VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

PURPOSE

The purpose of the alternatives analysis of this EIR is to assess a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the project and to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives (*CEQA Guidelines* §15126.6). The *Guidelines* state that the selection of alternatives should be governed by a "rule of reason." CEQA also states that, "[t]he EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project." Generally, significant impacts of an alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the proposed project, and should provide decision makers perspective as well as a reasoned choice.

ASSUMPTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

To develop project alternatives, the EIR preparers considered the project objectives and reviewed the significant impacts in Section IV of this EIR, identified those significant impacts that could be avoided or reduced substantially through an alternative (refer to Table VI-1 at the end of this section).

The objectives of the project are as follows:

- Provide new homes in the City of Pacifica, a portion of which would be affordable to low- to medium-income families.
- Create a model Green Building Development.
    - ◊ Demonstrate reduced impacts on City systems and the environment.
    - ◊ Balance energy production and energy used.
    - ◊ Use photovoltaic electricity production, solar thermal for water and space heat.
    - ◊ Reduce fossil fuel demand by subsidizing the use of Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicles.
    - ◊ Establish community bio-intensive food production.
- Demonstrate to the development community that there is a market for this type of project.
- Restore the remaining undeveloped area to its natural habitat.

No significant impacts remain with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures for the environmental issue areas listed below. Impacts associated with the following topics would be significant without the implementation of mitigation measures, but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level if the mitigation measures recommended in this EIR are implemented.

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Traffic and Circulation

Significant and unavoidable impacts were identified related to Aesthetics.

The following discussion is provided to meet the requirement of the *CEQA Guidelines* and provide the public and decision makers with information that will help them understand the adverse impacts and benefits associated with four potential alternatives to the proposed project. However, it is important to understand that none of the alternatives presented is necessary to avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. A discussion of the environmentally superior alternative is also provided.

Alternatives Considered but Rejected

Alternate Project Site Alternative

This alternative considered development of the proposed project on an alternate site in the City of Pacifica. However, this alternative was rejected for further analysis because the project applicant does not own any other property that would be feasible for this project or that could accommodate the density of this project in the City of Pacifica and can not "reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to [an] alternative site" (refer to §15126.[f][1] of the *CEQA Guidelines*). Thus, this alternative was deemed infeasible.

SELECTED ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A – No Project Alternative: No Build

Under Alternative A, the proposed project would not be constructed, and the project site would remain in its current condition. The analysis of Alternative A assumes the continuation of existing conditions. The potential environmental impacts associated with Alternative A are described below and are compared to the significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project.

Aesthetics

Under Alternative A, remnants of the old asphalt road present on the proposed project site would not be demolished and the project site would not be graded. This EIR concluded that project impacts related to scenic vistas, visual character would be significant and unavoidable. Impacts to light and glare would be less than significant. Under Alternative A, no new development would occur on the site, and this alternative would eliminate significant and unavoidable impacts related to Aesthetics. However, under this alternative, the hiking trail would not be built and the illegally dumped trash and garden waste would not be removed from the site.

Air Quality

Under Alternative A, no demolition, grading, or construction would occur at the project site. Thus, this Alternative would not generate any fugitive dust or other pollutant emissions associated with demolition and construction activities at the site. Implementation of Alternative A would eliminate the project-specific significant (but mitigatable) impacts related to construction/demolition emissions. The EIR concluded that project impacts related to long-term operation of the project, the project's consistency with the applicable air quality management plan (AQMP), and toxic air contaminants (TACs) would result in less-than-significant impacts. Impacts related to construction and demolition emissions would be significant but with implementation of prescribed mitigation measures, would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Under Alternative A, no new development would occur on the site, and no new traffic trips would be generated. As such, Alternative A would not generate any new pollutant emissions associated with long-term operation of a mixed-use development and would eliminate the project's ***less-than-significant*** air quality impacts associated with long-term operation of the project, construction emissions, and consistency with the AQMP, and TACs.

Cultural Resources

Under Alternative A, no new structures would be developed on the project site and grading and construction activities would not occur. The EIR concluded that project impacts related to archaeological and paleontological resources would be significant and with implementation of mitigation, these impacts would be less than significant. Because no new development would occur under this alternative, the archaeological resources that could exist on the project site would not be disturbed. Thus, this Alternative would not result in impacts.

Geology & Soils

Under Alternative A, no grading or construction of new structures and infrastructure would occur at the project site. This EIR concluded that project impacts related to seismic ground shaking, ground failure, and expansive soils would be significant and with implementation of mitigation, these impacts would be less than significant. Because no new development would occur, this Alternative would not result in significant geology and soils impacts.

Hydrology & Water Quality

Under Alternative A, no grading, construction of new structures and infrastructure, or drainage improvements would occur at the project site. This EIR concluded that project impacts related to water quality could be significant and with implementation of mitigation, these impacts would be less than significant. Project impacts related to alteration of existing drainage patterns and runoff in the project area could also be significant and would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Under Alternative A, because no development would occur, no water quality or drainage patterns would occur.

Noise

Under Alternative A, no construction or development would occur on the project site. This EIR concluded that project impacts related to substantial temporary or periodic increases in noise associated with construction activities could be significant, and implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Because no construction would occur and no residential units would be developed under Alternative A, these significant (but mitigatable) project impacts would be eliminated. This EIR also concluded that project impacts related to excessive construction-related groundbourne vibration, excessive operational groundbourne vibration, and substantial permanent increases in noise would be less than significant. Because no construction would occur, no residential units would be developed, and no traffic would be generated under Alternative A, this alternative would eliminate these less-than-significant project impacts.

Transportation/Traffic

Under Alternative A, no development on the project site would occur, and no traffic trips would be generated. Thus, this alternative would eliminate the proposed project's less-than-significant impacts related to intersection operation (project condition) and the project's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts.

Relationship of Alternative A to the Project Objectives

Alternative A would not meet any of the project objectives as they are focused primarily on the development of a new residential community in the City of Pacifica that highlights Green Building concepts. Because Alternative A would not involve any construction and no new residential development would occur, the project objectives would not be met.

Alternative B – Redistribution of Units

Alternative B would maintain the existing General Plan land use designations which would allow one unit on the western 7.5 acres of the site and 33 units on the eastern 3.7-acre portion of the site. Because the site plan under Alternative B would be consistent with the General Plan, a General Plan Amendment would not be required for project implementation. The residential units under Alternative B would be clustered on the eastern portion of the site, which is opposite of the proposed project, which all units would be sited

on the western two acres of the site. Under this Alternative, 33 of the proposed units would be sited atop the hill currently located in the eastern portion of the project site. The hiking trail and community gardens would be sited on the western 7.5 acres of the project site but would be reduced in size to accommodate a smaller available area. The amphitheatre would still be developed on the western edge of the project site. The number of parking spaces would not change from that under the proposed project but the subterranean structure would be eliminated and parking for the proposed residential units would be in the form of multiple-car surface parking lots in accordance with the City of Pacifica Zoning Code.

Aesthetics

Alternative B includes development of 34 residential structures, one of which would be sited on the western parcel of the project site and the remaining 33 to be sited on the eastern parcel. Alternative B would involve construction of the eastern 33 units at a higher and more prominent elevation than what is proposed under the project. The EIR concluded that impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic resources within a scenic highway and visual character would be significant and unavoidable and that impacts related to light and glare would be less than significant with recommended mitigation. The bulk and massing of the proposed structures would be similar under this Alternative, and their location on the project site would result in ***significant and unavoidable*** impacts, similar to the proposed project. Since the amount of development would not change under this alternative, impacts related to light and glare would be ***less than significant***, similar as with the proposed project.

Air Quality

Alternative B would include the siting of all but one of the residential structures on the eastern portion of the project site. During the demolition and construction phase for this alternative, fugitive dust and other pollutant emissions would be generated, and without proper control measures, construction/demolition emissions associated with Alternative B could be significant, similar to the proposed project. However, the mitigation measures prescribed in Section IV.F, Other Impacts, for the proposed project would also apply to this Alternative, reducing construction/demolition emissions to a less-than-significant level, similar to the proposed project. This EIR concluded that project impacts related to long-term operation of the project, the project's consistency with the AQMP, and TACs would result in less-than-significant impacts. Under Alternative B, similar development would occur on the project site, and the same amount of daily traffic trips would be generated than under the proposed project. As such, Alternative B would result in ***less-than-significant*** impacts related to long-term operational impacts, consistency with the AQMP, and TACs, similar to the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Development of Alternative B would involve the siting of almost all structures on the eastern parcel of the site. The EIR concluded that impacts related to impacts on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; movement of species; riparian habitats; and Federally Protected Wetlands could be significant and, with implementation of mitigation measures, would be less than significant. The total developed area on the

project site under Alternative B would be less because more of the proposed units would be developed in a smaller portion of the project site. As such, impacts mentioned above could be reduced to ***less-than-significant*** levels with mitigation measures, but would be less than under the proposed project. As shown in Figure IV.B-1, willow scrub and potential jurisdictional wetlands are potentially present in the western portion of the project site. Because development would be less under this Alternative, impacts to these resources would be less than the proposed project. Impacts to riparian habitats and Federally Protected Wetlands would be ***less than significant***, and would be less than under the proposed project. Impacts related to the movement of species would be ***less than significant*** but would be less than under the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Development under Alternative B would site 33 of the structures in the eastern portion of the project site, and one unit in the western portion of the site. The EIR concluded that impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources could be significant and that with implementation of mitigation measures, this impact would be less than significant. This Alternative involves redistribution of units and would decrease the total developed area on the project site because more of the proposed units would be developed in a smaller portion of the project site. In addition, the subterranean garage would not be constructed under this Alternative. As such, a lesser chance of disturbing archaeological resources would be possible under this Alternative. With implementation of the mitigation measures included in Section IV.B, this impact would be ***less than significant***, and would be less than under the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

Alternative B would involve a greater developed area of the project site as the eastern portion of the project would accommodate 33 of the 34 proposed with one residential unit on the western portion of the site. In addition, the subterranean garage would not be constructed under this Alternative. The EIR concluded that impacts related to seismic ground shaking, landslides, unstable geologic units, and expansive soils could be significant but with implementation of mitigation measures, would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Development that would occur under Alternative B would be different than under the proposed project but would be subject to similar recommendations made in the geotechnical report for the proposed project. However, activities related to earth moving that would have potential effects related to geology and soils would be greater under this Alternative as a larger area of the site would need to be graded to accommodate the units that would be located on the eastern portion of the site. Through adherence to the recommendations in the geotechnical investigation, impacts related to geology and soils hazards would be ***less than significant***, and would be greater than the proposed project.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Alternative B would involve a smaller developed area than under the proposed project but a larger area of the site would need to be graded to accommodate the units that would be located on the eastern portion of the site. The EIR concluded that that project impacts related to water quality could be significant and with

implementation of mitigation, these impacts would be less than significant. Because of the reasons mentioned above, project impacts related to alteration of existing drainage patterns and runoff in the project area could also be significant and could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels but would be greater than under the proposed project. However, under Alternative B could be similarly reduced to ***less-than-significant*** levels.

Noise

Alternative B would include development of 34 residential units, 33 of which would bee sited on the eastern portion of the project site, closer to the nearby SeaCrest development. Thus, Alternative B would also result in significant impacts related to substantial temporary or periodic increases in noise associated with construction activities and less-than-significant impacts related to excessive construction-related groundbourne vibration and substantial permanent increases in noise. Implementation of the mitigation measures prescribed for the proposed project for the significant noise impacts would apply to Alternative B, reducing the impacts to a ***less-than-significant*** level.

Traffic and Transportation

Alternative B would include development of 34 residential units on the proposed project site, similar to the project. This EIR concluded that project impacts related to intersection operation (project and cumulative condition), would be less than significant. However, impacts associated with hazards due to a design feature could be identified under this Alternative if access to the project site was located in the eastern edge. This is due to the speed of motorists traveling along Fassler Avenue adjacent to this portion of the site. Because this alternative would generate the same amount of traffic trips as the proposed project, impacts related to intersection operation would also be ***less than significant***, similar to the proposed project. However, because of the design feature that could be part of this Alternative, impacts related to traffic hazards would be greater than under the proposed project and ***significant.***.

Relationship of Alternative B to the Project Objectives

Assuming the design is economically feasible and could integrate the principles of Green Building., Alternative B would meet all the project objectives as it would provide new homes in the City of Pacifica that and would also meet the objective of returning the remaining undeveloped areas of the project site to its natural habitat as the associated amenities described in Chapter III would be implemented.

Alternative C – Reduced Density

Alternative C assumes the project site would be developed with 12 units, which is approximately 65 percent fewer units than proposed by the project. The reduced number of units under this Alternative is based on the lowest density permitted under the proposed re-designation of the western parcel of the site from Open Space Residential to Low Density Residential, which, at a minimum, would allow three units per acre. The site plan configuration would be similar to the proposed project, but 22 units would be

eliminated and the outdoor area associated with each unit would be increased. The subterranean garage would be reduced accordingly. Similar to the proposed project, the residential units would be a mix of two and three stories. The net density of the development under Alternative C would be one dwelling units per net acre, approximately two units per net acre less than the proposed project. The units that would not be constructed under this Alternative would primarily be the southernmost units. Specifically, units one through eight, 13 through 22, and units 25 though 28 (refer to Figure III-5) would not be constructed under this Alternative. The remaining 12 units on the northern portion of the project site would be constructed similar to the proposed project. Circulation and access for Alternative C would be the same as described for the proposed project in Section III, Project Description.

Aesthetics

Alternative C involved the development of 12 residential structures, 22 fewer than with the proposed project. This EIR concluded that project impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic resources within a scenic highway, and visual character would be significant and unavoidable and impacts to light and glare would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Under this Alternative, the massing, height, siting, and architecture of the structures that would be developed would be similar to those proposed under the project. However, the structures that contribute to the significant and unavoidable impacts related to scenic vistas and scenic resources within a scenic highway would be reduced. Under Alternative C, the views from Fassler Avenue would not be adversely altered and, as such, impacts within a scenic highway (Fassler Avenue) would not be substantially damaged, as under the proposed project. As shown in Figures IV.A-4 and IV.A-5, the westernmost structures are those that contribute to the identified aesthetic impacts of the project. Under Alternative C, impacts related to scenic vistas and scenic resources within a scenic highway would be less than the proposed project and would be reduced to ***less-than-significant*** levels with the identified mitigation measures. Impacts related to light and glare would be ***less than significant***, similar to the proposed project.

Air Quality

Alternative C would include the development of 12 residential structures, 22 fewer than with the proposed project. During the demolition and construction phase for this alternative, fugitive dust and other pollutant emissions would be generated, and without proper control measures, construction/demolition emissions associated with Alternative C could be significant, similar to the proposed project. However, the mitigation measures prescribed in Section IV.F, Other Impacts, for the proposed project would also apply to this Alternative, reducing construction/demolition emissions to a less-than-significant level, similar to the proposed project. This EIR concluded that project impacts related to long-term operation of the project, the project's consistency with the AQMP, and TACs would result in less-than-significant impacts. Under Alternative C, less development would occur on the project site, and the fewer daily traffic trips would be generated than under the proposed project. As such, Alternative C would result in ***less-than-significant*** impacts related to long-term operational impacts, consistency with the AQMP, and TACs, but would be less than the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Development under Alternative C would include 12 residential units, 22 fewer than under the proposed project. The EIR concluded that impacts related to impacts on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; movement of species; riparian habitats; and Federally Protected Wetlands could be significant and, with implementation of mitigation measures, would be less than significant. Because of the reduced density under this Alternative, impacts mentioned above could be reduced to ***less-than-significant*** levels with mitigation measures, but would be less than under the proposed project. As shown in Figure IV.B-1, willow scrub and potential jurisdictional wetlands are present in the western portion of the project site. Because development would be significantly reduced under this Alternative, impacts to these resources would be less than the proposed project as they could be avoided entirely. Impacts to riparian habitats and Federally Protected Wetlands would be ***less than significant***, and would be less than under the proposed project. Impacts related to the movement of species would be ***less than significant*** but would be less than under the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Development under Alternative C would include 12 residential units, 22 fewer than under the proposed project. The EIR concluded that impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources could be significant and that with implementation of mitigation measures, this impact would be less than significant. Because development under Alternative C would be smaller in area to the proposed project, impacts would also be ***less than significant*** but would be less than the proposed project.

Geology & Soils

Alternative C would include grading and site preparation and development of 12 residential structures and a subterranean parking structure that would be reduced in size to accommodate the reduced number of units. The EIR concluded that impacts related to seismic ground shaking, landslides, unstable geologic units, and expansive soils could be significant but with implementation of mitigation measures, would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Although development that would occur under Alternative C would be less than under the project, recommendation contained in the geotechnical investigation would be relevant for development under Alternative C. Through adherence to those recommendations, impacts related to geology and soils hazards would be ***less than significant***, similar to the proposed project.

Hydrology & Water Quality

Alternative C would include grading activities, development of drainage improvements at the project site, and development of 12 residential structures and subterranean parking structure. This EIR concluded that project impacts related to water quality could be significant and with implementation of mitigation, these impacts would be less than significant. Project impacts related to alteration of existing drainage patterns and runoff in the project area could also be significant and could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Under Alternative C, because of construction requirements, the amount of impervious surfaces,

future use of the site, and development of BMPs under this Alternative would be similar to the proposed project, impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be ***less than significant***, but would be less than the proposed project.

Noise

Alternative C would include development of 12 residential units, 22 fewer than under the proposed project. Alternative C could also result in significant impacts related to substantial temporary or periodic increases in noise associated with construction activities and less-than-significant impacts related to excessive construction-related groundbourne vibration and substantial permanent increases in noise. Implementation of the mitigation measures prescribed for the proposed project for the significant noise impacts would apply to Alternative B, reducing the impacts to a ***less-than-significant*** level, but would be less than the proposed project.

Transportation/Traffic

Alternative C would include development of 12 residential units on the proposed project site, 22 fewer than the proposed project. This EIR concluded that project impacts related to intersection operation (project condition) and that the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant. Because this alternative would generate fewer traffic trips than the proposed project, impacts related to intersection operation would also be ***less than significant***, but would be less than under the proposed project.

Relationship of Alternative C to the Project Objectives

If this design could integrate principles of Green Building, this alternative would meet most of the project objectives as it would provide new homes in the City of Pacifica and would also meet the objective of returning the remaining undeveloped areas of the project site to its natural habitat as the associated amenities described in Chapter III would be implemented. However, this impact may not meet the objective that would "demonstrate to the development community that there is a market for this type of project". This Alternative may not meet this objective because at the reduced density identified, it is unclear whether the project would be economically feasible and would ultimately succeed. Also, given the reduced number of units, it would most likely not provide the same number of units of affordable housing as the proposed project.

Alternative D – Modified Site Plan

Under Alternative D, Units #1 through #4 and Unit #13 and #18 on the site plan (see Figure III-5) would be sited in the northern portion of the western parcel, east of Unit #12. The subterranean garage would be constructed as under the proposed project. The proposed amenities located on the eastern portion of the site would remain the same as would access and circulation.

Aesthetics

Alternative D includes development of 34 residential structures, but the site plan of the proposed project would be altered to relocate the structures in the southwestern corner of the project site. The EIR concluded that impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic resources within a scenic highway, and visual character would be significant and unavoidable and that impacts related to light and glare would be less than significant with recommended mitigation. The bulk and massing of the proposed structures would be similar under this Alternative, but the location would, with mitigation, reduce these impacts to a ***less-than-significant*** level. Since the amount of development would not change under this alternative, impacts related to light and glare would be ***less than significant***, similar as with the proposed project.

Air Quality

Alternative D would include relocation of six of the proposed structures from the southwest portion of the site to the northeastern portion of the western parcel. During the demolition and construction phase for this alternative, fugitive dust and other pollutant emissions would be generated, and without proper control measures, construction/demolition emissions associated with Alternative D could be significant, similar to the proposed project. However, the mitigation measures prescribed in Section IV.F, Other Impacts, for the proposed project would also apply to this Alternative, reducing construction/demolition emissions to a less-than-significant level, similar to the proposed project. This EIR concluded that project impacts related to long-term operation of the project, the project's consistency with the AQMP, and TACs would result in less-than-significant impacts. Under Alternative D, similar development would occur on the project site, and the same amount of daily traffic trips would be generated than under the proposed project. As such, Alternative B would result in ***less-than-significant*** impacts related to long-term operational impacts, consistency with the AQMP, and TACs, similar to the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Alternative D would include relocation of six of the proposed structures from the southwest portion of the site to the northeastern portion of the western parcel. The EIR concluded that impacts related to impacts on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; movement of species; could be significant and, with implementation of mitigation measures, would be less than significant. Because under this Alternative the units would be relocated, impacts mentioned above could be reduced to ***less-than-significant*** levels with mitigation measures, similar to the proposed project. However, impacts to riparian habitats and Federally Protected Wetlands would be greater as the units that would be relocated under this Alternative would potentially impede into these areas (refer to Figure IV.B-1). As such, impacts to these resources would be greater than under the project, but could similarly be reduced to ***less-than-significant*** levels.

Cultural Resources

Alternative D includes development of the project site similar to the proposed project but six of the units would be moved to a different portion of the project site. The EIR concluded that the proposed project

could result in impacts related to archaeological and paleontological resources but with mitigation, this impact could be reduced to a less-than-significant level. This Alternative would also result in ***less-than-significant*** impacts, similar to the proposed project.

Geology & Soils

Alternative D would include grading and site preparation and development of 34 residential structures, similar to the proposed project. The EIR concluded that impacts related to seismic ground shaking, landslides, unstable geologic units, and expansive soils could be significant but with implementation of mitigation measures, would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Development that would occur under Alternative D would be relatively similar to that under the proposed project and would be subject to similar recommendations made in the geotechnical report for the proposed project. Through adherence to those recommendations, impacts related to geology and soils hazards would be ***less than significant***, similar to the proposed project.

Hydrology & Water Quality

Alternative D would include grading activities, development of drainage improvements at the project site, and development of 34 residential structures on a modified site plan. This EIR concluded that project impacts related to water quality could be significant and with implementation of mitigation, these impacts would be less than significant. Project impacts related to alteration of existing drainage patterns and runoff in the project area could also be significant and could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Under Alternative D, because of construction requirements, the amount of impervious surfaces, future use of the site, and development of BMPs under this Alternative would be similar to the proposed project, impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be ***less than significant***, similar to the proposed project.

Noise

Alternative D would include the development of 34 residential uses on a modified site plan. Alternative D could also result in significant impacts related to substantial temporary or periodic increases in noise associated with construction activities and less-than-significant impacts related to excessive construction-related groundbourne vibration and substantial permanent increases in noise. Implementation of the mitigation measures prescribed for the proposed project for the significant noise impacts would apply to Alternative D, reducing the impacts to a ***less-than-significant*** level.

Transportation/Traffic

Alternative D would include development of 34 residential units on a modified site plan. This EIR concluded that project impacts related to intersection operation (project condition) and the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant. Because this alternative would generate

the same amount of traffic trips as the proposed project, impacts related to intersection operation would also be ***less than significant***, similar to the proposed project.

Relationship of Alternative D to the Project Objectives

Assuming such a design is economically feasible and could integrate the principles of Green Building, this alternative would meet the project objectives as it would provide new homes in the City of Pacifica. This Alternative would also meet the objective of returning the remaining undeveloped areas of the project site to its natural habitat as the associated amenities described in Chapter III would be implemented.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires that an EIR alternatives analysis include designation of an "environmentally superior" alternative. Based on the analysis presented in this section, Alternative A, the No Project Alternative, would result in the greatest reduction in project impacts and would be the environmentally superior alternative. However, CEQA requires that if the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives (*CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6[e][2]). Based on the analysis provided above and in the Alternatives Comparison Table below (Table VI-1), it has been determined that Alternative C (Reduced Density Alternative) would be the environmentally superior alternative, because this alternative would result in the greatest reduction in significant project impacts.

Table VI-1
Alternatives Comparison

IMPACT AREA	IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT	ALTERNATIVE B Redistribution of Units	ALTERNATIVE C Reduced Density	ALTERNATIVE C Modified Site Plan
Aesthetics				
Scenic Vistas	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Visual Character	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Scenic Roadway	Significant and Unavoidable	Significant and Unavoidable	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Light and Glare	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Air Quality				
Air Quality Management Plan	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant
Construction/Demolition Emissions	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Regional Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10}	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant
TACs	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant
Cumulative Impacts	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant
Sensitive Receptors	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant
Odors	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant
Biological Resources				
Candidate, Sensitive, Special Status Species	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Riparian Habitats	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Federally Protected Wetlands	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Movement of Species	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Cultural Resources				
Archaeological and Paleontological Resources	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Geology & Soils				
Strong seismic ground shaking	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Landslides	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Unstable geologic unit	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Expansive Soils	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Hydrology & Water Quality				
Water Quality	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Alteration of Existing Drainage	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Runoff	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation

Table VI-1
Alternatives Comparison

IMPACT AREA	IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT	ALTERNATIVE B Redistribution of Units	ALTERNATIVE C Reduced Density	ALTERNATIVE C Modified Site Plan
Noise				
Substantial Temporary or Periodic Increases	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant
Excessive Construction-Related Groundborne Vibration	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation
Exposure of Persons to Existing Excessive Noise Levels	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant
Excessive Operational Groundborne Vibration	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant
Transportation and Traffic				
Substantial Increase in traffic	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant

This page left blank intentionally.