

---

---

## VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

---

---

### INTRODUCTION

The CEQA Guidelines require that EIRs include the identification and evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives that are designed to reduce the significant environmental impacts of the project while still meeting the general project objectives. The CEQA Guidelines also set forth the intent and extent of alternatives analysis to be provided in an EIR. Those considerations are discussed below.

### ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

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

#### Purpose

Section 15126.6(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states, “Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment, the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives, or would be more costly.”

#### Significant Project Impacts<sup>1</sup>

The project impacts that would be less than significant after mitigation include the following:

- Air Quality – Construction Emissions, Objectionable Odors
- Biological Resources – Special-Status Wildlife Species
- Cultural Resources – Archaeological Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains
- Geology & Soils – Seismic-Related Ground Failure, Total and Differential Settlement, Soil Erosion or Loss of Topsoil, Expansive Soil, and Pervious Pavements

---

<sup>1</sup> Refer to Table VI-1 at the end of this section.

- Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials, Airport Operations
- Hydrology & Water Quality – Substantially Alter Drainage Patterns, Quality of Surface Water Runoff, Degrade Groundwater Quality, and Tsunami and Seiche
- Noise – Construction-Related Noise and Construction-Related Groundborne Vibration
- Public Services – Fire Protection (Operational Impacts)
- Transportation/Traffic – Intersection LOS and Capacity, and Cumulative LOS
- Utilities & Service Systems – Wastewater Collection Capacity, Wastewater Recycling and Disposal Requirements, Wastewater and Recycling Water Flow Estimates, and Creek Crossing by Sewage Pipeline.

### **Selection of a Reasonable Range of Alternatives**

Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states: “The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.”

### **Project Objectives**

The objectives of the proposed project are as follows:

- To create an independent, inclusive DD community of people and businesses through a privately-funded Wellness Center and Office Park. In addition to providing recurring funding for the Wellness Center, the adjacent Office Park would provide meaningful and reliable full-time and part-time employment to DD adults while providing living and employment opportunities for DD adults and benefiting the Coastside community;
- To build a profitable commercial development that is large enough to provide for the long-term sustainability of the proposed Wellness Center and Office Park by locating the Wellness Center within walking/wheelchair distance to the Office Park, and to give low-income DD residents the ability to provide services to the Office Park;
- To provide living, social, and employment services (including entrepreneurship/business-ownership) to DD adults through the development of residential, recreational, and commercial uses on donated land and via shared development costs;

- To adhere to existing zoning laws that allow for special needs residential and commercial use on the same site and allows for nearby employment opportunities and develop the project to be consistent with local General Plan goals;
- To provide for an enriched quality of life for DD residents via safe and secure homes, home ownership, healthy organic diets by building a commercial kitchen and dining room services, recreational and artistic opportunities within walking distance, continuing education, a strong sense of community pride and interaction, daily onsite assistance and commercial enterprises and job/career opportunities;
- To take advantage of existing public transportation routes to provide Wellness Center residents and non-residents access to and from the project site to reduce commute distances/times for Coastside residents by providing high-paying local jobs;
- To build aesthetically pleasing Class A office space to create local, high-paying jobs;
- To phase the construction of the four-buildings as demand and sound business practices dictate;
- To integrate environmental sustainability through a variety of specific environmental goals, including, but not limited to, a sophisticated, grid-connected solar renewable energy system to lower costs, wetlands restoration and enhanced-functioning biological habitats, alternative transportation, pollution reduction, and climate-friendly development to reduce adverse environmental impacts;
- To protect surface and ground water resources with water recycling and ground infiltration systems that minimize uncontrolled surface runoff;
- Reduce traffic congestion on SR 1 and SR 92 by offering local employment and reverse commute traffic flow;
- To provide office space and building energy-efficient solar-powered affordable housing at below market-rate and provide ownership opportunities to create local, clean, secure and monitored community-centric involvement;
- To provide leading-edge telecommunications systems for the residents of the Wellness Center and tenants of the Office Park, as well as the entire Coastside;
- To provide high-paying employment opportunities for other local Coastside residents who want to live and work in the community;
- To provide a source of financial upward mobility potential to all members of the DD community;

- To build a facility for meetings, educational/recreational opportunities working with numerous service providers and cultural longevity, emotional support, recreational opportunity and offices for housing professionals and support staff for the Coastside DD community;
- To provide space for gardens to grow organic food for consumption;
- To create covenants, deed restrictions and an independent Board of Directors to implement Big Wave's goals and objectives;
- To create a financially sustainable community that generates recurring, inflation-adjusted revenue to cover administration costs in perpetuity;
- To provide numerous meaningful job opportunities for the DD community that provide work for those that have limited skill potential, as well as those that have very high skill potential; and
- To build a community that provides meaningful volunteer activities to local high school students, college students and other interested groups.

### **Overview of Selected Alternatives**

The alternatives to be analyzed in comparison to the proposed project include:

- Alternative A: No Project Alternative
- Alternative B: Reduced Density/Height for Office Park and Reduced Size for Wellness Center
- Alternative C: Modified Office Park Site Plan Alternative 1
- Alternative D: Modified Office Park Site Plan Alternative 2

### **Alternatives Rejected as Being Infeasible**

As described above, Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process, and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination.

Alternatives involving different land uses such as retail, heavy industrial or institutional uses were not analyzed in the DEIR because these land uses are not principally permitted on the project site based on the County's land use designations for the two parcels that comprise the project site. Such alternative land uses would not necessarily reduce the project's significant impacts and would not meet the project objectives. An alternative involving a park or open space only at the site was not analyzed because this type of alternative would not meet the basic objectives of the project.

An alternative involving development of only one of the two sites (i.e., Wellness Center only or Office Park only on one of the two sites) was rejected as being infeasible because the economic viability of the Wellness Center relies on funding from the Office Park, including the purchase of power, water and

communications from the Wellness Center. An Office Park alternative would not meet the project objective of providing housing for the DD community.

A reduced development alternative of the Wellness Center and Office Park on the northern parcel (Office Park site) only was also rejected as being infeasible because it would not be economically viable. Specifically, Big Wave, LLC is donating the Wellness Center site to the Big Wave non-profit organization, which allows for the non-profit organization to keep housing costs low. The Wellness Center has a solid ownership commitment for the Wellness Center site. If the Big Wave non-profit organization cannot build on the Wellness Center site, they would have to purchase one-half of the developable portion of the Office Park site that would ultimately result in the units at the Wellness Center being unaffordable for lower income residents.

An alternative involving development of the Office Park at the proposed Office Park site but the Wellness Center at an offsite location on the Coastside that permits affordable housing was also considered but rejected as being infeasible. The applicant does not own any other sites on the Coastside that permit affordable housing and such an alternative also would not be financially viable, as it would require the non-profit to purchase land at market rates. Potential affordable housing sites on the Coastside include: 1) Moss Beach Highlands Site (located on Etheldore Street; APN 037-320-270); 2) Etheldore Site (located between Highway 1 and Etheldore Street; APN 037-291-010); 3) Hospital Site No. 1 (South) (located on Etheldore Street; APN 037-160-110); 4) Hospital Site No. 2 (North) (located on Etheldore Street; APN 037-160-100); 5) Farallon Vista Site (located 400 feet east of Highway 1 with access from Carlos Street); and 6) North El Granada Site (located on Sevilla Avenue). These potential affordable housing sites have various environmental constraints and thus development of the Wellness Center at such sites would not reduce all of the significant impacts associated with the project and would create new significant impacts. Specifically, the Hospital Site No. 1 and Hospital Site No. 2 are too small to accommodate the proposed Wellness Center. The Etheldore Site contains prime agricultural land over the majority of the parcel. The Etheldore Site also contains sensitive habitat and the Moss Beach Highlands Site contains wetlands and habitat for the Red-Legged Frog. The Moss Beach Highlands Site also contains slopes at or in excess of 30 percent such that development would require substantial alteration of the natural landscape as well as potential traffic and noise impacts associated with significant grading. In terms of visual constraints, some of the affordable housing sites are located along or are highly visible from Highway 1, including the Etheldore Site and the Moss Beach Highlands Site. Lastly, potable water connections are not available at both Hospital Sites. This type of alternative also would not meet some of the project objectives, particularly the objective to locate the Wellness Center within walking/wheelchair distance to the Office Park.

An alternative involving development of the entire project at an offsite location on the Coastside was rejected as being infeasible because it would not be economically viable. As discussed above, Big Wave, LLC is donating the Wellness Center site to the Big Wave non-profit organization, which allows for the non-profit organization to keep housing costs low. If the Big Wave non-profit organization cannot build on the Wellness Center site, they would have to purchase an offsite parcel, which would ultimately result in the units at the Wellness Center being unaffordable for lower income residents. An alternative site

over the hill to the east was also rejected as being infeasible because the project applicant does not own a site with similar requirements (i.e., size, zoning) to develop the proposed project and such an alternative would not be economically viable.

### **Assumptions and Methodology**

The anticipated means for implementation of the alternatives can influence the assessment and/or probability of impacts for those alternatives. For example, a project may have the potential to generate significant impacts, but considerations in project design may also afford the opportunity to avoid or reduce such impacts. The alternatives analysis is presented as a comparative analysis to the proposed project and assumes that all applicable mitigation measures proposed for the project would apply to each alternative. The following alternatives analysis compares the potential significant environmental impacts of four alternatives with those of the proposed project for each of the environmental topics analyzed in detail in Section IV (Environmental Impact Analysis) of this DEIR.

#### **A. ALTERNATIVE A (NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE)**

As required by CEQA, this subsection analyzes a “No Project” Alternative (Alternative A). Under Alternative A, the proposed project would not be constructed, and the project site would remain in its current undeveloped condition and would continue to be used for agricultural purposes. The analysis of Alternative A assumes the continuation of existing conditions, as well as development of the related projects described in Section III.B. (Related Projects). 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, no grading or development would occur on the project site and the existing aesthetic characteristics would remain unchanged. There would be no impacts to scenic views, scenic resources, visual character and no new sources of light and glare on the site. Therefore, this alternative would result in no impacts related to aesthetics, compared to the project’s less-than-significant impacts related to aesthetics.

#### ***AGRICULTURE RESOURCES***

No grading or development would occur on the project site under Alternative A and existing agricultural operations would continue on the project site. Therefore, this alternative would result in no impacts related to agricultural resources, compared to the project’s less-than-significant impacts related to agricultural resources.

#### ***AIR QUALITY***

Under Alternative A, no grading or construction would occur at the site. Thus, this alternative would not generate any fugitive dust or other pollutant emissions associated with construction activities at the site.

Implementation of Alternative A would result in no air quality impacts resulting from construction activities, compared to the project's short-term, significant but mitigatable air quality impacts resulting from construction activities. Additionally, this EIR concluded that the long-term operation of the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to air quality. Under Alternative A, development would not occur on the site; therefore, no new traffic trips would be generated. As such, Alternative A would not generate any pollutant emissions associated with long-term operation of a Wellness Center and Office Park and would result in no air quality impacts associated with long-term operation of a Wellness Center and Office Park, compared to the project's less-than-significant air quality impacts associated with long-term operation of the project.

### ***BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES***

Section IV.D (Biological Resources) of the DEIR identifies that the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to most of the issues areas associated with biological resources, including but not limited to: special-status plant species, sensitive natural communities, wildlife movement and habitat connectivity, and conformance with policies and ordinances related to the protection of biological resources. Given that no new development would occur on the project site under Alternative A, this alternative would result in no impacts related to each of these issue areas listed above, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to each of these issue areas listed above. Alternative A would also result in no impacts related to special-status wildlife species, compared to the project's less-than-significant but mitigatable impacts related to special-status wildlife species. However, unlike the proposed project, Alternative A would not involve any restoration of the onsite wetlands.

### ***CULTURAL RESOURCES***

Under Alternative A, no ground-disturbing activities would occur beyond the current farming at the site. Since no ground-disturbing activities would occur beyond the current farming at the site under Alternative A, Alternative A would result in no impacts to historical resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to historical resources and less than significant impacts with mitigation related to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains.

### ***GEOLOGY & SOILS***

Under Alternative A, no development would occur on the site. Therefore, this alternative would result in no impacts related to fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, and other soil/geologic instabilities (i.e., seismic-related ground failure, total and differential settlement, soil erosion, expansive soil, and pervious pavements), compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to each of these issue areas listed above.

### ***HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS***

Because no new land uses would be built on the site and no new residents or employees would be at the site under Alternative A, this alternative would result in no impacts related to the routine use, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to this issue area. Alternative A would also result in no impacts related to interference with emergency plans and wildfires, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to interference with emergency plans, and the project's less-than-significant impacts related to wildfires. Additionally, Alternative A would result in no impacts related to the accidental release of hazardous materials, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts with mitigation.

### ***HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY***

Under Alternative A, no development would occur on the site. Therefore, this alternative would result in no impacts related to violation of water quality standards, depletion of groundwater supply and recharge, surface water runoff quality, and flood hazards, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to each of these issue areas listed above. Alternative A would also result in no impacts related to the alteration of drainage patterns, surface water runoff quality, and tsunami and seiche, compared to the project's significant but mitigatable impacts related to each of these issue areas listed above.

### ***LAND USE & PLANNING***

Because Alternative A would not involve any development, it would result in no impacts related to the division of an established community and conflict with plans and policies, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to each of these issue areas listed above.

### ***NOISE***

Because Alternative A would not involve any grading or development on the project site or new vehicle trips, this alternative would result in no impacts related to construction noise, construction-related groundborne vibration, and operational traffic noise, compared to the project's less-than-significant operational noise impacts and significant but mitigatable noise impacts related to construction noise and construction-related groundborne vibration.

### ***POPULATION & HOUSING***

Because the project site would not be developed under Alternative A, no additional population or housing would be added to the site. Therefore, this alternative would result in no impacts related to substantial population growth and displacement of substantial population, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to each of these issue areas listed above. However, a No Project scenario would not provide the project benefits of low-income housing for up to 50 DD members of the regional community.

## ***PUBLIC SERVICES***

### ***Police***

Under Alternative A, there would be no development on the project site and thus this alternative would not create additional demand for police protection services. Therefore, implementation of this alternative would result in no impacts related to police protection services, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to police protection services.

### ***Fire Protection***

Under Alternative A, there would be no development on the project site and thus this alternative would not create additional demand for fire protection services. Therefore, implementation of this alternative would result in no impacts related to fire protection services, compared to the project's significant but mitigatable impacts related to fire protection services.

### ***Schools***

Under Alternative A, there would be no development of residential land uses and no additional residents and school-aged children on the project site, and thus, this alternative would not create additional demand for school services. Therefore, implementation of this alternative would result in no impacts related to school services, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to school services.

### ***Parks & Recreation***

Under Alternative A, there would be no development of residential land uses and no additional families on the project site, and thus, this alternative would not create additional demand for parks and recreation services. Therefore, implementation of this alternative would result in no impacts related to parks and recreation, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to parks and recreation.

### ***Libraries***

Under Alternative A, there would be no development on the project site and thus this alternative would not create additional demand for library services. Therefore, implementation of this alternative would result in no impacts related to library services, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to library services.

## ***TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC***

Under Alternative A, no development on the project site would occur, and as such, no new vehicle trips would be generated. Therefore, this alternative would result in no impacts related to traffic hazards, access and onsite circulation, emergency access, parking, transit service, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to each of these issue areas listed above. Alternative A would also result in no impacts related to intersection LOS and capacity, and

cumulative LOS, compared to the project's significant but mitigatable impacts related to intersection LOS and capacity, and cumulative LOS.

### ***UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS***

#### ***Sewer***

Because Alternative A would not result in development on the project site this alternative would not result in generation of wastewater at the project site, and therefore no wastewater treatment plant or wastewater disposal would be needed. Thus, Alternative A would result in no impacts related to wastewater collection capacity, sanitary district regulations, wastewater recycling and disposal requirements, water flow estimates, and creek crossing by sewage pipeline, compared to the project's significant but mitigatable impacts related to the other issue areas listed above. Alternative A would also result in no impacts related to wastewater treatment and capacity, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to wastewater treatment and capacity.

#### ***Water***

Because Alternative A would not result in development on the project site this alternative would not result in a demand for more water at the project site. Thus, Alternative A would result in no impacts related to new or expanded water facilities, potable water demands, adequacy of onsite water well, and water treatment system, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to each of these issue areas listed above.

#### ***Solid Waste***

Because Alternative A would not result in development on the project site this alternative would not result in generation of solid waste at the project site. Thus, Alternative A would result in no impacts related to landfill capacity, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to landfill capacity.

#### ***Energy***

Because Alternative A would not result in development on the project site this alternative would not require additional energy beyond what is required under existing conditions. Therefore, Alternative A would result in no impacts related to energy, compared to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to energy.

### ***RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALTERNATIVE TO THE PROJECT OBJECTIVES***

Alternative A does not meet the project objectives.

## **B. ALTERNATIVE B (REDUCED INTENSITY/HEIGHT FOR OFFICE PARK AND REDUCED DENSITY FOR WELLNESS CENTER)**

Alternative B reduces the size of the Office Park from 225,000 square feet to 186,000 square feet and reduces the height of the Office Park buildings from three stories to two stories. The 70 apartment style and single-story style units (“breezeway units”) for use by up to 50 DD residents and 20 staff members proposed for the Wellness Center would be reduced to 57 apartment style and single-story style units. The 57 units would be used and shared by up to 50 DD residents and 20 staff members. A reduced development alternative with less than 186,000 square feet for the Office Park and fewer than 57 units for the Wellness Center was rejected as being infeasible because it would not be economically viable, according to the applicant.

Except as described above, other project characteristics are assumed to be generally similar to those of the proposed project, for the purpose of analyzing Alternative B. These characteristics include but are not limited to the general location, design and building materials and colors; the specific land uses and tenant types; Platinum level LEED certification, utilities and onsite power generation; onsite farming; wetlands restoration; grading; and phasing.

The potential environmental impacts associated with this alternative are described below and are compared to the significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. All applicable mitigation measures recommended for the proposed project are incorporated into Alternative B.

### ***AESTHETICS***

Under Alternative B, a four-building Office Park with 39,000 fewer square feet than the project would be developed, and the height of the office buildings would be two stories instead of three. However, it should be noted that under this scenario the building footprint of each office building would increase by approximately 20 percent. Also, the number of units for the Wellness Center would be reduced from 70 to 57 as a part of Alternative B. Due to the lower height of buildings, buildings would be almost entirely screened by the proposed landscaping. Where the proposed project would have been visible from Airport Street/Stanford Avenue and Highway 1 with mature landscaping, under this scenario, the buildings would be less visible from these locations. Likewise, there would be fewer impacts to scenic resources and visual character than the project under Alternative B, all of which were found to be less than significant with implementation of the proposed project. Additionally, due to the lower height and fewer windows associated with Alternative B, there would be fewer light and glare impacts under Alternative B compared to the project, which were found to be less than significant with mitigation.

### ***AGRICULTURE RESOURCES***

The majority of the existing farming onsite would be replaced by the proposed Wellness Center and Office Park under both the project and Alternative B. However, less development would occur on the Wellness Center site under Alternative B and this alternative does include the proposed onsite farming. The project site is depicted as Urban and Built-up Land and Other Land on the Important Farmland Map

for San Mateo County. Therefore, the project site has not been designated as important farmland and development of the site would not involve conversion of important farmland. Thus, Alternative B would result in similar impacts to agriculture resources as the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant.

### ***AIR QUALITY***

Alternative B would result in less air emissions compared to the project because Alternative B involves less square footage for office and residential uses and fewer housing units, as well as a reduction in vehicle trips due to a reduction in office space. Similar to the project, Alternative B would result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to construction emissions and objectionable odors. Also similar to the proposed project, Alternative B would result in less-than-significant air quality impacts related to: consistency with Air Quality Plan, operational emissions, cumulative regional operational emissions, sensitive receptors, and greenhouse gas emissions.

### ***BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES***

Due to one fewer story for each of the four office buildings, the building footprints for these buildings would be approximately 20 percent larger than the project, resulting in less wetlands restoration compared to the project. As a result, biological resources impacts associated with Alternative B could be greater than those associated with the project. However, as less of the Wellness Center site would be developed, buffer areas between the development and the wetlands could increase. While less square footage for office and residential uses and fewer units would be built under Alternative B compared to the project, Alternative B would still result in substantial grading of the site. Specifically, like the project, Alternative B would result in less-than-significant impacts related to: special-status plant species, sensitive natural communities, wildlife movement and habitat connectivity, and conformance with policies and ordinances related to the protection of biological resources. Likewise, Alternative B would also result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to special-status wildlife species.

### ***CULTURAL RESOURCES***

Due to fewer housing units, development of the Wellness Center would avoid the cultural site on the western portion of the site, resulting in fewer impacts to cultural resources than the proposed project. However, Alternative B would still result in grading of most of the site which could, potentially, contain unrecorded archaeological deposits. As a result, cultural resources impacts associated with Alternative B may include less-than-significant historical resources impacts, and significant but mitigatable impacts related to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains.

### ***GEOLOGY & SOILS***

Geology and soils impacts associated with Alternative B would be similar to slightly less compared to the project because both Alternative B and the project would result in grading and development of most of the site. The slight difference in impacts is attributed to Alternative B involving one fewer building story

for each of the four buildings at the Office Park as well as fewer employees at the Office Park that would be subject to the geology and soils hazards associated with the project site. Overall and similar to the project however, Alternative B would result in less-than-significant impacts related to fault rupture and seismic ground shaking, and significant but mitigatable impacts related to other soil/geologic instabilities (i.e., seismic-related ground failure, total and differential settlement, soil erosion, expansive soil, and pervious pavements).

### ***HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS***

The reduction in building square footage, units, and building heights associated with Alternative B is not anticipated to substantially change the hazards and hazardous materials impacts associated with the project. Implementation of Alternative B would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the routine use, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, similar to the project. Alternative B would also result in less-than-significant impacts related to interference with emergency plans, and the project's less-than-significant impacts related to wildfires. Also, Alternative B would result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to accidental release of hazardous materials and airport operations, which is also similar to the impacts associated with the project.

### ***HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY***

This scenario would result in increased building footprints at the Office Park and decreased building footprints at the Wellness Center. Therefore, Alternative B would still result in roughly the same amount of impermeable surfaces on the site. As a result, hydrology and water quality impacts associated with Alternative B would be similar to those associated with the project. Both Alternative B and the project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to violation of water quality standards, depletion of groundwater supply and recharge, surface water runoff quantity, and flood hazards. Alternative B and the project would also result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to the alteration of drainage patterns, surface water runoff quality, and tsunami and seiche.

### ***LAND USE & PLANNING***

The reduction in building square footage, units and building heights associated with Alternative B would not change the land use impacts associated with the proposed project. Specifically, both Alternative B and the project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the division of an established community and conflict with plans and policies.

### ***NOISE***

Although less construction would be associated with Alternative B compared to the project due to a reduction in office space and units, this alternative would still result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to construction noise and groundborne vibration, similar to the project. Like the project, Alternative B would also result in less-than-significant operational noise impacts.

**POPULATION & HOUSING**

Under Alternative B, the 70 apartment style and single-story style units (“breezeway units”) for use by up to 50 DD residents and 20 staff members proposed for the Wellness Center would be reduced to 57 apartment style and single-story style units. However, the 57 units would still be used and shared by up to 50 DD residents and 20 staff members. As such, there would be no population change for the Wellness Center under Alternative B. The reduction in office square footage associated with this alternative could result in slightly less permanent population in the area under the worst-case assumption that all employees relocated to the project area from outside of the unincorporated Half Moon Bay area. Regardless, Alternative B is anticipated to result in similar population and housing impacts as the proposed project. Specifically, Alternative B would also result in less-than-significant impacts related to inducing substantial population growth and related to the displacement of substantial amount of population.

**PUBLIC SERVICES**

**Police**

Because there would not be a substantial change in population as a result of Alternative B compared to the project, demands for police protection services under this alternative are anticipated to be similar to the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant.

**Fire Protection**

Because there would not be a substantial change in population as a result of Alternative B compared to the project, demands for fire protection services under this alternative are anticipated to be similar to the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant with mitigation.

**Schools**

Because there would not be a substantial change in population as a result of Alternative B compared to the project, demands for schools services under this alternative are anticipated to be similar to the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant.

**Parks & Recreation**

Because there would not be a substantial change in population as a result of Alternative B compared to the project, demands for parks and recreation services under this alternative are anticipated to be similar to the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant.

**Libraries**

Because there would not be a substantial change in population as a result of Alternative B compared to the project, demands for library services under this alternative are anticipated to be similar to the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant.

---

---

**TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

Section IV.M (Transportation/Traffic) of the DEIR found that the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to traffic hazards, access and onsite circulation, emergency access, parking, transit service, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Section IV.M (Transportation/Traffic) of the DEIR also concluded that the proposed project would result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to intersection LOS and capacity, and cumulative LOS. Given Alternative B reduces the office building square footage associated with the project, this alternative would also result in less-than-significant impacts related to traffic hazards, access and onsite circulation, emergency access, parking, transit service, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Likewise, Alternative B would also result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to intersection LOS and capacity, and cumulative LOS.

**UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS*****Sewer***

By reducing the Office Park by 39,000 square feet, Alternative B would result in the generation of less sewage compared to the project, and hence less sewage to be treated by the onsite wastewater plant and less treated sewage to dispose or recycle. Similar to the project, Alternative B would result in less-than-significant impacts related to wastewater treatment and capacity and sanitary district regulations. Like the project, Alternative B would also result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to wastewater collection capacity, wastewater recycling and disposal, water flow estimates, and creek crossing by sewage pipeline.

***Water***

By reducing the Office Park by 39,000 square feet, Alternative B would result in the consumption of less water compared to the project. Similar to the project, Alternative B would result in less-than-significant impacts related to new or expanded water facilities, potable water demands, adequacy of onsite water well, and water treatment system.

***Solid Waste***

Alternative B would result in less generation of solid waste compared to the proposed project because it involves 39,000 fewer square feet of office space than the project. However, impacts related to solid waste would be less than significant under Alternative B, which is similar to the project.

***Energy***

Alternative B would require less energy compared to the proposed project because it involves 39,000 fewer square feet of office space than the project. However, impacts related to energy would be less than significant under Alternative B, which is similar to the project.

---

---

**RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALTERNATIVE TO THE PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

Alternative B meets the project objectives.

**C. ALTERNATIVE C (MODIFIED OFFICE PARK SITE PLAN ALTERNATIVE 1)**

Alternative C reduces the building height of the Office Park from three stories to two stories but maintains the size of the proposed offices at 225,000 square feet. As a result, the building footprint for the Office Park would increase from 80,000 square feet to approximately 113,000 square feet. These changes to the project under Alternative C would also result in a reduction of the wetlands restoration from 226,038 square feet to approximately 192,000 square feet. However, the same amount of parking spaces as the project would be provided under Alternative C. No changes are proposed to the Wellness Center as a part of this alternative.

Except as described above, other project characteristics are assumed to be generally similar to those of the proposed project, for the purpose of analyzing Alternative C. These characteristics include but are not limited to the general location, design and building materials and colors; the specific land uses and tenant types; Platinum level LEED certification, utilities and onsite power generation; onsite farming; grading; and phasing.

The potential environmental impacts associated with this alternative are described below and are compared to the significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. All applicable mitigation measures recommended for the proposed project are incorporated into Alternative C.

**AESTHETICS**

While the lot coverage for the Office Park parcel would increase under Alternative C, the building heights for the four office buildings would be reduced from three stories to two stories. Due to the lower height of buildings, buildings would be almost entirely screened by the proposed landscaping. Where the proposed project would have been visible from Airport Street/Stanford Avenue and Highway 1 with mature landscaping, under this scenario, the buildings would be less visible from these locations. As a result, there would be fewer impacts to scenic views, scenic resources, and visual character than the project under Alternative C, all of which were found to be less than significant with implementation of the proposed project. Like the project, light and glare impacts associated with Alternative C would be less than significant after mitigation.

**AGRICULTURE RESOURCES**

Given that the same amount of square footage and units would be developed under both Alternative C and the project, the majority of the existing farming onsite would be replaced by this alternative and the project. The project site is depicted as Urban and Built-up Land and Other Land on the Important Farmland Map for San Mateo County. Therefore, the project site has not been designated as important farmland and development of the site would not involve conversion of important farmland. Thus,

Alternative C would result in similar impacts to agriculture resources as the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant.

### ***AIR QUALITY***

Alternative C would result in similar air emissions compared to the project because Alternative C involves the same square footage and units as well as vehicle trips. Similar to the project, Alternative C would result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to construction emissions and objectionable odors. Also similar to the proposed project, Alternative C would result in less-than-significant air quality impacts related to: consistency with Air Quality Plan, operational emissions, cumulative regional operational emissions, sensitive receptors, and greenhouse gas emissions.

### ***BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES***

Under Alternative C the building footprint for the Office Park would increase from 80,000 square feet to approximately 113,000 square feet, resulting in a reduction of the wetlands restoration from 226,038 square feet to approximately 192,000 square feet. Therefore, Alternative C would result in decreased benefits to wetlands than the proposed project. However, similar to the project, Alternative C would result in less-than-significant impacts related to: special-status plant species, sensitive natural communities, wildlife movement and habitat connectivity, and conformance with policies and ordinances related to the protection of biological resources. Likewise, Alternative C would also result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to special-status wildlife species.

### ***CULTURAL RESOURCES***

Approximately the same amount of grading would occur under Alternative C compared to the project. As a result, cultural resources impacts associated with Alternative C would be similar to those associated with the project. Such impacts include less-than-significant historical resources impacts, and significant but mitigatable impacts related to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains.

### ***GEOLOGY & SOILS***

Geology and soils impacts associated with Alternative C would be similar to slightly less compared to the project because both Alternative C and the project would result in grading and development of most of the site. The slight difference in impacts is attributed to Alternative C involving one fewer building story for each of the four buildings and, thereby, fewer occupants exposed to geology and soils hazards at the Office Park. Overall and similar to the project however, Alternative C would result in less-than-significant impacts related to exposure of Office Park and Wellness Center occupants to fault rupture and seismic ground shaking, and significant but mitigatable impacts related to other soil/geologic instabilities (i.e., seismic-related ground failure, total and differential settlement, soil erosion, expansive soil, and surface weakness associated with pervious pavements).

**HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Implementation of Alternative C would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the routine use, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, similar to the project. Alternative C would also result in less-than-significant impacts related to interference with emergency plans, and the project's less-than-significant impacts related to wildfires. Also, Alternative C would result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to accidental release of hazardous materials and airport operations, which is also similar to the impacts associated with the project.

**HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY**

Increased building footprints and a loss of restored wetlands at the Office Park under Alternative C would result in a greater amount of impermeable surfaces on the site compared to the project. As a result, hydrology and water quality impacts associated with Alternative C would be greater than those associated with the project. However, both Alternative C and the project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to violation of water quality standards, depletion of groundwater supply and recharge, surface water runoff quantity, and flood hazards. Alternative C and the project would also result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to the alteration of drainage patterns, surface water runoff quality, and tsunami and seiche.

**LAND USE & PLANNING**

Land use and planning impacts associated with Alternative C would be similar to the proposed project because both scenarios involve the same amount of square footage and development as well as the same land uses and discretionary actions. Both Alternative C and the project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the division of an established community and conflict with plans and policies.

**NOISE**

Alternative C would result in increased impacts related to construction noise and operational traffic noise to sensitive receptors at the Mobile Home Park to the north because it involves the location of buildings and therefore construction in closer proximity to adjacent residential uses, due to increased building footprints. This alternative would result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to construction noise and groundborne vibration, similar to the project. Like the project, Alternative C would also result in less-than-significant operational noise impacts.

**POPULATION & HOUSING**

Under Alternative C, the Wellness Center would include the same amount of DD residents and staff and the Office Park would include the same amount of employees. As such, Alternative C would result in similar population and housing impacts as the proposed project. Specifically, Alternative C would also

result in less-than-significant impacts related to inducing substantial population growth and related to the displacement of substantial amount of population.

***PUBLIC SERVICES***

***Police***

Because there would not be a change in population as a result of Alternative C compared to the project, demands for police protection services under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant.

***Fire Protection***

Because there would not be a change in population as a result of Alternative C compared to the project, demands for fire protection services under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant with mitigation.

***Schools***

Because there would not be a change in population as a result of Alternative C compared to the project, demands for schools services under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant.

***Parks & Recreation***

Because there would not be a change in population as a result of Alternative C compared to the project, demands for parks and recreation services under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant.

***Libraries***

Because there would not be a change in population as a result of Alternative C compared to the project, demands for library services under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant.

***TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC***

Section IV.M (Transportation/Traffic) of the DEIR found that the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to traffic hazards, access and onsite circulation, emergency access, parking, transit service, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Section IV.M (Transportation/Traffic) of the DEIR also concluded that the proposed project would result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to intersection LOS and capacity, and cumulative LOS. Given Alternative C includes the same building square footage and units associated with the project, this alternative would also result in less-than-significant impacts related to traffic hazards, access and onsite circulation, emergency access,

parking, transit service, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Likewise, Alternative C would also result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to intersection LOS and capacity, and cumulative LOS.

### ***UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS***

#### ***Sewer***

Alternative C would result in the generation of a similar amount of sewage compared to the project because it involves the same amount of square footage and units as the project. Similar to the project, Alternative C would result in less-than-significant impacts related to wastewater treatment and capacity and sanitary district regulations. Like the project, Alternative C would also result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to wastewater collection capacity, wastewater recycling and disposal, water flow estimates, and creek crossing by sewage pipeline.

#### ***Water***

Alternative C would result in the consumption of a similar amount of water compared to the project because it involves the same amount of square footage and units as the project. Similar to the project, Alternative C would result in less-than-significant impacts related to new or expanded water facilities, potable water demands, adequacy of onsite water well, and water treatment system.

#### ***Solid Waste***

Alternative C would result in the generation of a similar amount of solid waste compared to the proposed project because it involves the same amount of square footage and units as the project. Impacts related to solid waste would be less than significant under Alternative C, which is similar to the project.

#### ***Energy***

Alternative C would require a similar amount of energy compared to the proposed project because it involves the same amount of square footage and units as the project. Impacts related to energy would be less than significant under Alternative C, which is similar to the project.

### ***RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALTERNATIVE TO THE PROJECT OBJECTIVES***

Alternative C meets the project objectives.

#### **D. ALTERNATIVE D (MODIFIED OFFICE PARK SITE PLAN ALTERNATIVE 2)**

Alternative D reduces the size of the Office Park from 225,000 square feet to 200,000 square feet and also eliminates Building A from the Office Park parcel, resulting in three office buildings instead of four. As a result, the building footprint at the Office Park would decrease from 80,000 square feet to approximately 67,000 square feet. The three remaining office buildings (Buildings B, C and D) would be three stories in

height and would be built in the same location as proposed by the project (see Figure III-10). No changes are proposed to the Wellness Center as a part of this alternative.

Except as described above, other project characteristics are assumed to be generally similar to those of the proposed project, for the purpose of analyzing Alternative C. These characteristics include but are not limited to the general location, design and building materials and colors; the specific land uses and tenant types; Platinum level LEED certification, utilities and onsite power generation; onsite farming; wetlands restoration; grading; and phasing.

The potential environmental impacts associated with this alternative are described below and are compared to the significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. All applicable mitigation measures recommended for the proposed project are incorporated into Alternative C.

### ***AESTHETICS***

Under Alternative D, Building A would be eliminated from the Office Park parcel resulting in three office buildings instead of four. While building heights at the Office Park parcel would still be three stories, the elimination of Building A would provide more of a view of the bluffs to the southwest from Airport Street. Overall, Alternative D would result in less-than-significant impacts related to scenic views, scenic resources, and visual character, and less-than-significant impacts with mitigation related to light and glare, similar to the project.

### ***AGRICULTURE RESOURCES***

While less development would occur on the Office Park site under Alternative D and this alternative does include some onsite farming at the Wellness Center site, the majority of the existing farming onsite would be replaced by the proposed Wellness Center and Office Park under both the project and Alternative D. The project site is depicted as Urban and Built-up Land and Other Land on the Important Farmland Map for San Mateo County. Therefore, the project site has not been designated as important farmland and development of the site would not involve conversion of important farmland. Thus, Alternative D would result in similar impacts to agriculture resources as the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant.

### ***AIR QUALITY***

Alternative D would result in slightly less air emissions compared to the project because Alternative D involves less square footage as well as a reduction in vehicle trips. Similar to the project, Alternative D would result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to construction emissions and objectionable odors. Also similar to the proposed project, Alternative D would result in less-than-significant air quality impacts related to: consistency with Air Quality Plan, operational emissions, cumulative regional operational emissions, sensitive receptors, and greenhouse gas emissions.

***BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES***

Due to the construction of only three office buildings at the Office Park, Alternative D could provide more wetlands restoration compared to the project. While less square footage would be built under Alternative D compared to the project, Alternative D would still result in grading of most of the site. As a result, biological resources impacts associated with Alternative D would be similar to those associated with the project. Specifically, similar to the project, Alternative D would result in less-than-significant impacts related to: special-status plant species, sensitive natural communities, wildlife movement and habitat connectivity, and conformance with policies and ordinances related to the protection of biological resources. Likewise, Alternative D would also result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to special-status wildlife species.

***CULTURAL RESOURCES***

Although less square footage would be built under Alternative D compared to the project, Alternative D would still result in grading of most of the site. As a result, cultural resources impacts associated with Alternative D would be similar to those associated with the project. Such impacts include less-than-significant historical resources impacts, and significant but mitigatable impacts related to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains.

***GEOLOGY & SOILS***

Geology and soils impacts associated with Alternative D would be similar to slightly less compared to the project because both Alternative D and the project would result in grading and development of most of the site. The slight difference in impacts is attributed to Alternative D involving one fewer building as well as slightly fewer employees at the Office Park that would be subject to the geology and soils hazards associated with the project site. Overall and similar to the project however, Alternative D would result in less-than-significant impacts related to fault rupture and seismic ground shaking, and significant but mitigatable impacts related to other soil/geologic instabilities (i.e., seismic-related ground failure, total and differential settlement, soil erosion, expansive soil, and pervious pavements).

***HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS***

The reduction in building square footage associated with Alternative D is not anticipated to substantially change the hazards and hazardous materials impacts associated with the project. Implementation of Alternative D would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the routine use, transport and disposal of hazardous materials, similar to the project. Alternative D would also result in less-than-significant impacts related to interference with emergency plans, and the project's less-than-significant impacts related to wildfires. Also, Alternative D would result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to accidental release of hazardous materials and airport operations, which is also similar to the impacts associated with the project.

---

---

## ***HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY***

Slightly less square footage would be built under Alternative D compared to the project, thus Alternative D could result in 13,000 square feet less impermeable surfaces on the site. However, hydrology and water quality impacts associated with Alternative D are anticipated to be similar to those associated with the project. Both Alternative D and the project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to violation of water quality standards, depletion of groundwater supply and recharge, surface water runoff quantity, and flood hazards. Alternative D and the project would also result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to the alteration of drainage patterns, surface water runoff quality, and tsunami and seiche.

## ***LAND USE & PLANNING***

The reduction in building square footage associated with Alternative D would not change the land use impacts associated with the proposed project. Specifically, both Alternative D and the project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the division of an established community and conflict with plans and policies.

## ***NOISE***

Although less construction (including the elimination of Building A, which is the closest sensitive noise receptor to the project site) and fewer vehicle trips would be associated with Alternative D compared to the project, this alternative would still result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to construction noise and groundborne vibration, similar to the project. Like the project, Alternative D would also result in less-than-significant operational noise impacts.

## ***POPULATION & HOUSING***

Under Alternative D, the Wellness Center would include the same amount of DD residents and staff whereas the Office Park would include slightly fewer employees. As such, there would be no population change for the Wellness Center under Alternative D. The reduction in office square footage associated with this alternative could result in slightly less permanent population in the area under the worst-case assumption that all employees relocated to the project area from outside of the unincorporated Half Moon Bay area. Regardless, Alternative D is anticipated to result in similar population and housing impacts as the proposed project. Specifically, Alternative D would also result in less-than-significant impacts related to inducing substantial population growth and related to the displacement of substantial amount of population.

## ***PUBLIC SERVICES***

### ***Police***

Because there would not be a substantial change in population as a result of Alternative D compared to the project, demands for police protection services under this alternative are anticipated to be similar to the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant.

***Fire Protection***

Because there would not be a substantial change in population as a result of Alternative D compared to the project, demands for fire protection services under this alternative are anticipated to be similar to the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant with mitigation.

***Schools***

Because there would not be a substantial change in population as a result of Alternative D compared to the project, demands for schools services under this alternative are anticipated to be similar to the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant.

***Parks & Recreation***

Because there would not be a substantial change in population as a result of Alternative D compared to the project, demands for parks and recreation services under this alternative are anticipated to be similar to the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant.

***Libraries***

Because there would not be a substantial change in population as a result of Alternative D compared to the project, demands for library services under this alternative are anticipated to be similar to the proposed project, which were found to be less than significant.

***TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC***

Section IV.M (Transportation/Traffic) of the DEIR found that the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to traffic hazards, access and onsite circulation, emergency access, parking, transit service, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Section IV.M (Transportation/Traffic) of the DEIR also concluded that the proposed project would result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to intersection LOS and capacity, and cumulative LOS. Given Alternative D reduces the building square footage associated with the project, this alternative would still result in less-than-significant impacts related to traffic hazards, access and onsite circulation, emergency access, parking, transit service, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Likewise, Alternative D would also result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to intersection LOS and capacity, and cumulative LOS.

***UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS***

***Sewer***

By reducing the Office Park by 25,000 square feet, Alternative D would result in the generation of less sewage compared to the project, and hence less sewage to be treated by the onsite wastewater plant and less treated sewage to dispose or recycle. Similar to the project, Alternative D would result in less-than-significant impacts related to wastewater treatment and capacity and sanitary district regulations. Like the

project, Alternative D would also result in significant but mitigatable impacts related to wastewater collection capacity, wastewater recycling and disposal, water flow estimates, and creek crossing by sewage pipeline.

### ***Water***

By reducing the Office Park by 25,000 square feet, Alternative D would result in the consumption of less water compared to the project. Similar to the project, Alternative D would result in less-than-significant impacts related to new or expanded water facilities, potable water demands, adequacy of onsite water well, and water treatment system.

### ***Solid Waste***

Alternative D would result in less generation of solid waste compared to the proposed project because it involves 25,000 fewer square feet than the project. However, impacts related to solid waste would be less than significant under Alternative D, which is similar to the project.

### ***Energy***

Alternative D would require less energy compared to the proposed project because it involves 25,000 fewer square feet than the project. However, impacts related to energy would be less than significant under Alternative D, which is similar to the project.

## ***RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALTERNATIVE TO THE PROJECT OBJECTIVES***

Alternative D meets the project objectives.

## **E. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

In addition to the discussion and comparison of impacts of the proposed project and the alternatives, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative be selected and the reasons for such a selection disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the least amount of significant impacts. In this case, Alternative A (No Project) would result in the least amount of significant environmental impacts (see Table VI-1). However, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an environmentally superior alternative be selected other than the “No Project Alternative”. Based on the analysis above and Table VI-1 on the following pages, Alternative B (Reduced Density/Height for Office Park and Reduced Size for Wellness Center Alternative) has been selected as the environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project. Alternative B is superior to the proposed project and other alternatives primarily due to fewer impacts to visual resources (due to the 2-story building heights) and avoidance of the cultural site on the southern (Wellness Center) site.

**Table VI-1  
Alternatives Comparison**

IMPACT AREA	IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<b>Aesthetics</b>					
Scenic Vistas	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Scenic Resources	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Visual Character	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Light and Glare	LTS/M	NI	LTS/M	LTS/M	LTS/M
Construction	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Agriculture Resources</b>					
Conversion of Farmland	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Air Quality</b>					
Consistency with Air Quality Plan	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Construction Emissions	LTS/M	NI	LTS/M	LTS/M	LTS/M
Operational Emissions	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Cumulative Regional Operational Emissions	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Sensitive Receptors	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Objectionable Odors	LTS/M	NI	LTS/M	LTS/M	LTS/M
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Biological Resources</b>					
Special Status Plant Species	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Special Status Wildlife Species	LTS/M	NI	LTS/M	LTS/M	LTS/M
Sensitive Natural Communities	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Federally Protected Wetlands	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Wildlife Movement and Habitat Connectivity	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Conformance with Policies and Ordinances	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Cultural Resources</b>					
Historical Resources	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Archaeological Resources	LTS/M	NI	LTS/M	LTS/M	LTS/M
Paleontological Resources	LTS/M	NI	LTS/M	LTS/M	LTS/M
Human Remains	LTS/M	NI	LTS/M	LTS/M	LTS/M
<b>Geology &amp; Soils</b>					
Fault Rupture	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Seismic Ground Shaking	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Seismic-Related Ground Failure	LTS/M	NI	LTS/M	LTS/M	LTS/M

**Table VI-1  
Alternatives Comparison**

IMPACT AREA	IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Total and Differential Settlement Soil Erosion or Loss of Topsoil Expansive Soil Pervious Pavements	LTS/M LTS/M LTS/M LTS/M	NI NI NI NI	LTS/M LTS/M LTS/M LTS/M	LTS/M LTS/M LTS/M LTS/M	LTS/M LTS/M LTS/M LTS/M
<b>Hazards &amp; Hazards Materials</b> Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials Airport Operations Interfere with Emergency Plans Wildfires	LTS LTS/M LTS/M LTS LTS	NI NI NI NI NI NI	LTS LTS/M LTS/M LTS LTS	LTS LTS/M LTS/M LTS LTS	LTS LTS/M LTS/M LTS LTS
<b>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</b> Violate Water Quality Standards Substantially Deplete Ground Water Supply and Recharge Substantially Alter Drainage Patterns Quantity of Surface Water Runoff Quality of Surface Water Runoff Degradate Groundwater Quality 100-Year Flood Hazard Flooding from Failure of Dam or Levee Tsunami and Seiche	LTS LTS LTS/M LTS LTS/M LTS/M LTS LTS LTS/M	NI NI NI NI NI NI NI NI NI NI	LTS LTS LTS/M LTS LTS/M LTS/M LTS LTS LTS/M	LTS LTS LTS/M LTS LTS/M LTS/M LTS LTS LTS/M	LTS LTS LTS/M LTS LTS/M LTS/M LTS LTS LTS/M
<b>Land Use &amp; Planning</b> Division of a Community Conflict with Plans and Policies	LTS LTS	NI NI	LTS LTS	LTS LTS	LTS LTS
<b>Noise</b> Construction Noise Construction-Related Groundborne Vibration Operational Noise Levels at Site Operational Roadway Noise Levels	LTS/M LTS/M LTS LTS	NI NI NI NI	LTS/M LTS/M LTS LTS	LTS/M LTS/M LTS LTS	LTS/M LTS/M LTS LTS
<b>Population &amp; Housing</b> Induce Substantial Population Growth Displace Substantial Population	LTS LTS	NI NI	LTS LTS	LTS LTS	LTS LTS
<b>Public Services</b> Police Protection	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS

**Table VI-1  
Alternatives Comparison**

IMPACT AREA	IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT	ALTERNATIVE A	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Fire Protection – Construction	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Fire Protection – Operation	LTS/M	NI	LTS/M	LTS/M	LTS/M
Schools	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Parks and Recreation	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Libraries	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Transportation/Traffic</b>					
Intersection LOS and Capacity	LTS/M	NI	LTS/M	LTS/M	LTS/M
Hazards	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Access and Onsite Circulation	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Emergency Access	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Parking	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Transit Service	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Construction	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Cumulative LOS	LTS/M	NI	LTS/M	LTS/M	LTS/M
Cumulative Signal Warrant Analysis	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</b>					
Wastewater Treatment and Capacity	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Wastewater Collection Capacity	LTS/M	NI	LTS/M	LTS/M	LTS/M
Sanitary District Regulations	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Wastewater Recycling & Disposal	LTS/M	NI	LTS/M	LTS/M	LTS/M
Water Flow Estimates	LTS/M	NI	LTS/M	LTS/M	LTS/M
Creek Crossing by Sewage Pipeline	LTS/M	NI	LTS/M	LTS/M	LTS/M
New or Expanded Water Facilities	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Potable Water Demands	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Adequacy of Onsite Water Well	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Water Treatment System	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Solid Waste	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
Energy	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS
<p><b>Key:</b>                      SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact                      LTS = Less-than-Significant Impact                      LTS/M = Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation                      NI = No Impact</p>					