5.1 CEQA REQUIREMENTS

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) analyze a reasonable range of feasible alternatives that meet most or all Project objectives while reducing or avoiding one or more significant environmental effects of the Project. The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires an EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f]). Where a potential alternative was examined but not chosen as one of the alternatives, the CEQA Guidelines require that the EIR briefly discuss the reasons the alternative was dismissed.

Alternatives that are evaluated in the EIR must be potentially feasible alternatives. However, not all possible alternatives need to be analyzed. An EIR must "set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice." (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(f).) The CEQA Guidelines provide a definition for a "range of reasonable alternatives" and, thus limit the number and type of alternatives that need to be evaluated in an EIR.

First and foremost, alternatives in an EIR must be potentially feasible. In the context of CEQA, "feasible" is defined as:

> *… capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors.* (CEQA Guidelines 15364)

The inclusion of an alternative in an EIR is not evidence that it is feasible as a matter of law, but rather reflects the judgment of lead agency staff that the alternative is potentially feasible. The final determination of feasibility will be made by the lead agency decision-making body through the adoption of CEQA Findings at the time of action on the Project. (Mira Mar Mobile Community v. City of Oceanside (2004) 119 Cal.App.4th 477, 489 see also CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3) findings requirement, where alternatives can be rejected as infeasible); Section 15126.6 ([an EIR] must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation"). The following factors may be taken into consideration in the assessment of the feasibility of alternatives: site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plan or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and the ability of the proponent to attain site control (Section 15126.6 (f) (1)).

Equally important to attaining the Project objectives is the reduction of some or all significant impacts, particularly those that could not be mitigated to a less than significant level. The following significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project are discussed in Chapters 3.1 through 3.14:

- Impact 3.1-1: Project implementation would result in substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas and resources or substantial degradation of visual character;
- Impact 3.13-1: Under Existing (2017) Plus Project conditions, the Project may conflict with an applicable program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system – Roadway Segments and Intersections; and
- Impact 3.13-2: Under Cumulative (2040) Plus Project conditions, the Project may conflict with an applicable program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system – Roadway Segments and Intersections.

The following analysis of alternatives focuses on significant impacts, including both those that can be mitigated to a less than significant level and those that would remain significant even if mitigation is applied or for which no feasible mitigation is available.

A Notice of Preparation was circulated to the public to solicit recommendations for a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project. Additionally, a public scoping meeting was held during the public review period to solicit recommendations for a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project. No comments related to potential alternatives to the Project were received.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The alternatives to the Project selected for analysis in the EIR were developed to minimize significant environmental impacts while fulfilling the basic objectives of the Project. As described in Chapter 2.0, Project Description, the following objectives have been identified for The Ranch Project:

- Create a high-quality development that implements the vision of the General Plan, which designates the Project site for development with a local town center, a mix of residential densities, and a natural resources preserve;
- Respect the Project site's existing natural features through preservation of 199.5 acres of wetlands, vernal pools, and open space;
- Provide a residential development that would assist the City in meeting its housing needs, including a range of housing types to serve the senior population;
- Provide a residential development that would assist the City in meeting its affordability goals providing housing at many price points and attract residents from different areas;
- Create a unique age-restricted community that provides a mix of housing types and amenities, including a club house and recreation facility;
- Accommodate neighborhood-serving commercial uses as part of the town center;
- Implement the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans through providing an on-site bicycle and pedestrian network that is accessible by the general public and provides opportunities for connectivity with bicycle and pedestrian facilities on adjacent properties; and
- Implement the City's Transit Master Plan through providing a Signature Transit Station and accommodating the Signature Transit Route along Rancho Cordova Parkway.

ALTERNATIVES NOT SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

Alternatives to the Project were considered, but rejected from further analysis. These alternatives included an alternative site location and a Project redesign alternative. The alternatives that were rejected from further analysis are discussed below.

Alternative Site Location

The City of Rancho Cordova considered alternative locations early in the public scoping process. The City's key considerations in identifying an alternative location were as follows:

- Is there an alternative location where significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened?
- Is there a site available within the City's Sphere of Influence with the appropriate size and characteristics such that it would meet the basic project objectives?

A hypothetical off-site alternative was considered but dismissed from further analysis. The Project applicant has not been able to identify a potential site for acquisition that meets the Project objectives. There are no alternative sites in the City suited for development that the Project applicant could reasonably acquire which would replace the proposed site (in size and physical characteristics) and also avoid significant impacts that would result from Project implementation. It is anticipated that a project of comparable size would result in similar transportation/circulation and aesthetic impacts in an alternative location. An off-site location could result in additional environmental impacts compared to the Project because of increased construction impacts (noise, air quality, water runoff, etc.) stemming from the extension of the basic infrastructure if the site is not proximate to existing infrastructure. Additionally, development of the Project site for residential mixed uses is identified by the City's General Plan and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS). Further, development of an off-site location would not result in preservation of the Project site in the long-term as it would likely develop with residential, commercial, and other uses as envisioned by the General Plan and the MTP/SCS. Therefore, the Off-Site Location Alternative is dismissed from further analysis.

In addition, as discussed in *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553 (Goleta II*), where a project is consistent with an approved general plan, no off-site alternative need be analyzed in the EIR. The EIR "is not ordinarily an occasion for the reconsideration or overhaul of fundamental land-use policy." (Goleta II, supra, 52 Cal.3d at p. 573.) In approving a general plan, the local agency has already identified and analyzed suitable alternative sites for particular types of development and has selected a feasible land use plan. "Informed and enlightened regional planning does not demand a project EIR dedicated to defining alternative sites without regard to feasibility. Such ad hoc reconsideration of basic planning policy is not only unnecessary, but would be in contravention of the legislative goal of long-term, comprehensive planning." (Goleta II, supra, 52 Cal.3d at pp. 572-573.) Here, the Project is generally consistent with the types of uses considered in the General Plan and associated EIR. As discussed in Section 3.9, Land Use, of this EIR, the Rancho Cordova General Plan currently designates the Project site as the SunCreek/Preserve Planning Area. The Project is consistent

with the City's General Plan. Thus, in addition to the reasons discussed above, an off-site alternative need not be further discussed in this EIR.

Project Redesign

Under the Project Redesign Alternative, the number of residential and non-residential uses would remain the same and would be constructed at the Project site, but with a revised design and layout. For example, the preserve area could be relocated or redesigned. The Project has been designed to avoid impacts to natural resources present on the Project site and has been proposed with less development than was anticipated under the Rancho Cordova General Plan and General Plan EIR in order to preserve natural features on the Project site. Due to the extensive wetland and vernal pool features present on the Project site, a significant redesign may avoid some of the existing impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U.S. and State, but would create new impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U.S. in other locations on the Project site, resulting in potential impacts associated with biological resources and water quality. This alternative would not result in a significant reduction in impacts associated with re-arranging uses on the Project site. Therefore, the Project Redesign Alternative is dismissed from further analysis.

5.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THIS EIR

Three alternatives to the Project were developed based on City of Rancho Cordova staff input and the technical analysis performed to identify the environmental effects of the Project. The alternatives analyzed in this EIR include the following three alternatives in addition to the Project:

- No Project Alternative
- Reduced Project Alternative #1
- Reduced Project Alternative #2

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6[e]) require consideration of a No Project Alternative that represents the existing conditions, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project were not approved. For purposes of this analysis, the No Project Alternative assumes that the Project site remains in its existing state and no additional development would occur in the short-term. However, it is anticipated that a new development Project would be submitted and that the Project site would be developed with uses consistent with the General Plan, as described for the SunCreek/Preserve Planning Area. The current condition of the site is largely undeveloped and has accommodated agricultural uses (cattle grazing) in the past.

As noted above, the Rancho Cordova General Plan currently designates the Project site as the SunCreek/Preserve Planning Area. While the No Project Alternative may delay the development of the Project site, in the mid- to long-term, the Project site is anticipated to be developed as envisioned by the General Plan. The No Project Alternative would allow the Project site to be

converted from agricultural to a development with a mix of residential densities, town center uses, and parks/recreation uses as envisioned by the General Plan. The assumed maximum buildout of the project site as envisioned in the General Plan EIR includes 2,624 residential units on 303.5 acres, as well as a village center with commercial uses, park areas and wetland preserve. This maximum buildout for the Project site is identified in Table 4.0-1 of the General Plan Draft EIR in "The Preserve at Sunridge" row on page 4.0-6. The development scenario envisioned under the General Plan would be more intense than anticipated for the Project under the No Project Alternative. The preserve would be smaller than the area preserved by the Project and additional impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U.S. and state are anticipated under this alternative.

REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE #1

Under Reduced Project Alternative #1, the Project site would be developed with the same amount of non-residential uses as the Project, but with a reduction in the amount of residential development (age-restricted and non-age-restricted). This alternative would result in:

- 59,000 sf of non-residential uses (32,000 sf of commercial and a 27,000-sf clubhouse),
- 637 single-family non-age-restricted units,
- 643 single-family active adult age-restricted units,
- 50 active adult multifamily units, and
- 268 multifamily non-age-restricted units (or the same amount as the Project).

Under the Reduced Project Alternative #1, 100 single family non-age-restricted units and 50 active adult single family units would be eliminated. This alternative would avoid impacts to an additional 0.025 acres of seasonal wetlands and 0.668 acres of vernal pools. This alternative would also include increased setbacks from Rancho Cordova Parkway aimed to reduce impacts related to aesthetics. The proposed amenities, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and landscaping would be the same as the Project. The development footprint would be decreased compared to the Project.

REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE #2

Under Reduced Project Alternative #2, the Project site would be developed with the same amount of non-residential uses as the Project, but with a reduction in the amount of residential development (non-age-restricted only). This alternative would result in:

- 59,000 sf of non-residential uses (32,000 sf of commercial and a 27,000-sf clubhouse),
- 477 single-family non-age-restricted units,
- 693 single-family age-restricted units,
- 50 multifamily age-restricted units, and
- 268 multifamily non-age-restricted units.

This alternative would result in a reduction in 260 single family non-age-restricted units. This alternative would also include increased setbacks, landscaped areas, and parks aimed to reduce impacts related to aesthetics. This alternative would avoid impacts to an additional 0.025 acres

of seasonal wetlands and 0.668 acres of vernal pools. The proposed amenities, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and landscaping would be the same as the Project. The development footprint would be decreased compared to the Project.

Table 5.0-1 compares the characteristics of the Project to each of the three alternatives analyzed below. Table 5.0-2 compares trips generated by the Project to each of the three alternatives analyzed below.

TABLE 5.0-1: COMPARISON OF PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS TO THE ALTERNATIVES

COMPONENT	*PROJECT*	*NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE*	*REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE #1*	*REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE #2*
Single Family, Non-Age-Restricted (Units)	735	1,124	637	477
Single Family Units, Senior Age-Restricted (Units)	737	1,000	643	693
Multifamily, Non-Age-Restricted (Units)	215	400	268	268
Multifamily Units, Senior Age-Restricted (Units)	38	100	50	50
Subtotal Dwelling Units	*1,725*	*2,624*	*1,598*	*1,488*
Senior Community Clubhouse (square feet)	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000
Commercial Parcel (acres)	5.16	5.08	5.08	5.08
Parks and Recreation (acres)	19.24	19.24	19.24	19.24
Nature Preserve (acres)	199.5	136.8	212.0	221.1

TABLE 5.0-2: COMPARISON OF PROJECT TRIPS TO THE ALTERNATIVES

LAND USE	*THE RANCH PROJECT*			*ALTERNATIVE 1*		*ALTERNATIVE 2*		*ALTERNATIVE 3*	
	UNITS	*TOTAL TRIPS*	*TRIP RATE*[1]	*UNITS*	*TRIPS*	*UNITS*	*TOTAL TRIPS*	*UNITS*	*TOTAL TRIPS*
Single Family, Non-restricted (units)	735	6,796	9.246	1,124	10,393	637	5,890	477	4,410
Multifamily, Non-restricted (units)	215	1225	5.698	1,000	5,698	268	1,527	268	1,527
Senior Single Family (units)	737	2519	3.418	400	1,367	643	2,198	693	2,369
Senior Multifamily (units)	38	112	2.947	100	295	50	147	40	118
Shopping Center (thousand square feet)	32	954	29.813	32	954	32	954	32	954
TOTAL	**-**	**11,606**		**-**	**18,707**	**-**	**10,716**	**-**	**9,378**

[1]*TRIP RATES CALCULATED BASED ON KIMLEY HORN JAEGER RANCH SUPPLEMENTAL TRAFFIC ANALYSIS, TRIP GENERATION MEMORANDUM, JUNE 12, 2019*

5.3 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The alternatives analysis provides a summary of the relative impact level of significance associated with each alternative for each of the environmental issue areas analyzed in this EIR. Following the analysis of each alternative, Table 5.0-3 summarizes the comparative effects of each alternative.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

The No Project Alternative would result in the long-term development of the Project site with up to 2,624 residential units, a village center, and park uses. Similar to the Project, this alternative would result in increases in daytime glare and nighttime lighting. The visual character of the Project site would change under this alternative compared to existing conditions.

As described in Chapter 3.1, the visual character of the Project site would be significantly altered as a result of Project implementation. Compliance with the City's design guidelines and the proposed Architectural + Site Design Guidelines for multi-family parcels and commercial parcels would ensure that impacts are reduced to the greatest extent possible. Nevertheless, impacts related to degradation of the visual character of the site would be significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.1-1 would ensure that lighting features do not result in light spillage onto adjacent properties and do not significantly impact views of the night sky. Adherence to the requirements in this mitigation would ensure that excessively reflective building materials are not used, and that the Project would not result in significant impacts related to daytime glare. As such, impacts related to nighttime lighting and daytime glare would be less than significant.

In summary, the Project would result in new sources of light and glare and would also result in impacts to the existing visual character or quality of the Project site and its surroundings. The No Project Alternative would result in construction of 2,624 units on 303.5 acres, a village center, and park uses throughout the Project site. In order to avoid the on-site aquatic habitats, the No Project Alternative would also cluster development to maintain large open space characteristic of the Project. However, because this alternative would result in up to 876 more units than the Project, the development footprint would be required to increase, densities may increase, there would be additional potential sources of light and glare, and less preservation of open space and natural resources would occur. Therefore, aesthetic impacts would not be reduced by this alternative and would be worse than the Project.

Air Quality

As described in Section 3.2, implementation of the Project would generate emissions during both the construction phase and the operational phase. The projected emissions would be reduced to a level that does not exceed the project-level operational thresholds of significance with implementation of the mitigation measures in Section 3.2.

Construction related impacts would be greater under this alternative when compared to the Project, as the extent of development would be increased and duration of construction would be increased. Under this alternative, mobile source emissions and emissions associated with residential operations would increase. Mobile source (vehicle emissions) are directly related to the number of vehicle trips generated by a project. Under this alternative, a greater number of people and residential units would be located on the Project site due to the substantial increase in units, which would generate approximately 7,101 more daily vehicle trips when compared to the Project, as shown in Table 5.0-2. As a result, this alternative would generate higher levels of pollutants from mobile sources. Therefore, this alternative would have increased impacts related to air quality when compared to the Project.

Biological Resources

As described in Section 3.3, while Project implementation is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to biological resources, construction activities associated with the Project would result in impacts to wetlands and ground disturbing activities associated with the potential to impact or harm biological resources, including special-status species. Under the No Project Alternative, the Project site would be developed with up to 2,624 units, a village center, and park areas. Due to the increased development intensities, this alternative would dedicate a lesser amount of the Project site for open space and wetland preserve uses compared to the Project. Due to the on-site aquatic resources, any future project on the Project site that is consistent with the General Plan would likely be designed to minimize and avoid impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U.S. Because this alternative would result in a decrease in the amount of open space preserved, including a decrease in the preservation of sensitive aquatic resources, impacts to biological resources would be worse than the Project, although such impacts would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of mitigation. Overall, this impact would have greater impacts on biological resources when compared to the Project.

Cultural and Tribal Resources

The No Project Alternative would result in ground disturbing activities throughout much of the Project site. The Project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to cultural or historical resources, and the No Project Alternative would result in similar risks related to the unintentionally discovery of such resources by developing much of the Project site with residential and commercial uses. As such, this impact would be equal when compared to the Project.

Geology and Soils

The No Project Alternative would result in development of 876 more units than the Project. The future development allowed under this alternative would be exposed to the same level of risk from geologic hazards as the Project. This alternative is not anticipated to result in a significant change in any risks associated with geology and soils. Therefore, the impact under this alternative would be comparable to the Project.

Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change, and Energy

Under the No Project Alternative, more housing units would be constructed on the Project site. Implementation of the Project would generate GHG emissions during construction and operation. Short-term construction GHG emissions are a one-time release of GHGs and are not expected to significantly contribute to global climate change over the lifetime of a project. As noted previously, construction related impacts would be similar under this alternative when compared to the Project, as the duration of construction would be comparable.

Under the No Project Alternative, because more people would likely reside within the Project site under this alternative, amount of emissions associated with residential activities would increase and the number of vehicle trips generated would also increase by approximately 7,101 daily trips, as shown in Table 5.0-2. As such, the operational, including mobile, greenhouse gas emissions would also increase when compared to the Project. While there would be additional development under this alternative, it is anticipated that energy-saving measures would be similar to the Project and there would not be a significant change in the potential for wasteful, inefficient, or excessive consumption of energy under this alternative.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The No Project Alternative is similar to the Project in that both the Project and this alternative would result in development of the Project site with residential, commercial, and park uses. However, this alternative would increase the number of people residing within the Project site. As described in Chapter 3.7, construction activities may result in the use and transport of common hazardous materials, including oils, fuels, paints and solvents. This potential impact would still occur under the No Project Alternative. Additionally, the operational phases of both the Project and the No Project Alternative would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Future development under the No Project Alternative would be subject to the City's General Plan policies, and other local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to hazardous materials and no significant increase in the potential for release of or exposure to hazardous materials is anticipated under this alternative. This impact would be similar under this alternative when compared to the Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The No Project Alternative would result in development of the Project site with up to 2,624 units, a village center, and park uses. This alternative would result in a similar amount of land covered with impervious surfaces compared to the Project. Similar to the Project, stormwater would be directed to on-site detention basin(s) and landscaped areas, and the storm drainage system would be designed to ensure that post-construction runoff volumes do not exceed pre-development conditions. Because the alternative would be required to implement improvements in order to manage and treat stormwater flows from the site, impacts related to water quality would be similar.

As described in Chapter 3.8, when the Project is developed, the on-site impervious area would increase, leading to faster runoff rates. The No Project Alternative would provide a greater amount of impervious surface on-site as compared to the Project, which would also result in

greater impacts related to rainfall infiltration and runoff during storm events as compared to the Project. This is largely due to the fact that this alternative would result in 876 more units than the Project.

The No Project Alternative would provide a similar amount of impervious surface on-site as compared to the Project, which would also result in similar impacts related to rainfall infiltration and runoff during storm events as compared to the Project.

As described in Chapter 3.8, Project implementation has the potential to result in the discharge of pollutants into detention basins, and would change the existing drainage pattern on the site, although these impacts are less than significant as a result of compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. Under the No Project Alternative, these impacts would be similar to the Project. Overall, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would not be improved under the No Project Alternative when compared to the Project.

Land Use

The No Project Alternative would also require a change of the Project site's General Plan Land Use designation from Planning Area to Low Density Residential (LDR), Medium Density Residential (MDR), High Density Residential (HDR), Commercial (C), Parks and Open Space (P/OS), and Natural Resources (NR). Under this alternative, the Project site would be developed with uses consistent with the General Plan land use designation and the identified net density associated with the SACOG MTP/SCS for the site. The analysis in Section 3.9 concluded that the Project would not result in any significant land use impacts; the No Project Alternative would also not result in significant land use impacts. Therefore, this alternative would have similar impacts compared to the Project.

Noise and Vibration

As described in Section 3.10, the primary sources of noise associated with implementation of the Project are from increased vehicle trips on study area roadways in the Project vicinity from on-site uses, and increased noise from future operation within the Project site. Under this alternative, noise associated with vehicle trips is expected to increase due to the increase in vehicle trips, while other on-site noise sources would likely be comparable to those generated by the Project. The Project is estimated to generate approximately 11,606 new external vehicle trips on a daily basis. When compared to the Project, this alternative would result in an increase in the number of daily vehicle trips by 7,101. This alternative would generate more daily vehicle trips and peak hour trips associated with the increase in residential units, which would generate increased noise levels on area roadways. Similar to the Project, this alternative would expose future residential uses to noise sources. Overall, due to the increase in anticipated vehicle trips, this impact would be increased under this alternative when compared to the Project.

Population and Housing

This alternative would result in the construction of more housing units over a comparable area as the Project. As discussed in Section 3.11, the Project would be a residential and commercial mixed use development, resulting in the addition of up to 1,748 residential units (up to 1,430

single family units and up to 328 multifamily units) in total. This would allow for a maximum population of approximately 4,410 residents, based on the number of units planned for development.

Under the No Project Alternative, the Project site would be developed with up to 2,642 units, a village center, and park uses. Because this alternative would substantially increase the amount of units, the associated population would also increase. However, this increase is consistent with the General Plan and does not conflict with regional plans for growth. Therefore, impacts related to population and housing would be comparable to the Project.

Public Services and Recreation

This alternative would result in an increase in the number of housing units by 876 units. As described in Section 3.12, implementation of the Project would result in an increase in demand for police and fire protection services, as well as increased demand for schools, parks, and other public facilities. As discussed previously, there would be a larger change in the population generated under this alternative when compared to the Project. However, while this alternative would have an increased demand for public services compared to the Project, this increase is not anticipated to require construction, expansion, or relocation of public service facilities. The 876 additional units under this alternative could, however, require the construction of additional park and/or recreation facilities on- or off-site. Overall, impacts associated with environmental effects associated with the construction, expansion, or relocation of physical facilities associated with the provision of public services and recreation would be slightly greater than the Project.

Transportation and Circulation

As described above, this alternative would result in an increase in total daily vehicle trips when compared to the Project, which would in turn increase the peak hour AM and PM vehicle trips. The Project is estimated to generate up to 11,606 new daily trips, with 841 and 1,102 trips occurring during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. Under this alternative, the increased development would generate an increase of approximately 7,101 daily trips compared to the Project, as shown in Table 5.0-2. The increase in traffic would result in increased AM and PM peak hour trips under this alternative when compared to the Project. This has the potential to increase impacts to area roadways and intersections. Impacts related to traffic and circulation would be increased under this alternative when compared to the Project.

Utilities

Both the Project and this alternative would be served by the Sacramento Area Sewer District (SASD) and the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (Regional San). The Project would have a less-than-significant impact on public wastewater service, including disposal or treatment systems. Development under the No Project Alternative would also result in an increase in solid waste generation within the Project site due to the increase in residential units. Because the No Project Alternative would result in an increased population compared to the Project, water demand would also increase. There is the potential for development under this alternative to exceed the growth anticipated in the infrastructure planning to serve the Project

area and to require additional water and wastewater facilities to serve the Project. Overall, this alternative would have worse impacts to utilities when compared to the Project.

REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE #1

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

Under Reduced Project Alternative #1, the Project site would be developed with the same amount of non-residential uses as the Project, but with a reduction in the amount of residential development (50 fewer single-family age-restricted units and 100 fewer single-family non-age-restricted units). When compared to the Project, the area of the Project site developed with residential uses would be decreased and there would be an increase in the area preserved as a nature preserve. Developing the entire Project site with 127 fewer residential units would likely result in buildings with equal stories as the Project. The building setbacks and landscaped areas adjacent to existing and future roadways under this alternative would likely be greater than the Project, which may increase the visual and aesthetic appeal of the site compared to the Project. Overall, this alternative would have reduced impacts to aesthetics when compared to the Project, but the conversion of the Project site to a residential community with a commercial center and parks and recreation uses would still result in a significant and unavoidable impact associated with changes in visual character.

Air Quality

As described in Section 3.2, implementation of the Project would generate emissions during both the construction phase and the operational phase. Construction related impacts would be reduced under this alternative when compared to the Project, as the area of ground disturbance would be less, and the duration of construction may be slightly reduced. Under this alternative, mobile source emissions would also slightly decrease. Mobile source (vehicle emissions) are directly related to the number of vehicle trips generated by a project. Under this alternative, the residential uses developed on the Project site would generate approximately 890 fewer daily vehicle trips when compared to the Project, as shown in Table 5.0-2, which would generate lower levels of pollutants from mobile sources. Therefore, this alternative would have reduced impacts related to air quality when compared to the Project.

Biological Resources

As described in Section 3.3, while Project implementation is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to biological resources, construction activities associated with the Project would result in impacts to wetlands and ground disturbing activities that may impact or harm biological resources, including special-status species. Under Reduced Project Alternative #1, the Project site would be developed with the same amount of non-residential uses as the Project, but with a reduction in the amount of residential development of 127 units. This alternative would increase the area of the site for permanent open space uses compared to the Project. Due to the on-site aquatic resources, this alternative would also be designed to minimize and avoid impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U.S. Because this alternative would require fill of wetlands and waters of the U.S. and conversion of much of the Project site to urban uses,

impacts to biological resources would require mitigation similar to the Project to be reduced to less than significant. However, overall, this alternative would have a reduction in impacts to biological resources compared to the Project.

Cultural and Tribal Resources

Reduced Project Alternative #1 would result in ground disturbing activities throughout much of the Project site. The Project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to cultural or historical resources, and Reduced Project Alternative #1 would result in similar risks related to the unintentional discovery of such resources by developing much of the Project site with residential and commercial uses. As such, this impact would be comparable to the Project.

Geology and Soils

Reduced Project Alternative #1 would result in development of 127 fewer residential units than the Project. The future development allowed under this alternative would be exposed to the same level of risk from geologic hazards as the Project. Therefore, this impact under this alternative would be comparable to the Project.

Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change, and Energy

Under Reduced Project Alternative #1, fewer housing units would be constructed on the Project site. Implementation of the Project would generate GHG emissions during construction and operation. Short-term construction GHG emissions are a one-time release of GHGs and are not expected to significantly contribute to global climate change over the lifetime of a Project. As noted previously, construction related impacts would be reduced under this alternative when compared to the Project, as the extent of the development footprint and duration of construction activities would be reduced slightly.

Under Reduced Project Alternative #1, because fewer people would likely reside within the Project site under this alternative due to the reduction of 127 units, the number of vehicle trips generated would also decrease by approximately 890 daily vehicle trips. Emissions associated with area sources and the mobile greenhouse gas emissions associated with vehicle trips would decrease when compared to the Project. As such, the greenhouse gas emissions impact would be decreased when compared to the Project.

While there would be reduced development under this alternative, it is anticipated that energy-saving measures would be similar to the Project and there would not be a significant change in the potential for wasteful, inefficient, or excessive consumption of energy under this alternative.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Reduced Project Alternative #1 is similar to the Project in that both the Project and this alternative would result in development of the Project site with residential, commercial, and park uses. As described in Chapter 3.7, construction activities may result in the use and transport of common hazardous materials, including oils, fuels, paints and solvents. This potential impact would still occur under Reduced Project Alternative #1. Additionally, the operational phases of both the Project and Reduced Project Alternative #1 would not pose a

significant hazard to the public or the environment. Future development under Reduced Project Alternative #1 would be subject to the City's General Plan policies, and other local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to hazardous materials. This impact would be similar under this alternative when compared to the Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Reduced Project Alternative #1 would reduce development by 127 single family units compared to the Project and result in an increase in permanent open space. While this alternative would result in a reduced amount of land covered with impervious surfaces compared to the Project, stormwater would be directed to on-site detention basin(s) and landscaped areas, and the storm drainage system would be designed to ensure that post-construction runoff volumes do not exceed pre-development conditions similar to the Project. Because the alternative would be required to implement improvements in order to manage and treat stormwater flows from the site, impacts related to water quality would be similar.

As described in Chapter 3.8, Project implementation has the potential to result in the discharge of pollutants into detention basins, and would change the existing drainage pattern on the site, although these impacts are less than significant as a result of compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. Under Reduced Project Alternative #1, these impacts would be similar to the Project. Overall, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would not be significantly improved under Reduced Project Alternative #1 when compared to the Project.

Land Use

Reduced Project Alternative #1 would also require a change of the Project site's General Plan Land Use designation from Planning Area to LDR, MDR, HDR, C, P/OS, and NR designations. Under this alternative, the Project site would be developed with similar uses as the Project. The analysis in Section 3.9 concluded that the Project would not result in any significant land use impacts. Similarly, this alternative could be designed to be consistent with the General Plan. The decrease in units and decreased development footprint associated with this alternative would not conflict with the adopted MTP/SCS as this alternative would result in comparable residential net densities on the Project site when compared to the Developing Community assumptions for the Project site. Therefore, this alternative would have similar impacts compared to the Project.

Noise and Vibration

As described in Section 3.10, the primary sources of noise associated with implementation of the Project are from increased vehicle trips on study area roadways in the Project vicinity from on-site uses, and increased noise from future operation within the Project site. The Project is estimated to generate approximately 11,606 new external vehicle trips on a daily basis. Under this alternative, noise associated with vehicle trips is expected to decrease by approximately 890 daily trips due to the decrease in residential units, while other on-site noise sources would likely be comparable to those generated by the Project. This alternative would generate fewer daily vehicle trips and peak hour trips, which would generate decreased noise levels on area roadways. Similar to the Project, this alternative would expose future residential uses to noise

sources. Overall, due to the decrease in anticipated vehicle trips, this impact would be decreased under this alternative when compared to the Project.

Population and Housing

This alternative would result in the construction of fewer housing units over a smaller area than the Project. As discussed in Section 3.11, the Project would be a residential and commercial mixed use development, resulting in the addition of up to 1,725 residential units (up to 1,472 single family units and up to 253 multifamily units) in total. This would allow for a maximum population of approximately 4,319 residents, based on the number of units planned for development.

Under Reduced Project Alternative #1, the Project site would be developed with up to 1,598 units. While this alternative would add fewer residents as compared with the Project, impacts related to population and housing would be comparable to the Project as neither this alternative nor the Project would conflict with applicable population forecasts.

Public Services and Recreation

This alternative would result in a decrease in the number of housing units by 127 units. As described in Section 3.12, implementation of the Project would result in an increase in demand for police and fire protection services, as well as increased demand for schools, parks, and other public facilities. As discussed previously, there would be a reduction in the population generated under this alternative when compared to the Project. As such, this alternative would have a decreased demand for public services compared to the Project and a decrease in the amount of park area required to serve the Project. Similar to the Project, this alternative would not result in need for construction, relocation, or expansion of facilities for public services and recreation, other than the park and recreation uses proposed as part of the alternative. Because this alternative would decrease demand for public services and would require less parkland than the Project, physical environmental impacts related to public services and recreation would be slightly less than the Project.

Transportation and Circulation

As described above, this alternative would result in a decrease in total daily vehicle trips when compared to the Project, which would in turn decrease the peak hour AM and PM vehicle trips. The Project is estimated to generate up to 11,606 new daily trips, with 841 and 1,102 trips occurring during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. Under this alternative, the decrease in residential units would result in a reduction of 890 daily trips. The trip generation for this alternative was calculated using the same trip generation rates as the Project that were provided by Kimley-Horn (June 12, 2019, as shown in Table 5.0-2). The related decrease in AM and PM peak hour trips under this alternative would generate decreased traffic levels on area roadways when compared to the Project. This has the potential to decrease impacts to area roadways and intersections, in particular, the impact at Intersection #21, Sunrise Boulevard/White Rock Road is anticipated to be reduced to less than significant resulting from a decrease in delay compared to the Project. The remaining potentially significant impacts would not be avoided under this alternative, but the level of delay would be reduced compared to the

Project. Overall, impacts related to traffic and circulation associated with roadway operations would be decreased under this alternative when compared to the Project.

Utilities

Both the Project and this alternative would be served by the SASD and Regional San. The Project would have a less-than-significant impact on public wastewater service, including disposal or treatment systems. It is noted, however, that the decrease in residential units under this alternative would decrease the wastewater treatment demand compared to the Project. Development under Reduced Project Alternative #1 would also result in a decrease in solid waste generation within the Project site due to the decrease in residential units. Because Reduced Project Alternative #1 would result in a decreased amount of development compared to the Project, water demand would also decrease. Overall, this alternative would have less impacts to utilities when compared to the Project.

REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE #2

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

Under Reduced Project Alternative #2, the Project site would be developed with the same amount of non-residential uses as the Project, but with a reduction in the amount of residential development (non-age-restricted only). When compared to the Project, the area of the Project developed with residential uses would be decreased and there would be an increase in the area preserved as a nature preserve. Developing the entire Project site with 247 fewer residential units would likely result in buildings with a comparable number of stories as the Project. The building setbacks and landscaped areas adjacent to existing and future roadways under this alternative would likely be greater to the Project, which may increase the visual and aesthetic appeal of the site compared to the Project. Overall, this alternative would have reduced impacts to aesthetics when compared to the Project, but the conversion of the Project site to a residential community with a commercial center and parks and recreation uses would still result in a significant and unavoidable impact associated with changes in visual character.

Air Quality

As described in Section 3.2, implementation of the Project would generate emissions during both the construction phase and the operational phase Construction related impacts would be reduced under this alternative when compared to the Project, as the area of ground disturbance would be less, and the duration of construction may be slightly reduced. Under this alternative, mobile source emissions would also slightly decrease. Mobile source (vehicle emissions) are directly related to the number of vehicle trips generated by a project. Under this alternative, the residential uses developed on the Project site would generate approximately 2,228 fewer daily vehicle trips when compared to the Project, as shown in Table 5.0-2, which would generate lower levels of pollutants from mobile sources. Therefore, this alternative would have reduced impacts related to air quality when compared to the Project.

Biological Resources

As described in Section 3.3, while Project implementation is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to biological resources, construction activities associated with the Project would result in impacts to wetlands and ground disturbing activities that may impact or harm biological resources, including special-status species. Under Reduced Project Alternative #2, the Project site would be developed with the same amount of non-residential uses as the Project, but with a reduction in the amount of residential development (247 fewer units). This alternative would increase the area of the site for permanent open space uses compared to the Project. Due to the on-site aquatic resources, this alternative would also be designed to minimize and avoid impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U.S. Because this alternative would require fill of wetlands and waters of the U.S. and conversion of much of the Project site to urban uses, impacts to biological resources would require mitigation similar to the Project to be reduced to less than significant. However, overall, this alternative would have a reduction in impacts to biological resources compared to the Project.

Cultural and Tribal Resources

Reduced Project Alternative #2 would result in ground disturbing activities throughout much of the Project site. The Project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to cultural or historical resources, and Reduced Project Alternative #2 would result in similar risks related to the unintentional discovery of such resources by developing much of the Project site with residential and commercial uses. As such, this impact would be comparable to the Project.

Geology and Soils

Reduced Project Alternative #2 would result in development of 247 fewer residential units than the Project. The future development allowed under this alternative would be exposed to the same level of risk from geologic hazards as the Project. Therefore, this impact under this alternative would be comparable to the Project.

Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change, and Energy

Under Reduced Project Alternative #2, fewer housing units would be constructed on the Project site. Implementation of the Project would generate GHG emissions during construction and operation. Short-term construction GHG emissions are a one-time release of GHGs and are not expected to significantly contribute to global climate change over the lifetime of a project. As noted previously, construction related impacts would be reduced under this alternative when compared to the Project, as the extent of the development footprint and duration of construction activities would be reduced slightly.

Under Reduced Project Alternative #2, there would be less residential development, resulting in a reduced population and a reduction in the number of vehicle trips generated. As such, the mobile greenhouse gas emissions would decrease when compared to the Project and the greenhouse gas emissions impact would be decreased when compared to the Project.

While there would be reduced development under this alternative, it is anticipated that energy-saving measures would be similar to the Project and there would not be a significant change in the potential for wasteful, inefficient, or excessive consumption of energy under this alternative.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Reduced Project Alternative #2 is similar to the Project in that both the Project and this alternative would result in development of the Project site with residential, commercial, and park uses. As described in Chapter 3.7, construction activities may result in the use and transport of common hazardous materials, including oils, fuels, paints and solvents. This potential impact would still occur under Reduced Project Alternative #2. Additionally, the operational phases of both the Project and Reduced Project Alternative #2 would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Future development under Reduced Project Alternative #2 would be subject to the City's General Plan policies, and other local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to hazardous materials. This impact would be similar under this alternative when compared to the Project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Reduced Project Alternative #2 would reduce development by 260 single family units compared to the Project and result in an increase in permanent open space. While this alternative would result in a reduced amount of land covered with impervious surfaces compared to the Project, stormwater would be directed to on-site detention basin(s) and landscaped areas, and the storm drainage system would be designed to ensure that post-construction runoff volumes do not exceed pre-development conditions similar to the Project. Because the alternative would be required to implement improvements in order to manage and treat stormwater flows from the site, impacts related to water quality would be similar.

As described in Chapter 3.8, Project implementation has the potential to result in the discharge of pollutants into detention basins, and would change the existing drainage pattern on the site, although these impacts are less than significant as a result of compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. Under Reduced Project Alternative #2, these impacts would be similar to the Project. Overall, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would not be significantly improved under Reduced Project Alternative #2 when compared to the Project.

Land Use

Reduced Project Alternative #2 would also require a change of the Project site's General Plan Land Use designation from Planning Area to LDR, MDR, HDR, C, P/OS, and NR designations. Under this alternative, the Project site would be developed with similar uses as the Project. The analysis in Section 3.9 concluded that the Project would not result in any significant land use impacts. The decrease in units and decreased development footprint associated with this alternative would not conflict with the adopted MTP/SCS and would result in comparable residential net densities on the Project site when compared to the Developing Community assumptions for the Project site. Reduced Project Alternative #2 would also not result in

significant land use impacts. Therefore, this alternative would have similar impacts to the Project.

Noise and Vibration

As described in Section 3.10, the primary sources of noise associated with implementation of the Project are from increased vehicle trips on study area roadways in the Project vicinity from on-site uses, and increased noise from future operation within the Project site. The Project is estimated to generate approximately 11,606 new external vehicle trips on a daily basis. Under this alternative, noise associated with vehicle trips is expected to decrease due to approximately 2,228 fewer daily vehicle trips due to the decrease in residential units, while other on-site noise sources would likely be comparable to those generated by the Project. This alternative would generate fewer daily vehicle trips and peak hour trips, which would generate decreased noise levels on area roadways. Similar to the Project, this alternative would expose future residential uses to noise sources. Overall, due to the decrease in anticipated vehicle trips, this impact would be decreased under this alternative when compared to the Project.

Population and Housing

This alternative would result in the construction of fewer housing units over a comparable area as the Project. As discussed in Section 3.11, the Project would be a residential and commercial mixed use development, resulting in the addition of up to 1,725 residential units in total. This would allow for a maximum population of approximately 4,4319 residents, based on the number of units planned for development.

Under Reduced Project Alternative #2, the Project site would be developed with 247 fewer single-family units than the Project and would have similar commercial uses, recreation, park uses, and a preserve. While this alternative would add fewer residents as compared with the Project, impacts related to population and housing would be comparable to the Project as neither this alternative nor the Project would conflict with applicable population forecasts.

Public Services and Recreation

This alternative would result in a decrease in the number of housing units by 247 units compared to the Project. As described in Section 3.12, implementation of the Project would result in an increase in demand for police and fire protection services, as well as increased demand for schools, parks, and other public facilities. As discussed previously, there would be a reduction in the population generated under this alternative when compared to the Project. As such, this alternative would have a decreased demand for public services compared to the Project and, similar to the Project, not result in need for construction, relocation, or expansion of facilities for public services and recreation, other than the park and recreation uses proposed as part of the alternative. Therefore, physical environmental impacts related to public services and recreation would be comparable to the Project.

Transportation and Circulation

As described above, this alternative would result in a decrease in total daily vehicle trips when compared to the Project, which would in turn decrease the peak hour AM and PM vehicle trips.

The Project is estimated to generate up to 11,606 new daily trips, with 841 and 1,102 trips occurring during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. Under this alternative, the decrease in residential units would result in a reduction of 2,228 daily trips, as shown in Table 5.0-2. The trip generation for this alternative was calculated using the same trip generation rates as the Project that were provided by Kimley-Horn (June 12, 2019). The related decrease in AM and PM peak hour trips under this alternative would generate decreased traffic levels on area roadways when compared to the Project. This has the potential to decrease impacts to area roadways and intersections, in particular, the impact at Intersection #21, Sunrise Boulevard/White Rock Road is anticipated to be reduced to less than significant resulting from a decrease in delay compared to the Project. The remaining potentially significant impacts would not be avoided under this alternative, but the level of delay would be reduced compared to the Project. Overall, impacts related to traffic and circulation associated with roadway operations would be decreased under this alternative when compared to the Project.

Utilities

Both the Project and this alternative would be served by the SASD and Regional San. The Project would have a less-than-significant impact on public wastewater service, including disposal or treatment systems. It is noted, however, that the decrease in residential units under this alternative would decrease the wastewater treatment demand compared to the Project. Development under Reduced Project Alternative #2 would also result in a decrease in solid waste generation within the Project site due to the decrease in residential units. Because Reduced Project Alternative #2 would result in a decreased amount of development compared to the Project, water demand would also decrease. Overall, this alternative would have less impacts to utilities when compared to the Project.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the alternatives that are analyzed in the EIR. If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, an EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2)). The environmentally superior alternative is that alternative with the least adverse environmental impacts when compared to the Project.

A comparative analysis of the Project and each of the Project alternatives is provided in Table 5.0-3 below. The table includes a numerical scoring system, which assigns a score of “2,” “3,” or “4” to the Project and each of the alternatives with respect to how each alternative compares to the Project in terms of the severity of the environmental topics addressed in this EIR. A score of “2” indicates that the alternative would have a better (or lessened) impact when compared to the Project. A score of “3” indicates that the alternative would have the same (or equal) level of impact when compared to the Project. A score of “4” indicates that the alternative would have a worse (or greater) impact when compared to the Project. The Project alternative with the lowest total score is considered the environmentally superior alternative.

TABLE 5.0-3: COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE PROJECT IMPACTS TO THE PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE	*PROJECT*	*NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE*	*REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE #1*	*REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE #2*
Aesthetics and Visual Resources	3 – Same	4 - Greater	2 – Less	2 – Less
Air Quality	3 – Same	4 – Greater	2 – Less	2 – Less
Biological Resources	3 – Same	4 - Greater	2 – Less	2 - Less
Cultural and Tribal Resources	3 – Same	3 – Same	3 – Same	3 – Same
Geology and Soils	3 – Same	3 - Same	3 - Same	3 - Same
Greenhouse Gas, Climate Change, and Energy	3 – Same	4 – Greater	4 – Greater	4 - Worse
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	3 – Same	3 – Same	3 – Same	3 – Same
Hydrology and Water Quality	3 – Same	3 – Same	3 – Same	3 – Same
Land Use	3 – Same	3 – Same	3 – Same	3 – Same
Noise and Vibration	3 – Same	4 – Greater	2 – Less	2 – Less
Population and Housing	3 – Same	3 - Same	2 – Less	2 – Less
Public Services and Recreation	3 – Same	4 - Greater	2 – Less	3 - Same
Transportation and Circulation	3 – Same	4 – Greater	2 – Less	2 – Less
Utilities	3 – Same	3 - Same	2 – Less	2 – Less
Summary	**42**	**49**	**35**	**36**

As shown in Table 5.0-3, the No Project Alternative would result in 49 points, Reduced Project Alternative #1 would result in 35 points, and Reduced Project Alternative #2 would result in 36 points. However, because Reduced Project Alternative #2 would reduce the extent of development, including the acreage and number of residential units and associated population, more than Reduced Project Alternative #1, impacts of Reduced Project Alternative #2 associated with air quality, noise, and traffic would be reduced more than Reduced Project Alternative #1. Therefore, Reduced Project Alternative #2 is the next environmentally superior alternative to the Project. It is noted that the superior alternative would depend on the City's local priorities (i.e., traffic impacts to the regional roadway system, maintenance of public services and utilities services, etc.), as well as the ability to meet the Project's objectives. It is noted, however, that this alternative would not eliminate the significant and unavoidable impact related to aesthetics that would occur under the Project. Each alternative's ability to satisfy the Project objectives is discussed in the following section.

5.4 COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES TO SATISFY PROJECT OBJECTIVES

This section examines how each of the alternatives selected for more detailed analysis meets the Project objectives.

1. *Create a high-quality development that implements the vision of the General Plan, which designates the Project site for development with a local town center, a mix of residential densities, and a natural resources preserve.*

The No Project Alternative would satisfy this Project objective because under this alternative, the project site would be developed consistent with the General Plan land use designation and the SACOG MTP/SCS vision for the site. Under Reduced Project Alternative #1, the Project site would be developed with the same amount of non-residential uses as the Project, but with a reduction in the amount of residential development (age-restricted and non-age-restricted). Under Reduced Project Alternative #2, the Project site would be developed with the same amount of non-residential uses as the Project, but with a reduction in the amount of residential development (non-age-restricted only). Therefore, Reduced Project Alternatives #1 and #2 would achieve this objective.

2. *Respect the Project site's existing natural features through preservation of 199.5 acres of wetlands, vernal pools, and open space.*

The No Project Alternative would satisfy this Project objective because under this alternative, a wetland preserve area would be provided; however, the preserve would be smaller than that associated with the Project. Similarly, Reduced Project Alternatives #1 and #2 would also provide preserve areas comparable to or larger than the Project. Therefore, Reduced Project Alternatives #1 and #2 would achieve this objective.

3. *Provide a residential development that would assist the City in meeting its housing needs, including a range of housing types to serve the senior population.*

The No Project Alternative would satisfy this Project objective because this alternative would include a range of housing types, although the ultimate types (including single family versus multifamily and age-restricted versus non-age-restricted) of units is unknown at this time but has been estimated for the purpose of this analysis. Reduced Project Alternative #1 also meets this objective because the alternative would provide a range of housing types for various age groups. However, because this alternative would reduce the amount of total housing by 127 units, this objective would be met to a lesser extent than the Project. Similarly, Reduced Project Alternative #2 meets this objective because the alternative would provide a range of housing types for various age groups. However, because this alternative would reduce the amount of total housing by 247 units, this objective would be met to a lesser extent than the Project.

4. *Provide a residential development that would assist the City in meeting its affordability goals providing housing at many price points and attract residents from different areas.*

Similar to objective number three above, the No Project Alternative would satisfy this Project objective because this alternative would include ample residential housing at many price points, although the ultimate types (including single family versus multifamily and age-restricted versus non-age-restricted) of units is unknown at this time. Reduced Project Alternative #1 also meets

this objective because the alternative would provide a range of housing types for various income groups. However, because this alternative would reduce the amount of total housing by 127 units, this objective would be met to a lesser extent than the Project. Similarly, Reduced Project Alternative #2 meets this objective because the alternative would provide a range of housing types for various income groups. However, because this alternative would reduce the amount of total housing by 247 units, this objective would be met to a lesser extent than the Project.

5. *Create of a unique age-restricted community that provides a mix of housing types and amenities, including a club house and recreation facility.*

Depending on the ultimate housing types, the No Project Alternative would satisfy this Project objective because under this alternative, a mix of housing types and amenities would be provided. However, uncertainty regarding the level of amenities and number of age-restricted units could prevent the No Project Alternative from fully satisfying this objective. Reduced Project Alternative #1 would meet this objective to a lesser extent than the Project because the alternative would reduce the number of age-restricted units by 82. Reduced Project Alternative #2 would meet this objective by a lesser extent as well because the alternative would provide 42 fewer age-restricted units than the Project.

6. *Accommodate neighborhood-serving commercial uses as part of the town center.*

All three alternatives would achieve this object because all of the alternatives would include a town center area with neighborhood-serving commercial uses.

7. *Implement the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans through providing an on-site bicycle and pedestrian network that is accessible by the general public and provides opportunities for connectivity with bicycle and pedestrian facilities on adjacent properties.*

The No Project Alternative would satisfy this Project objective because under this alternative, the site would be developed consistent with the General Plan land use designation for the site, and the General Plan incorporates the provisions of the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans. Both Reduced Project Alternative #1 and Reduced Project Alternative #2 would also achieve this objective by providing ample pedestrian and bicycle facilities throughout the Project site, which would connect to adjacent properties.

This page is intentionally left blank.