

## **8.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

---

### **8.1 INTRODUCTION**

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project, or to the location of the Project, which could feasibly achieve most of its basic objectives, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects identified in the EIR analysis. An EIR is not required to consider every conceivable alternative to a proposed project. Rather, an EIR must consider a reasonable range of alternatives that are potentially feasible; an EIR is not required to consider alternatives that are infeasible. In addition, an EIR should evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. Therefore, this section of the EIR sets forth potential alternatives to the Project and evaluates them, as required by CEQA.

Key provisions of the CEQA Guidelines relating to the alternatives analysis (Section 15126.6 et seq.) are summarized below:

- The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.
- The “No Project” alternative shall be evaluated along with its impact. The “No Project” analysis shall discuss the existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project is not approved.
- The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason”; therefore, the EIR must evaluate only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.
- For alternative locations, only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR.
- An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.

October 2006

---

### **8.1.1 Rationale for Selecting Potentially Feasible Alternatives**

The alternatives must include a no project alternative, a different type of project, modification of the proposed project, or suitable alternative project sites. However, the range of alternatives discussed in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” which CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(3) defines as:

*...set[ting] forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making.*

Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives (as described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1)) are environmental impacts, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the project proponent could reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to an alternative site. An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effects could not be reasonably identified, and whose implementation is remote or speculative.

For purposes of this analysis, the project alternatives are evaluated to determine the extent to which they attain the basic project objectives, while significantly lessening any significant effects of the project. One of the core primary objectives of the Project is to implement the NMC General Plan, which was adopted by the City on January 7, 1998. Those objectives include, among others:

- Accommodate development in accordance with the organizational principles and standards contained in the NMC General Plan as implemented through subsequent detailed specific plans as set forth in the NMC General Plan.
- Foster a cohesive and distinctively identifiable mixed use community that integrates a diversity of residential neighborhoods, regional centers, industrial and business parks, and open spaces.
- Accommodate a diversity of high quality housing to support residential needs and the development of neighborhood centers that shall serve as the focal point of neighborhood identity, activity, and celebration.
- Promote a diversity of retail, office, entertainment, housing, cultural, public and similar uses that serve the geographical areas covered by the NMC and which are integrated in a highly active pedestrian oriented environment.

- Provide for a transportation system that meets the future mobility needs of the NMC ensuring that the NMC transportation infrastructure will adequately serve local and regional trips.
- Provide for the portion of the phased backbone transportation infrastructure envisioned in the NMC General Plan for this subarea and to augment the City's existing comprehensive City-wide traffic model to include the Project site.
- Provide a supply of developable residential housing opportunities to accommodate the amount and type of projected household and job growth forecast to occur within the City,
- Provide housing opportunities for groups of special needs and for all people and to develop a project that responds well to market demand and meets a range of housing types and affordability.
- Maximize single-family detached housing opportunities to assist the City in providing housing units in sufficient quantities to meet anticipated demand and the City's regional housing allocation requirements.

In addition to the foregoing, the Project objectives also include the following:

**Residential Areas**

- Provide for connectivity between residential neighborhoods and adjacent commercial land uses, as well as to the elementary and middle schools, by means of pedestrian and bicycle trail linkages along the Avenue and trails incorporated into both the Southern California Edison Easement and the Cucamonga Creek Channel.
- Plan residential neighborhoods around a series of parks and open space areas, promoting outdoor activity and interaction among neighbors.
- Create a strong functional relationship between homes and schools.
- Create a hierarchy of parks, providing for active and passive recreation.
- Provide for connectivity between neighborhoods and recreational areas through a network of sidewalks and bicycle trails.
- Create residential neighborhoods with diverse architectural styles and traditional design elements reflecting some of the characteristics of older established Ontario neighborhoods.
- Plan for seamless transitions between housing product types in order to create cohesive neighborhoods that include a range of types and styles.

- Development of a variety of housing types into the land use plan addressing a wide variety of lifestyles and economic segments.
- Provide for both single family attached and detached housing in low density residential districts.

### **Commercial Areas**

- Develop retail and commercial uses to meet the needs of the residential community and larger surrounding market area, as well as implement General Plan Policies.
- Provide trails and sidewalks to connect the residential community with the retail and commercial areas.
- Consider the development of plazas and other public spaces amenities within the retail and commercial areas providing space for social interaction.
- Orient retail and commercial buildings to the street, wherever possible, to create an urban edge and sense of arrival.

## **8.2 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS**

The goal for evaluating any alternatives is to identify ways to avoid or lessen the significant environmental effects resulting from implementation of the proposed Project, while attaining most of the Project objectives. The City has included the following three alternatives for consideration:

- No Project Alternative – No Development
- Reduced Residential Density; and
- Increased Residential Density – No Retail Alternative.

### **8.2.1 Alternatives Not Selected for Analysis**

#### **Alternative Sites**

It is required under CEQA that alternative site(s) be evaluated if any feasible sites exist where significant impacts can be lessened. The Avenue Specific Plan component of the Project is anticipated to result in significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to:

- Agriculture: Implementation of The Avenue Specific component of the Project, specifically the permanent conversion of Prime Farmland to nonagricultural uses, conflicts with the Williamson Act resulting from the early cancellation of Williamson Act Contracts, and changes in the existing environment that would contribute to the conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural uses

- **Air Quality:** The Project Site is in a non-attainment region, thus, any release of air emissions from the development associated with The Avenue Specific Plan component of the Project would contribute to a cumulative negative impact on regional air quality. Consequently, cumulative air quality impacts would be considered significant and adverse despite the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. The Project will result in exceeding the regional emissions thresholds set forth by the SCAQMD for emissions of VOCs, NOx, CO and PM10 during both short-term construction and long-term operational activity.
- **Hydrology/Water Quality:** Development per The Avenue Specific Plan component of the Project in conjunction with all other development in the NMC create significant cumulative impacts to the water quality of Reach 1 of Cucamonga Creek Channel, Mill Creek (Prado Area), and Reach 3 of the Santa Ana River because these water bodies are currently in violation of their water quality standards.
- **Noise:** Over time virtually all rural uses in the NMC will be replaced by new development per the NMC General Plan, of which The Avenue Specific Plan component of the Project is a part. Additionally, noise within the NMC is generated along roadways due to traffic generated in other jurisdictions to the south, west and east, and the developed portion of the City to the north. This traffic will contribute to an increase in the ambient noise levels in the NMC by more than 3 dBA, CNEL, which is considered significant.
- **Transportation/Circulation:** Significant and unavoidable impacts to the intersections of Euclid Avenue (NS) at Edison Avenue (EW) and Archibald Avenue (NS) at Schaefer Avenue (EW), Edison Avenue (EW), Merrill Avenue (EW), and Cloverdale Road (Limonite Avenue) (EW) would operate below established City and CMP standards. However, the traffic model for build-out of the NMC identified that these five intersections will operate at acceptable levels of service beyond the Year 2015, due to the future redistribution of traffic expected beyond Year 2015.

Given the nature of The Avenue Specific Plan component of the Project an alternative location within the NMC or Chino Basin as a whole will not alleviate air, cumulative water quality (hydrology), cumulative noise, or cumulative traffic impacts.. Alternatively-located land in the Project vicinity would involve agricultural soils and property used or designated for agricultural purposes, thereby still resulting in an overall loss of farmland. Therefore, analysis of an alternatively-located site is not considered necessary because it will not provide avoidance or mitigation of significant impacts resulting from the Project. In addition, the proposed Project is consistent with the NMC General Plan and therefore a review of alternative sites would not further the goals and policy purposes underlying the NMC General Plan.

**Alternatives That do Not Include Residential and Commercial Development**

As stated above, development of the Project per The Avenue Specific Plan is anticipated to result in unavoidable adverse impacts related to the loss of designated farmland and agricultural uses and cumulative air quality, transportation/circulation, and water quality (hydrology) impacts. It should be noted that all proposed alternatives that involve residential and commercial development would increase traffic which would result in similar impacts related to noise and air quality. The analysis of alternatives also includes the assumption that all applicable mitigation measures associated with the Project would be implemented with the alternative under consideration. Alternatives which do not involve residential and commercial development would not meet NMC General Plan policies, plans, and goals.

Alternatives without residential development would also make it more difficult for the City to achieve its housing goals City-wide. Therefore, alternatives which avoid potentially significant impacts related to air quality and noise are considered infeasible because NMC General Plan goals cannot be met without commercial and residential development in this area.

**8.3 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES****8.3.1 Alternative 1 - No Project Alternative – No Development**

Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 (3), the “No Project” alternative could take two forms, no change from the existing uses or development into already approved land uses. The Avenue Specific Plan component of the proposed Project meets the NMC General Plan approved land uses for the Project Site. For this reason, and because the proposed Project and the other alternatives address potential impacts associated with development, the No Project Alternative will address continued/reactivated agricultural use of the Project Site.

This alternative compares with the conditions existing at the time the Amended NOP was published (May 11, 2006) and what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project were not approved without subsequent development proposals. This alternative compares the environmental effects of the property remaining in its current condition against the environmental effects that would occur if the Project is approved.

The discussion and evaluation of a No Project Alternative is required by the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, the City has an obligation to comply with the provisions of CEQA by discussing and evaluating this alternative. The No Project alternative provides a comparison of the environmental impacts of implementing the proposed Project with the environmental impacts that could result from not approving the Project. The City has discretionary authority over the proposed Project and could choose to deny it; therefore, the environmental impacts of that action must be disclosed. As a result, the Project Site could

remain in its current condition for an undetermined period of time and not be the subject of any further development proposals. Evaluation of this alternative will determine if any significant impacts identified with the proposed Project would be eliminated or if any less than significant impacts would be further reduced.

### **8.3.2 Alternative 2 - Reduced Residential Density Alternative**

This alternative was selected to evaluate the potential impacts assuming reduced residential density associated with the proposed land uses. This alternative includes low and medium density residential, parks, neighborhood commercial, and public schools. This Project design would generate up to 2,059 dwelling units (which includes parks and schools), and up to 30 acres of commercial/retail development. This alternative incorporates the adopted General Plan density of 3.7 du/ac, it is an approximate 11% reduction in land use development as with the proposed Project.

### **8.3.3 Alternative 3 - Increased Residential Density and No Retail Alternative**

This alternative was selected to determine if any significant impacts of the proposed Project would be eliminated or further reduced by increasing the proposed 2,326 dwelling units to 2,537 with the elimination of the retail land use component. This alternative would require a substantive policy amendment to the City's General Plan. This alternative incorporates a proposed density of approximately 4.2 du/ac and constitutes an approximate 9% increase in the number of proposed dwelling units  $((2,537-2,326)/2326 \times 100\%)$ .

## **8.4 EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES**

### **8.4.1 Alternative 1 - No Project Alternative/No Development**

The No Project Alternative would result in no traffic impacts as with the proposed Project. However, this alternative would not provide road improvements and connections ultimately needed in the area. Although increased air quality impacts associated with increased vehicular traffic would not result from this alternative, continued dairy use poses air quality impacts on its own, particularly those associated with ammonia and particulate matter. No loss of agricultural land or soils would result from Alternative 1. Potential water quality impacts associated with continued dairy use would not be improved as with implementation of the proposed Project. Alternative 1 would meet none of the objectives of the proposed Project, or the NMC General Plan.

**8.4.2 Alternative 2 - Reduced Residential Density Alternative**

Alternative 2 includes low and medium density residential, parks, neighborhood commercial, and public schools. Alternative 2 would allow up to 2,059 dwelling units (3.7du/ac) in lieu of the proposed 2,326 dwelling units (4.2 du/ac), which represents an approximate 11% reduction in proposed dwelling units  $((2,059-2,326)/2,326)$ . All other components of the proposed Project would remain the same.

The Reduced Residential Density Alternative (Alternative 2) would provide approximately an 11% reduction in traffic which relates to a similar, although not exact, reduction in long-term air pollutants resulting from the Project. The proposed Project exceeds air quality standards for NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and ROC. An approximate 9% reduction in pollutants would not result in air quality emissions less than the thresholds. Little or no reduction in short-term (construction) air quality impacts would be afforded by this alternative because the same acreage is being developed as the proposed Project. Other impacts that are the same as the Project include loss of agricultural land or soils and cumulative impacts to water quality. This alternative would meet many, but not all of the Project objectives. In addition, this alternative would not meet the Project objective of maximizing single-family detached housing opportunities to assist the City in providing housing units in sufficient quantities to meet anticipated demand and to satisfy the City's regional housing needs requirements.

**8.4.3 Alternative 3 - Increased Residential Density and No Retail Alternative**

This alternative was selected to determine if any significant impacts of the proposed Project would be eliminated or further reduced by increasing the number of proposed dwelling units from 2,326 to 2,537, which represents an approximate increase of 9%  $((2,537-2,326)/2,537 \times 100)$  with the elimination of the retail land use component.

This alternative would provide approximately a 23% reduction in overall daily traffic due to the elimination of the 30 acres of commercial land use which would be replaced with 30 acres of residential development.

According to the trip generation data contained in the Air Quality Study (Appendix C), a 23% reduction in traffic relates to a similar, although not exact, reduction in long-term air pollutants resulting from the Project. The proposed Project exceeds air quality standards for NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and ROC. Under this alternative a 23% or less reduction in emissions would not result in air quality emissions dropping to less than significant levels. Little or no reduction in short-term (construction) air quality impacts would be afforded by this alternative because the same acreage is developed as the proposed Project. Other impacts that are the same as the proposed Project resulting from the development of this land include loss of agricultural land or soils, and an increase in ambient noise levels.

This alternative would not implement the Project objectives with regard to retail and commercial uses. This alternative would further eliminate the sustainability ideals of the NMC General Plan where neighborhoods are served directly by their own schools, retail and entertainment centers, medical offices, public services and recreation facilities. This alternative would generally meet Project objectives, but while this alternative would lessen traffic and associated impacts, it would not meet the direction of the NMC General Plan and would not result in changes adequate to eliminate entirely or avoid environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project.

Table 8-1 provides a summary of each alternative related to the environmental issues in Sections 5.1 through 5.16 determined to have a significant effect on the environment. It includes the level of significance associated with the proposed Project in order to facilitate a thorough comparison of the alternatives.

It is a comparison of the above described alternatives of the proposed Project's significant effects with those of the alternatives, per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d). Table 8-2 identifies the areas of potential environmental effects per CEQA and ranks each alternative as *better*, *different*, the *same*, or *worse* than the proposed Project with respect to each area of potential impacts.

**Table 8-1 Impact Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Alternative 1 No Project / No Development</b>	<b>Alternative 2 Reduced Residential Density</b>	<b>Alternative 3 Increased Residential Density / No Retail</b>
Agricultural Resources	Significant – Loss of Prime Farmland and existing agricultural uses.	Better – Project site would remain in agricultural use.	Same – Loss of Prime Farmland and existing agricultural uses.	Same – Loss of Prime Farmland and existing agricultural uses.
Air Quality	Significant with mitigation measures – exceeds standards for NO <sub>x</sub> , CO, PM <sub>10</sub> and ROC, Cumulatively Significant – contributes to non-attainment of air quality standards in Air Basin.	Different and Better – Minimal impacts to air quality from vehicular travel. Existing odor problems remain. Continuation of high particular due to ammonia projection from dairies.	Better/Same – Reduction of emissions. Thresholds would still be exceeded for NO <sub>x</sub> , CO, PM <sub>10</sub> and ROC Still cumulatively significant impacts to Air Basin.	Better/Same – Reduction of emissions. Thresholds would still be exceeded for NO <sub>x</sub> , CO, PM <sub>10</sub> and ROC Still cumulatively significant impacts to Air Basin.
Biology	Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.	Better – No loss of burrowing owl or foraging habitat.	Same – Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.	Same – Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Alternative 1 No Project / No Development</b>	<b>Alternative 2 Reduced Residential Density</b>	<b>Alternative 3 Increased Residential Density / No Retail</b>
Cultural Resources	Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.	Same or worse – Project Site would remain in agricultural use which has no requirement to preserve resources, but excavation is typically surficial.	Same – Less than Significant effort with mitigation incorporated.	Same – Less than Significant effort with mitigation incorporated.
Geology / Soils	Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.	Better or Worse – Erosion due to wind or water not regulated in same way for agriculture.	Same – Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.	Same – Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.
Hazards / Hazardous Materials	Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.	Worse – Dumping of organic and inorganic materials will continue. Use of on-site fuels and agricultural chemicals will continue.	Same – Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.	Same – Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.
Hydrology / Water Quality	Cumulatively Significant due to impairment of downstream water bodies.	Worse – Water quality impacts resulting from dairies and agriculture often worse than urban uses.	Same – Less than Significant Project impacts with mitigation incorporated. Cumulatively significant due to impairment of downstream water bodies.	Same – Less than Significant Project impacts with mitigation incorporated. Cumulatively significant due to impairment of downstream water bodies.
Noise	Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.	Better – Maintenance of existing noise levels. No construction noise and no new people exposed to over-standard ambient levels.	Same – Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.	Same – Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.
Public Services	Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.	Better – No impacts to public services.	Same – Less than Significant effect with mitigation.	Same – Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.
Transportation/Traffic	Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.	Better – Existing traffic levels from the Project Site are maintained.	Same – Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.	Same – Less than Significant effect with mitigation incorporated.

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Alternative 1 No Project / No Development</b>	<b>Alternative 2 Reduced Residential Density</b>	<b>Alternative 3 Increased Residential Density / No Retail</b>
Utilities	Cumulative significant-solid waste.	Better – Existing utilities use levels from the Project Site are maintained.	Cumulative significant-solid waste.	Cumulative significant-solid waste.
Environmentally Superior to Proposed Project	N/A	Yes – but not without environmental impacts of its own.	Same	Same
Meets Project Objectives?	Yes	No	No	Yes
Meets NMC GPA Objectives	Yes	No	No	No

A project alternative must be able to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed Project. Table 8-2 provides an assessment of the ability of each of the alternatives to achieve the basic objectives identified in Section 3.6 of this EIR. For reference, the objectives are repeated in Table 8-2.

**Table 8-2 Objective Feasibility Comparison**

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Alternative 1 No Project / No Development</b>	<b>Alternative 2 Reduced Residential Density</b>	<b>Alternative 3 Increased Residential Density / No Retail</b>
Accommodate development in accordance with the organizational principles and standards contained in the NMC General Plan as implemented through subsequent detailed specific plans as set forth in the NMC General Plan.	No	Yes	No
Foster a cohesive and distinctively identifiable mixed use community that integrates a diversity of residential neighborhoods, regional centers, industrial and business parks, and open spaces.	No	Yes	No
Accommodate a diversity of high quality housing to support residential needs and the development of neighborhood centers that shall serve as the focal point of neighborhood identity, activity, and celebration.	No	No	No

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Alternative 1 No Project / No Development</b>	<b>Alternative 2 Reduced Residential Density</b>	<b>Alternative 3 Increased Residential Density / No Retail</b>
Promote a diversity of retail, office, entertainment, housing, cultural, public and similar uses that serve the geographical areas covered by the NMC and which are integrated in a highly active pedestrian oriented environment.	No	Yes	No
Provide for a transportation system that meets the future mobility needs of the NMC ensuring that the NMC transportation infrastructure will adequately serve local and regional trips.	No	Yes	Yes
Provide for the portion of the phased backbone transportation infrastructure envisioned in the NMC General Plan for this subarea and to augment the City's existing comprehensive City-wide traffic model to include the Project Site.	No	Yes	Yes
Provide a supply of developable residential housing opportunities to accommodate the amount and type of projected household and job growth forecast to occur within the City.	No	Yes	Yes
Provide housing opportunities for groups of special needs and for all people and to develop a project that responds well to market demand and meets a range of housing types and affordability.	No	No	Yes
Maximize single-family detached housing opportunities to assist the City in providing housing units in sufficient quantities to meet anticipated demand and the City's regional housing allocation requirements.	No	No	Yes
Provide for the connectivity between residential neighborhoods and adjacent commercial retail land uses, as well as to the elementary and middle schools, by means of pedestrian and bicycle trail linkage along spine street and a trail incorporated into the Southern California Edison easement and Cucamonga Creek.	No	Yes	No
Plan residential neighborhoods around a series of neighborhood parks and open space areas, promoting outdoor activity and casual social interaction among neighbors.	No	Yes	Yes
Create strong architectural and functional relationships between residential and school site areas.	No	Yes	Yes

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Alternative 1 No Project / No Development</b>	<b>Alternative 2 Reduced Residential Density</b>	<b>Alternative 3 Increased Residential Density / No Retail</b>
Create an effective system and hierarchy of parks, providing for active and passive recreational opportunities.	No	Yes	Yes
Provide for connectivity between residential neighborhood and recreational areas through a network of pedestrian sidewalks and on- and off-street bicycle trails.	No	Yes	Yes
Create residential neighborhoods with diverse architectural styles and design elements reflecting the characteristics of older established Ontario neighborhoods.	No	Yes	Yes
Plan for seamless transitions between housing product types in order to create cohesive neighborhoods that include a range of densities.	No	Yes	Yes
Development of a variety of housing types incorporated into the land use plan addressing a wide variety of lifestyles and economic segments.	No	Yes	Yes
Provide for both single family attached and detached housing in low density residential districts.	No	No	No
Development of commercial/retail uses to meet the needs of residential community and larger surrounding market area as well as implement General Plan Policies.	No	Yes	No
Provide trails and sidewalks to connect the residential community with the commercial/retail areas.	No	Yes	No
Consider development of plazas and other amenities within the commercial/retail areas providing space for social interaction.	No	Yes	No
Orientation of commercial retail buildings to the street wherever possible to create an urban edge and sense of arrival.	No	Yes	No

Based on the analysis contained in this section, the Environmentally Superior Alternative is the No project – No Development Alternative (Alternative 1). The Environmentally Superior Alternative from the remaining alternatives is the Reduced Residential Density Alternative.

## **8.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6(e) (2), requires the identification of the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Of the alternatives evaluated above, the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) is an Environmentally Superior Alternative with respect to reducing impacts created by the proposed Project; however, potentially significant water quality, air quality, hydrology, aesthetic and hazardous materials impacts caused by agricultural uses will be perpetuated. The CEQA Guidelines also require the identification of another Environmentally Superior alternative if the No Project Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Based on the analysis contained in this section, the Environmentally Superior Alternative from the remaining alternatives is the Reduced Residential Density Alternative (Alternative 2).