not reduce the project's contribution to a less-than-significant level. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, implementation of the No Project Alternative would eliminate a significant and unavoidable impact of the project and the impact would be less. (*Less; would avoid significant unavoidable impacts*)

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This alternative would not include any new development, and thus would not generate new construction that could expose construction workers and the environment to hazardous chemicals or materials at the project site. Further, there would be no change in the potential for traffic or circulation patterns to interfere with adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. By comparison, the proposed project would result in the demolition of on-site structures and past activities at the project site could have resulted in contamination of site soils and/or groundwater that could expose construction workers to hazardous chemicals. Mitigation Measure 3.5-1 was recommended to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level through the preparation and implementation of a health and safety plan, which will outline measures such as proper handling of hazardous materials and procedures to follow in the event that contaminated soil and/or groundwater or other hazardous materials are generated or encountered during construction. The project's site-specific emergency response plan has not been prepared; therefore, the project's compatibility with implementation of or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan is currently unknown. Mitigation Measure 3.5-2 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level through preparation of an emergency response plan for the project. Overall, the No Project Alternative would result in less hazard and hazardous material impacts compared to the project. (*Less*)

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Under the No Project Alternative, no construction or soil disturbance would occur and, therefore, there would be no change in runoff conditions and soil erosion from site and, thus, no impacts on storm drainage systems. By comparison, development of the project would add new development at the project site, which could potentially increase surface runoff, potentially resulting in exceeding the capacity of on-site stormwater systems and increasing the potential for on- and off-site flooding. Therefore, this impact would be potentially significant. However, recommended mitigation would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Although project construction would result in new impervious surfaces, the total area of impervious surface will decrease with project implementation compared to current conditions (i.e., the No Project Alternative) because of the already developed nature of the site. The proposed project would provide adequate on-site storm drainage facilities to ensure that all runoff from the project site will not exceed pre-project flow rates, and incorporate appropriate BMPs into project design to prevent long-term water quality degradation. This would serve to improve existing conditions. Therefore, even though the No Project Alternative would not result in any changes to discharges from the project site, it would not offer the improvement that the proposed project would; therefore, overall impacts would be greater. (*Greater*)

LAND USE

This alternative would not alter land uses on the project site. There would be no change in land use or potential for land use conflicts to occur. The No Project Alternative would not conflict with plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating a significant effect. This alternative would not conflict with existing industrial zoning on

the site. By comparison, the project would not result in any significant land use impacts as the project would not divide an establish community and would be consistent with relevant County plans and policies. Overall, impacts under this alternative would be similar. *(Similar)*

NOISE

This alternative would not involve the construction of new or modified facilities. This alternative would not result in any construction-related impacts (although impacts with the project would be less than significant). Further, this alternative would not increase traffic on local roadways. While the project would contribute trips to the local roadways, these trips would not substantially affect noise levels in the area. While noise levels would not be substantially different than noise levels associated with the No Project Alternative, noise levels would be slightly less. *(Less, but no significant reduction)*

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Under this alternative, a new jail facility would not be constructed at the projects site and no construction or operational traffic impacts would occur. By comparison, the project would add traffic to existing roadways resulting in adverse project and cumulative impacts on local intersections and during construction. Recommended mitigation measures would reduce some of these impacts to a less-than-significant level. However, some impacts at area intersections would be considered significant and unavoidable. Because this alternative would avoid any increase in roadway traffic, overall traffic impacts would be less than those that would occur with the project. *(Less; would avoid significant unavoidable impacts)*

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

This alternative would not construct the new jail on the site, and would not require extension of water or sewer infrastructure to the site. By comparison, the project would result in the need to extend water and sewer infrastructure to the site. Further, the City's wastewater conveyance infrastructure and the influent pump station at the WWTP are at capacity and the project's increased flows would result in a potentially significant impact. However, recommended mitigation would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Although impacts would be less than significant, the No Project Alternative would not require the extension of water or sewer infrastructure to the site; therefore, overall impacts would be less. *(Less)*

CONCLUSION

While the No Project Alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable environmental impacts identified for the project (i.e., GHG emissions, transportation and traffic), it would not meet the County's project objectives (see Section 6.2, "Project Objectives").

6.3.4 MITIGATED DESIGN ALTERNATIVE

As described above, the project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to GHG emissions and traffic on area roadways. Other significant impacts (e.g., construction-related air emissions, exposure of construction workers to hazardous materials, storm drainage impacts, and wastewater infrastructure capacity) could be reduced to less-than-significant levels through the implementation of recommended mitigation. The purpose of the mitigated design alternative is to identify a project design that would eliminate or substantially reduce the project's significant and unavoidable impacts. To do this, an alternative that would avoid significant and unavoidable GHG emissions and transportation and traffic impacts would need to be developed.

This alternative would include development of a 366-bed jail on the project site, but without the core facilities that would permit expansion to 526 beds. These core facilities would include the kitchen, laundry, HVAC, etc. No

changes in the number of staffing would occur under this alternative. Rather, this alternative would limit the size of certain facilities and features of the project that would allow the expansion of the facility to 526 beds. Ultimately this alternative would limit total inmate and employees at the site to a 366-bed facility.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

AESTHETICS

The Mitigated Design Alternative would result in the development of a 366-bed jail on the project site. Visually, the Mitigated Design Alternative would be similar to the project, but with slightly less building footprint on the project site. While new lighting sources are proposed, these sources would not result in significant light and glare impacts. Both the Mitigated Design Alternative and the proposed project would result in similar, less-than-significant visual resource impacts. *(Similar)*

AIR QUALITY

This alternative would include demolition and construction activities similar to the project over the same site footprint, and thus would generate new construction and operations-related air emissions that could exceed applicable thresholds. However, implementation of the same mitigation that was recommended for the project would reduce potential impacts associated with development of the Mitigated Design Alternative to a less-than-significant level. Overall, this alternative would result in similar air quality impacts compared to the project. *(Similar)*

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

This alternative would result in the development of a new jail facility that would have similar construction and operational activities as the project over a similar site footprint. The total building area developed would be slightly less than the project; therefore, this alternative would generate a reduced amount of construction and operational GHG emissions compared to the project. However, because of the size of the construction project, it is still likely that total GHG emissions would exceed applicable thresholds, which would be a significant impact. Mitigation recommended for the project that would implement GHG-reduction measures, would reduce GHG emissions from this alternative although it is likely that these measures would not reduce the alternative's contribution to a less-than-significant level. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable but slightly less than the project. *(Less)*

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This alternative would result in demolition of existing structures and new development similar to the project. Therefore, this alternative would have the similar potential to expose construction workers and the environment to hazardous chemicals or materials at the project site. Mitigation recommended for the project would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Overall, the Mitigated Design Alternative would result in similar hazards and hazardous materials impacts as the project. *(Similar)*

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Construction of the Mitigated Design Alternative at the project site, as with the proposed project, has the potential to adversely affect water quality because this alternative would result in demolition and soil disturbance at the same site. Similar to the project, appropriate best management practices would be implemented to control and treat on-site stormwater and a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan would be prepared. Similar to the project, this alternative would design and construct facilities such that project stormwater discharges would not exceed pre-project conditions and would meet appropriate water quality

standards. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts of the Mitigated Design Alternative would be similar to what would occur under the project. *(Similar)*

LAND USE

Under the Mitigated Design Alternative, similar to the proposed project, no significant land use impacts would occur. Therefore, overall impacts under this alternative would be similar. *(Similar)*

NOISE

This alternative would result in the demolition of existing structures and construction of new facilities. Similar construction-related noise impacts would occur under this alternative. Similar to the project, while this alternative would contribute trips to the local roadways, these trips would not substantially affect noise levels in the area. However, the total number of trips contributed to local roadways would be less because this alternative would not result in the expansion to 526 beds, which requires increased staffing compared to the proposed project. Therefore, overall noise impacts would be slightly less compared to the project. *(Less)*

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Development of the Mitigated Design Alternative at the project site would result in similar levels of traffic in the project area compared with the proposed project (366 beds) because each would include the same number of inmates and staff. However, the total number of trips contributed to local roadways would be less because this alternative would not result in the expansion to 526 beds, which requires increased staffing compared to the proposed project. Nonetheless, it is likely that with implementation of this alternative, multiple project area intersections would degrade to unacceptable operating conditions and/or project implementation would further exacerbate existing adverse operating conditions at these intersections, which would be a significant impact. Mitigation recommended for the project includes the County contributing its proportional share to the City towards potential future improvements at these various intersections; however, timing and funding for many of these improvements are uncertain, and are outside the County's control. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. *(Less, but no significant reduction)*

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Similar to the project, the Mitigated Design Alternative would result in the need to extend water and sewer infrastructure to the site. Further, the City's wastewater conveyance infrastructure and the influent pump station at the WWTP are at capacity and the project's increased flows would result in a potentially significant impact. However, recommended mitigation would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Overall, this alternative would result in similar utility and service system impacts. *(Similar)*

CONCLUSION

While the Mitigated Design Alternative would incrementally lessen the project's significant and unavoidable impact related to GHG emissions and transportation and traffic, it would not reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level; they would remain significant and unavoidable. Further, this alternative would not fully satisfy the County's stated project objectives to meet future facility needs by providing the potential for up to 526 beds (see Section 6.2, "Project Objectives"). The Mitigated Design Alternative would only increase the inmate capacity from 277 beds to 366 beds, leaving the need for an additional 160 beds. Nonetheless, this alternative is environmentally superior to the project because it would incrementally lessen some of the project's significant and unavoidable impacts.

6.3.5 DOWNTOWN SITE ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would expand the existing jail in downtown Napa to accommodate a single 398-bed jail on the existing site. The existing County Jail is located at the Hall of Justice at 1125 3rd Street. The existing jail is approximately 53 feet tall and is housed in the Hall of Justice Building and Jail Annex, which together are approximately 125,000 square feet in area.

The existing jail facility would be demolished in phases and a new jail facility would be constructed in its place. The construction process may involve temporarily accommodating inmates elsewhere.

The architectural concept for the new jail on the downtown site provides for a basement and four above-ground floors providing 202,052 square feet of floor space and 398 beds. The height of the jail would be 51 to 55 feet tall. The exterior design of the structure could be designed to respect the character of nearby historic buildings. A total of 126 personnel, including 12 administrative staff, 22 support services staff, and 92 custodial staff would be required for this facility. Staff shifts and operations at the facility would be the same as the proposed project. Exhibit 6-1 presents a conceptual layout of the Downtown Site Alternative.



Source: CGL 2011; adapted by Ascent Environmental in 2013

Exhibit 6-1

Downtown Site Alternative



The downtown site would also accommodate a commercial development opportunity on the Main Street side of the new jail structure. This structure would be placed on the site where staff parking currently exists to screen the new jail building from Main Street. The commercial building would be mixed use, retail, office, and/or residential with a footprint of approximately 47 feet by 200 feet and would provide approximately 36,200 square feet of leasable area.

Industrial use of the project site (the Pacific Coast and Boca parcels) would continue similar to existing conditions. Any future use of the project site under this alternative would be too speculative, and, thus, is not described here. The County would look for other potential locations for the staff-secure facility; otherwise, this component would be eliminated under this alternative.

In January 2011, the County facilitated a community meeting to solicit public input on the Downtown Campus Redevelopment Plan (i.e., this alternative). At that meeting, which was attended by approximately 90 people, most of the comments were directed at the plan to keep the jail in downtown Napa. Among other things, speakers questioned whether keeping the jail downtown was a viable option given the Governor's prison inmate realignment proposal, argued that the land the new jail would sit on could better be used for retail or other purposes, and argued that the proposed new jail would be too big and not fit in with the surrounding land uses.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

AESTHETICS

The Downtown Site Alternative would result in the demolition of the existing jail facility and construction of a new jail facility in its place. The new jail building would be one story greater in height compared to the existing jail, with an expanded footprint by approximately 40,000 square feet. The Downtown Site Alternative would also include a new mixed retail structure on Main Street. The Downtown site is in an area that has undergone significant redevelopment over the last few years. The Downtown Site Alternative would be designed to be consistent with surrounding public facilities and would include elements intended to reflect the development surrounding the site. For example, the façade of the retail component of this alternative would include a high-level of design that would screen views of the jail from street level. Lighting at the facility would not substantially change from existing conditions. No significant visual resources impacts are anticipated. By comparison, the project would result in the demolition of existing industrial facilities at a different location and the construction of a new jail facility. The existing Downtown jail facility would remain in place and unchanged. The project would not substantially degrade views from off-site areas. While new lighting sources are proposed under the project, these sources would not result in significant light and glare impacts. Impacts would be less than significant with the project. Both the Downtown Site Alternative and the proposed project would result in less-than-significant visual resource impacts; however, impacts would occur in different visual settings. Nonetheless, a similar level of visual change would occur. (*Similar*)

AIR QUALITY

This alternative would include demolition and construction activities similar to the project, and thus would generate new construction and operations-related air emissions that could exceed applicable thresholds. However, implementation of the same mitigation that was recommended for the project would reduce potential impacts associated with development of the Downtown Site Alternative to a less-than-significant level. This alternative would not be located in close proximity to any sources of TACs, and, as such, would not result in any significant impacts from exposure to TACs. Overall, this alternative would result in less air quality impacts compared to the project. (*Less*)

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

This alternative would result in the development of a new jail facility that would have similar construction and operational activities as the project, albeit slightly less because of the reduced number of beds and staff required for this alternative. Therefore, this alternative would generate a reduced amount of construction and operational GHG emissions compared to the project. However, because of the size of the construction project, it is still likely that total GHG emissions would exceed applicable thresholds, which would be a significant impact. Mitigation recommended for the project that would implement GHG-reduction measures, would reduce GHG emissions from this alternative although it is likely that these measures would not reduce the alternative's contribution to a less-than-significant level. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable but slightly less than the project. (*Less*)

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This alternative would result in demolition of existing structures and new development similar to the project. Therefore, this alternative would have the similar potential to expose construction workers and the environment to hazardous chemicals or materials at the project site. Mitigation recommended for the project would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. The existing jail facility has an existing emergency response plan in place; therefore, implementation of this alternative would avoid the project's impact related to compatibility with implementation of or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan. However, the project impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.5-2. Overall, the Downtown Site Alternative would result in similar hazards and hazardous materials impacts as the project. (*Similar*)

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Construction of the proposed project at the downtown site, as with the proposed site, has the potential to adversely affect water quality because this alternative would result in demolition and soil disturbance. Similar to the project, this site is mostly paved and would implement appropriate best management practices to control and treat on-site stormwater and would prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for the site. Similar to the project, this alternative would design and construct facilities such that project stormwater discharges would not exceed pre-project conditions and would meet appropriate water quality standards. The Downtown Site is located within the 100-year floodplain of the Napa River. Therefore, this alternative would result in the exposure of persons to flood-related hazards, although project facilities would be designed consistent with City and County policies to resist the effects of flood damage. This would be a new significant impact that would not occur with the project. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts of the Downtown Site Alternative would be greater than what would occur under the project. (*Greater*)

LAND USE

The Downtown Alternative would continue existing jail uses on the site and therefore, would not result in any conflicts with City land use policies (although the City's preference is to remove the jail from downtown), nor would it result in the division of an established community. Further, because this alternative would result in the development of retail and commercial uses, it would likely be more compatible and complimentary with existing development surrounding the site. No significant land use impacts would occur. By comparison, the project would not result in any significant land use impacts; therefore, overall impacts under this alternative would be similar. (*Similar*)

NOISE

This alternative would result in the demolition of existing structures and construction of new facilities. Similar construction-related noise impacts would occur under this alternative. However, this alternative would be located in closer proximity to noise-sensitive land uses including hotels, churches, and residences. Nonetheless, construction activities would likely occur between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. and, therefore, would be exempt from the City's noise ordinance. Similar to the project, while this alternative would contribute trips to the local roadways, these trips would not substantially affect noise levels in the area and would be incrementally less than noise changes that would occur with the project. Overall, noise impacts would be less, but would not be substantially reduced compared to the project. (*Less, but no significant reduction*)

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Construction of the new jail at the Downtown Site would increase levels of automobile traffic, pedestrian and bicycle traffic, and increase demand for parking in downtown Napa. According to the traffic analysis contained in the *Downtown Napa Specific Plan (DNSP) Draft Program EIR*, under existing conditions, all intersections in downtown Napa are operating at acceptable levels (City of Napa 2012: 4.L-6,) and would continue to do so with build out under the Downtown Specific Plan, which includes the existing jail (City of Napa 2012:4.L-27, 4.L-32). One intersection outside of the specific plan area (SR 29 northbound off ramp/First Street) would continue to operate at unacceptable levels.

The cumulative traffic (2030) analysis for the DNSP includes Napa County Jail expansion plans for up to 500 beds. Under the cumulative conditions, with the DNSP, it is anticipated that all intersections in the vicinity of the jail would continue to operate at acceptable levels, assuming planned roadway and intersection improvements are in place (City of Napa 2012:4.L-34 to 36). Two intersections outside of the downtown area (SR 29 off ramp/First Street and Silverado Trail/Third Street/East Avenue/Coombsville Road) would operate at unacceptable levels.

Based on the traffic analysis conducted for the DNSP, it is not anticipated that an increase in inmate capacity of 121 beds (to a total of 398 beds) would cause a substantial adverse effect on traffic conditions in downtown Napa. By comparison, the project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to area roadways. Overall, impacts of this alternative would be less. (*Less*)

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Similar to the proposed project, the City would provide utility service to the Downtown Site Alternative, including water, wastewater, and solid waste/recycling service. This alternative would result in fewer beds (i.e., 398 beds vs. 526 beds) than what would be constructed with the project and as a result would result in less demand for water supplies and wastewater conveyance and treatment services. As described for the project, adequate water supplies are available to meet the demands of a 526-bed jail facility and no significant water supply impacts would occur. It is anticipated that new water supply pipelines and connections would be constructed to meet the flow demand of this alternative such that no significant impacts would occur. This would be similar to what would occur under the project.

Similar to the project, the Downtown Site Alternative would increase the wastewater flows generated by the facility and conveyed to the City. Similar to conditions that would occur with the project, the City's wastewater conveyance infrastructure and the influent pump station at the WWTP are at capacity and the alternative's increased flows (although reduced compared to the project) would result in a potentially significant impact. However, mitigation recommended for the project would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Overall, this alternative would result in similar utility and service system impacts. (*Similar*)

CONCLUSION

While the Downtown Site Alternative would lessen some of the significant and unavoidable impacts identified for the project (i.e., GHG, transportation and traffic), it would have greater hydrology and water quality impacts, and it would not fully satisfy the County’s stated project objectives to meet future facility needs by providing the potential for up to 526 beds (see Section 6.2, “Project Objectives”). The Downtown Site Alternative would only increase the inmate capacity from 277 beds to 398 beds, leaving the need for an additional 128 beds.

6.3.6 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

Table 6-1 summarizes the environmental analyses provided above for the project alternatives.

Table 6-1 Comparison of the Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives in Relation to the Proposed Project				
Environmental Topic	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative	Mitigated Design Alternative	Downtown Site Alternative
Aesthetics	LTS	LTS (Less)	LTS (Similar)	LTS (Similar)
Air Quality	LTSM	LTS (Less)	LTSM (Similar)	LTSM (Less)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	SU	LTS (Less)	SU (Less)	LTSM (Less)
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	LTSM	LTS (Less)	LTSM (Similar)	LTS (Similar)
Hydrology and Water Quality	LTSM	LTS (Greater)	LTSM (Similar)	LTSM (Greater)
Land Use	LTS	LTS (Similar)	LTS (Similar)	LTS (Similar)
Noise	LTS	LTS (Less)	LTS (Less)	LTS (Less)
Transportation and Traffic	SU	LTS (Less)	SU (Less)	LTS (Less)
Utilities and Service Systems	LTSM	LTS (Less)	LTSM (Similar)	LTSM (Similar)
Impact Status: LTS = Less Than Significant Impact LTSM = LTS with Mitigation SU = Significant and Unavoidable Source: Data compiled by Ascent Environmental in 2013				

6.4 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT ANALYZED IN DETAIL

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) provides the following guidance in selecting a range of reasonable alternatives for the project. The range of potential alternatives for the project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project, and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but were rejected during the planning or scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination.

The following describes other alternatives considered by Napa County but dismissed from further evaluation in this DEIR, and a brief description of the reasons for their rejection.

6.4.1 NEW JAIL AT THE AIRPORT INDUSTRIAL AREA

Under this alternative, a new jail would be constructed at the Airport Industrial area, approximately 5.5 miles south of the existing jail. The jail would be constructed to provide 366 beds with future expansion potential for up to 526 beds. This alternative was rejected because the location is considered too distant from the courts, making inmate transportation impractical, and because the location in southern Napa County is a significant distance from the many law enforcement agencies who bring individuals for booking into the jail. Further, building a jail in the Airport Industrial area would conflict with the Specific Plan and would be incompatible with the County's objectives for that area, which include maintaining an industrial zone that acts as "back of house" for uses in the agricultural preserve, and provides an area for economic development (i.e., job growth and property taxes).

6.4.2 SPLIT OPERATIONS ALTERNATIVES

In addition to housing all inmates at one location, alternatives involving split operations were examined from the standpoint of feasibility and costs.

The following alternatives were considered:

1. A 526-bed two-jail operation with a 358-bed jail on the existing downtown site and a 168-bed jail elsewhere in the County; or
2. A 366-bed two-jail operation with a 262-bed jail on the existing downtown site and a 104-bed jail elsewhere in the County.

The County determined that implementation of these alternatives would have substantially greater costs. Specifically, the operation of split facilities would result in the need for more (duplicative) staff, and the operation of duplicate care facilities such as the kitchen. These additional staff would generate greater traffic trips on local roadways and would result in greater operational air and GHG emissions. Therefore, this alternative would not result in the elimination of any of the project's significant and unavoidable impacts and it was rejected from further consideration.

6.4.3 INCREASED ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION TO LIMIT INMATE POPULATION GROWTH

Under this alternative, a new jail would not be necessary because the County would increase the utilization of alternatives to incarceration and programming options that would negate the need for an expanded jail. In this alternative, the existing downtown jail would continue to be used without any expansion. The County currently uses a number of evidence-based programs and alternatives to incarceration to help appropriately manage the jail population, including the following:

1. Deferred Entry of Judgment (Driving offenses/Misdemeanor offenses): Allows offenders to attend classes and complete other requirements to have charges for certain offenses dropped.
2. Pre-Trial Release Program: Allows offenders who meet certain qualifications to be released on varying levels of supervision pre-trial without having to post bond.
3. Home Detention/Electronic Monitoring Program: Allows offenders who meet certain qualifications to receive time served credits while under home detention/electronic monitoring outside of the jail facility.

4. Community Corrections Work Program: Currently under expansion, this program allows offenders who meet certain qualifications to perform community service under supervision and receive time served credits.
5. County Parole: Allows offenders who meet certain qualifications to be “paroled” from the facility for significant progress towards goals aimed at reducing recidivism (i.e., education, program attendance, etc.).

In its population projections, the County accounted for the impact that these types of programs and evidence-based practices would have on the recidivism rate and ultimately the jail population. The projections include growth limits resulting from a 23.5% reduction in recidivism through evidence-based programs. Even with the further addition of a staff-secure alternative custody facility, the projected numbers substantially exceed the jail’s capacity. To assume that programming and alternatives will expand enough to keep the population from growing at all in the planning period is impractical because many of the factors that affect jail populations, such as crime levels and sentencing policies, are both unpredictable and outside the County’s administrative control. Further, this alternative would not meet the project goals of providing adequate and efficient inmate housing, programming, medical, and mental health space for the population the County will have over the coming years. Therefore, this alternative was rejected from further consideration.

6.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The No Project Alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project. However, the No Project Alternative would not attain any of the objectives of the proposed project. CEQA requires (CCR Section 15126.6 [e][2]) that if the environmentally superior project is the No Project Alternative, another environmental superior alternative shall be identified among the other alternatives. Among the other alternatives, the Mitigated Design Alternative is environmentally superior to the project because it would incrementally lessen some of the project’s significant and unavoidable impacts. However, this alternative would not meet the important project objective related to meeting future facility needs by providing the potential for up to 526 beds.