

Section 7.0
Alternatives to the Proposed Project



7.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

In accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6, the following section describes a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed Project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the proposed Project. The evaluation considers the comparative merits of each alternative. The analysis focuses on alternatives capable of avoiding significant environmental effects or reducing them to less than significant levels, even if these alternatives would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the proposed Project objectives.

Potential environmental impacts associated with three separate alternatives are compared to impacts from the proposed Project. The alternatives include:

- ◆ No Project Alternative;
- ◆ Reduced Density Alternative A; and
- ◆ Reduced Density Alternative B.

Throughout the following analysis, impacts of alternatives are analyzed for each of the issue areas examined in Section 5.0 of this EIR. In this manner, each alternative can be compared to the proposed Project on an issue-by-issue basis. Each impact is compared to the proposed Project. The section concludes with a subsection, which concludes the environmentally superior alternative in accordance with Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the *CEQA Guidelines*.

An EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative; where the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the others evaluated. Only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are relevant in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed Project.

7.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

The No Project Alternative assumes that the Specific Plan would not be implemented and buildout would be in accordance with the 1995 *General Plan*, as currently approved. With this Alternative, buildout in the area would consist of 27 residential dwelling units and 3,379,039 square feet (sf) of commercial uses. Residential densities within the proposed Project propose an increase to 0-24 du/ac, 0-30 du/ac, and 0-40 du/ac, which would result in a buildout of 1,115 residential units and a reduction in commercial uses to approximately 2.9 million square feet. The existing residential, retail, restaurant, office, and industrial uses would remain on-site.



IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Traffic and Circulation

The No Project Alternative would maintain the existing traffic and circulation conditions as referenced in the 1995 *General Plan*. A horizon year of 2030 was used to compare long-term effects of the existing conditions/No Project Alternative to the proposed Project. Refer to Section 5.1, *Traffic and Circulation*, for the complete study and analysis. The following is a summary of circulation conditions and existing traffic.

Trips for the No Project Alternative/General Plan Year 2030 indicate SR-62 is the most heavily traveled roadway, with daily traffic volumes ranging from 34,000 vehicles per day (VPD) to 59,800 VPD in the study area. Several other roadways are projected to carry daily traffic volumes in excess of 20,000 VPD, including SR-247, Yucca Trail, Joshua Lane, and Onaga Trail. Twenty-two intersections, primarily along Twentynine Palms Hwy, Santa Fe Trail, and Yucca Trail, are projected to experience unacceptable levels of service, according to the Town of Yucca Valley/County of San Bernardino criteria, during the peak hours (without improvements). Additionally, 13 intersections within the study area are projected to warrant traffic signals by 2030 under the No Project Alternative.

The traffic patterns for the proposed Project are generally similar to 2030 No Project conditions. The primary difference is that re-alignment of SR-62 would reduce traffic volumes on Main Street in the Old Town area to between 3,200 and 6,600 VPD. Additionally, intersection turning movement volumes are projected to experience unacceptable levels of service during the peak hours (without improvements) at 16 intersections, according to the Town of Yucca Valley/County of San Bernardino criteria, and 15 traffic signals are anticipated to be necessary by the 2030 Horizon Year proposed Project traffic conditions.

The No Project Alternative data was not found to result in environmentally superior long-term results. The No Project Alternative is equivalent to the proposed Project.

Air Quality

Under the No Project Alternative, buildout of the area would occur under the existing *General Plan* land use designations. Based on the analysis provided in Section 5.2, *Air Quality, General Plan* buildout impacts would result in approximately 2,006 less daily trips compared to the proposed Project. As development under the *General Plan* would result in fewer trips, it would also result in less emission of criteria pollutants.

Furthermore, the proposed Project was found to be inconsistent with the existing Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District's (MDAQMD's) *Ozone Attainment Plan* (2004). Since the *Attainment Plan* is based upon the land use assumption contained within the Town of Yucca Valley *General Plan*, a No Project Alternative would be consistent with the *Attainment Plan*. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be considered less than significant. The No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed Project in this regard.



Hydrology/Drainage and Water Quality

Under the No Project Alternative, existing land use designations would remain; however, similar to the proposed Project, new development within the Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs) would be required to comply with FEMA regulations for flood mitigation. Increased density could result in greater lot coverage along with increased building heights. As the No Project Alternative would allow development on each parcel within the SPA, the reduction in residential density would not necessarily result in a substantial decrease in runoff resulting from less impermeable surface throughout the SPA. Additionally, impact fees, which are imposed based on the degree of impact to the drainage and hydrology of the area, would mitigate impacts of the No Project Alternative conditions, similar to the same level as the proposed Project. Thus, the No Project Alternative would be considered environmentally equivalent to the proposed Project.

Public Services and Utilities

An increase in demand for public services and utilities would occur with implementation of the proposed Project due to a total potential of 1,115 residential dwelling units, compared to what is allowed under existing conditions. However, though impact fees and other measures are noted in [Section 5.4](#), these impacts have been found to be less than significant in regards to fire and police protection, schools, library, roadway maintenance, recreation, water, solid waste, and other utilities.

With regard to wastewater, the No Project Alternative would continue to result in wastewater treated through septic systems located on individual lots within the SPA. Currently, this method is contributing to the concentration of nitrates at some wells and the decline of the water aquifer. This problem would continue under existing conditions until a wastewater collection and treatment facility is constructed. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the use of septic systems and result in increased wastewater in the systems, which is likely to worsen the existing problem. Thus, the No Project Alternative would not be considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project in this regard.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The No Project Alternative would not be consistent with the purpose and intent of the Specific Plan, which is to attract and expand economic activity and commerce within the Old Town area, nor would it implement the goals, objectives, and policies of the Town's *General Plan*, which include the following:

- ◆ Implement the *General Plan* policies by presenting more detailed direction for the old Town areas to improve overall walkability, traffic circulation, and economic viability.
- ◆ Provide a diversity of housing opportunities that responds to a variety of local needs, incomes, densities, and promote a vibrant Old Town area.



- ◆ Establish high-quality architectural design, in both scale and character, to address the future growth of the area.
- ◆ Develop safe motor vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation systems, emphasizing the pedestrian experience along the “Main Street” within the Old Town area and mitigating potential future impacts at SR-62 intersections.
- ◆ Carry forward the Vision Plan, guiding principles, and community input and consensus generated during the community outreach program, through more detailed plans, guidelines, and regulations.

The No Project Alternative would maintain the existing conditions within the Old Town area in Yucca Valley. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would be inferior to the proposed Project in its objectives and purpose.

7.2 REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE A

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

The Reduced Density Alternative A modifies the proposed Specific Plan, which consists of four planning districts: the Old Town Mixed-Use District, Old Town Commercial/Residential District, Old Town Industrial/Commercial District, and the Old Town Highway Commercial District. The approximately 250-acre Project boundary would remain the same; however, residential densities would be reduced to those permitted by the 1995 *General Plan*. This would include reducing densities to up to 10 du/ac and 14 du/ac, which are classified under Residential Multi-Family R-M-10 and R-M-14, respectively. Currently, the Project area is permitted to develop a maximum of 0-5 du/ac within the Residential Single-Family land use designation (R-S-5) located in two northern sections of the SPA. Residential Rural allows less units per acre and current *General Plan* conditions permit a total of 27 units at buildout. The General Commercial (C-G) and Service Commercial (C-S) land designations do not permit residential development, and any residences currently located within those areas are non-conforming uses. The Mixed-Use Commercial designation (C-MU) is intended to include a mix of land uses, including residential uses in and near the downtown area, in order to allow highly integrated commercial uses with residential development that can rely on pedestrian access to commercial services and employment centers. Implementation of the Reduced Density Alternative A would modify the existing C-G and C-S uses, but is in compliance with the C-MU designation requirement of creating of a Specific Plan.

The Reduced Density Alternative A would result in a greater than 50 percent reduction in residential density in three of the land use districts proposed in the Old Town Yucca Valley Specific Plan. Residential densities are reduced to designations identified within the 1995 *General Plan*, R-M-14 and R-M-10. The Alternative would alter the regulations and guidelines identified in the Old Town Yucca Valley Specific Plan for residential land use, in order to maintain consistency with residential land designations allowed by the 1995 *General Plan*. Table 7-1, *Comparison of Proposed Project and Reduced Density Alternative A*, provides a comparison of the proposed Project and the *General Plan* Density Alternative, Scenario 2.



This alternative allows up to 14 du/ac, which is classified in the 1995 *General Plan* as Residential Multi-Family (RMF: R-M-14), for the Old Town Mixed-Use District and the Old Town Industrial/Commercial District. According to the *General Plan*, the purpose of this land designation is to promote planned residential development (PRD) and amenities beyond those expected under conventional development. It is also meant to achieve greater flexibility in design, vary ranges in densities, and encourage well planned neighborhoods through creative and imaginative planning.

Table 7-1
Comparison of Proposed Project and Reduced Density Alternative A

Reduced Density Alternative A District and Land Use Type(s)	Reduced Density Alternative A		Old Town Yucca Valley Specific Plan Buildout		Reduced Project Alternative Buildout Net Change From Specific Plan	
	Dwelling Units	Square Feet	Dwelling Units	Square Feet	Dwelling Units	Square Feet
Old Town Mixed-Use						
Commercial/Retail - up to 1.00 FAR; Residential – up to 14 du/ac	163	759,317	465	759,317	(302)	0
Old Town Highway Commercial						
Commercial/Retail – up to 0.35 FAR; Residential – none	N/A	889,684	N/A	889,684	N/A	0
Old Town Commercial/Residential						
Commercial/Retail – up to 0.40 FAR; Residential – up to 10 du/ac	172	699,769	413	699,769	(241)	0
Old Town Industrial/Commercial						
Industrial/Commercial – up to 0.40 FAR; Res. – up to 14 du/ac	111	551,834	237	551,834	(126)	0
TOTALS	446	2,900,604	1,115	2,900,604	(669)	0
Source: <i>Old Town Yucca Valley Specific Plan</i> , RBF Consulting, Urban Design Studio, Spreadsheet subdistricts_091205. May 5, 2006.						
FAR = Floor Area Ratio; du/acre = Dwelling Units per Acre.						
Calculations are approximate and based on parcel totals and excluding public right-of-way.						

The Old Town Commercial/ Residential district would allow for up to 10 du/ac. According to the *General Plan*, this designation allows for greater diversity of residential development, ranging from single family to apartments. It allows the creation of planned communities and senior housing, where smaller units and higher densities may be appropriate. Duplex and multiplex development is the most common and provides for PRD's comprised of a varying range of residential types, including apartments and condominiums. Mobile home parks or subdivisions with PRD type development are also allowed. This land use designation would alter the proposed *Specific Plan* regulations by allowing single-family housing within the approximately 57-acre district. Commercial, industrial, retail, and all other uses



would be subject to the requirements outlined within the Old Town Yucca Valley Specific Plan.

Development of this Alternative would result in 446 residential units, including multifamily, live/work spaces, condominiums/townhomes, and mixed-use developments (residential over retail/office). Single-family residential would only be permitted in the Old Town Commercial/Residential District.

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Traffic and Circulation

The Reduced Density Alternative A maintains a similar land use structure as the Specific Plan with a 669-unit reduction in residential units. This alternative would result in a reduction of commercial/Industrial square feet, compared to the existing General Plan Conditions (2.9 million sf) and a reduction in residential units, compared to the proposed Specific Plan. This would likely result in a slight reduction of ADTs to and from the SPA, however, the 669-unit reduction is not likely to reduce all impacts to intersections, considering that existing deficiencies, and improvements would remain necessary.

The nature of the proposed Project, which creates multi-uses for trip linkage, proximity for local residents and a pedestrian friendly environment, is not accounted for in the Traffic Study calculations. However, it is stated that these features are expected to further reduce vehicle traffic and trip generation rates within the SPA. Alternative A jeopardizes the integrity of the proposed Project due to altered regulations that modify allowed residential uses on-site. Therefore, traffic reductions, due to design regulations and land uses, may not be as effective as the proposed Project. Thus, Alternative A would not be considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project in this regard

Air Quality

The Reduced Density Alternative A would result in approximately 669 less dwelling units compared to the proposed Project, which would result in a significant air quality impact during short-term construction, long-term operation and cumulative impacts. It is anticipated that impacts associated with the Reduced Density Alternative A would also result in significant short-term and long-term impacts regarding air quality. Additionally the proposed Project would not be consistent with the local air quality management plan.

Despite implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the Alternative and proposed Project would have significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality. Although Alternative A would include less dwelling units, the change would not significantly decrease the impacts associated with development of the area. Implementation of Alternative A would be considered environmentally equivalent to the proposed Project.



Hydrology and Drainage

Under the Reduced Density Alternative A, any development within the SFHAs would be required to comply with FEMA regulations for flood mitigation. Since this Alternative allows for development on each parcel within the SPA, the reduction in residential density would not necessarily result in a substantial decrease in runoff. Additionally, impact fees, which are imposed based on the degree of impact to the drainage and hydrology of the area, would mitigate impacts. Thus, the Reduced Density Alternative A would be considered environmentally equivalent to the proposed Project.

Public Services and Utilities

An increased in demand for public services and utilities would occur with implementation of the proposed Project due to the total of 1,115 residential dwelling units, a 1,088 increase, compared to what is allowed by the existing conditions. The Reduced Density Alternative A would also increase the number of residential units in the SPA to 446, which is a 419-unit increase from what is currently planned for in the 1995 General Plan. Impact fees and other measures noted in Section 5.4 of this EIR identify requirements to mitigate impacts to fire and police protection, roadway maintenance, and recreation to a level less than significant. Schools may be impacted due to single-family housing in the Old Town Commercial/Residential district. As indicated by the MUSD, large tract developments of residential housing in concentrated areas within the Specific Plan area may require the establishment of Community Facility Districts, which would reduce the impact to a level less than significant.

The Reduced Density Alternative A would continue the current condition of wastewater being treated through septic systems located on individual lots within the SPA. This method is contributing to the concentration of nitrates at some wells and the decline of the water aquifer. The problem would continue under until the construction of a wastewater collection and treatment facility is initiated and completed by the Hi-Desert Water District. Any new development would generate more wastewater and increase the use of septic tanks, which could worsen the existing problem. However, this Alternative would result in less wastewater generated. Thus, Reduced Density Alternative A would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project in this regard.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Reduced Density Alternative A would not fully achieve the purpose and intent of the Specific Plan. The purpose, to attract and expand economic activity and commerce within the Old Town area, and implement the goals, objectives and policies of the Town's General Plan. This Alternative maintains the districts proposed in the Old Town Yucca Valley Specific Plan, however, it alters the residential densities and regulations. The Alternative has the potential to result in the partial to full achievement of the following goals:



- ◆ Implement the General Plan Policies by presenting more detailed direction for the Old Town areas to improve its overall walkability, traffic circulation and economic viability.
- ◆ Development safe motor vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation systems, emphasizing the pedestrian experience along the “Main Street” within the Old Town area and mitigating potential future impacts at SR-62 intersections.
- ◆ Carry forward the vision Plan, guiding principles and community input and consensus generated during the community outreach program, through more detailed plans, guidelines, and regulations.

Because Reduced Density Alternative A would comply with plan regulations and guidelines, with the exception of residential regulations, the Alternative would maintain the majority of the goals and policies for the proposed Project. Potential underachievement or inadequacy resulting from the Reduced Density Alternative A would be with the following goals:

- ◆ Establish high-quality architectural design, in both scale and character, to address the future growth of the area.
- ◆ Provide a diversity of housing opportunities that responds to a variety of local needs, incomes, densities and promote a vibrant Old Town area.

Under this Alternative, the ability to achieve “economic vitality” and “vibrancy” would be jeopardized due to the reduced residential density. The reduction in residential units reduces the amount of people living in the SPA, which is a large factor in determining the long-term success of a commercial/retail area. This would make the SPA more reliant on an economic draw from residents from outside the SPA. It is difficult to predict the exact effect density modifications would have in an area and the ability for different types of businesses to attract outsiders into the area and also how additional independent variable would interact with both. However, due to the nature of the Old Town area, it is likely the proposed Project objectives would not be achieved to the same caliber with the Reduced Density Alternative A.

7.3 REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE B

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE

The Reduced Density Alternative B maintains the same policy, regulations, and guidelines discussed in the Specific Plan; however, it reduces residential density of the proposed Project to equal that of the lowest allowed residential density (24 du/ac) in the proposed Specific Plan. The Old Town Commercial/ Residential allows up to 24 du/ac for residential; therefore, under this Alternative B, residential densities for the Old Town Mixed-Use and Old Town Industrial/Commercial are reduced from up to 40 du/ac and up to 30 du/ac respectively to 0-24 du/ac. This Alternative would result in 882 maximum allowed residential units, which is a 234-unit reduction, when compared to the proposed Old Town Yucca Valley Specific Plan. Commercial square footage would remain the same at approximately 2.9 million. Refer to Table



7-2, *Comparison of Proposed Project and Reduced Density Alternative B*, for a comparison of the projects.

Table 7-2
Comparison of Proposed Project and Reduced Density Alternative B

Reduced Density Alternative B District and Land Use Type(s)	Reduced Density Alternative B		Old Town Yucca Valley Specific Plan Buildout		Reduced Project Alternative Buildout Net Change From Specific Plan	
	Dwelling Units	Square Feet	Dwelling Units	Square Feet	Dwelling Units	Square Feet
Old Town Mixed-Use						
Commercial/Retail - up to 1.00 FAR; Residential – up to 24du/ac	279	759,317	465	759,317	(186)	0
Old Town Highway Commercial						
Commercial/Retail – up to 0.35 FAR; Residential – none	N/A	889,684	N/A	889,684	N/A	0
Old Town Commercial/Residential						
Commercial/Retail – up to 0.40 FAR; Residential – up to 24 du/ac	413	699,769	413	699,769	0	0
Old Town Industrial/Commercial						
Industrial/Commercial – up to 0.40 FAR; Res. – up to 24 du/ac	190	551,834	238	551,834	(48)	0
TOTALS	882	2,900,604	1,115	2,900,604	(234)	0
<small>FAR = Floor Area Ratio; du/acre = Dwelling Units per Acre. Source: <i>Old Town Yucca Valley Specific Plan</i>, RBF Consulting, Urban Design Studio, May 5, 2006. Note: Numbers were calculated by the 100th decimal during the Specific Plan process, and were rounded for the purpose of analysis in this EIR.</small>						

IMPACT COMPARISON TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Traffic and Circulation

The Reduced Density Alternative B maintains the land uses described in the Specific Plan with a 234-unit reduction in residential units. This alternative would result in a reduction of commercial square feet, compared to General Plan buildout conditions and a residential unit reduction, compared to the proposed Specific Plan. This would likely result in a further reduction of ADTs to and from the SPA, however, the 234-unit reduction is not likely to reduce impacts to intersections and improvements would remain necessary.

Both Alternative B and the proposed Project would create a more pedestrian friendly environment, which is expected to further reduce vehicle traffic, although no additional reduction was assumed in the traffic study analysis. Nor was credit taken in for the mixed-use nature of the development when calculating trip generation. Alternative B would maintain the regulations within the Specific Plan and most of the integrity of the proposed Project with a 234-unit reduction in residential units. Thus,



the Reduced Density Alternative B would be environmentally equivalent to the proposed Project.

Air Quality

The Reduced Density Alternative B would result in approximately 234 less dwelling units compared to the proposed Project. As previously mentioned, the proposed Project would result in a significant air quality impact during short-term construction, long-term operation, cumulative impacts, and local air quality management plan consistency. Similar to Alternative A, it is anticipated that impacts associated with Alternative B would result in significant short-term and long-term impacts regarding air quality.

The change in densities for residential homes associated with Alternative B would not significantly decrease emissions. Development would exceed the MDAQMD short-term and long-term standards. Furthermore, impacts regarding plan consistency and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, implementation of Alternative B would be considered environmentally equivalent to the proposed Project.

Hydrology and Drainage

Under the Reduced Density Alternative B, any development within the SFHAs would be required to comply with FEMA regulations for flood mitigation. Increased density results in a greater lot coverage along with increased building heights. As the Reduced Density Alternative allows for development on each parcel within the SPA, the reduction in residential density would not necessarily result in a substantial decrease in runoff resulting from less impermeable surfaces. Additionally, impact fees, which are imposed based on the degree of impact to the drainage and hydrology of the area, would mitigate impacts from the proposed Project to the equivalent end result as the existing conditions. Thus, the Reduced Project Density Alternative would be considered environmentally equivalent to the proposed Project.

Public Services and Utilities

An increased in demand for public services and utilities would occur with implementation of the proposed Project due to a total of 855 residential dwelling units, which is greater than what is allowed by the existing General Plan. However, though impact fees and other measures noted in [Section 5.4](#), these impacts have been found to be less than significant in regards to Fire and Police protection, schools, library, roadway maintenance, recreation, water, solid waste and other utilities. Therefore, Scenario 3 is environmentally equivalent to the proposed Project for the utilities listed.

In regard to wastewater, Scenario 3, Reduced Density Alternative would continue to allow wastewater to be treated through septic systems located on individual lots within the SPA. Currently, this method is contributing to the concentration of nitrates at some wells and the decline of the water aquifer. This problem will continue under existing conditions until the construction of a wastewater collection and treatment facility is completed or the approval of development impact fees. Implementation of



the Reduced Density Alternative would generate more wastewater and increase the use of septic tanks, which is likely to worsen the existing problem. However, the Reduced Density Alternative would generate less wastewater than the proposed Project and thus would be considered environmentally superior.

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Reduced Density Alternative B, would likely achieve the purpose and intent of the Specific Plan, which is to attract and expand economic activity and commerce within the Old Town area. It would also be able implement the goals, objectives and policies of the Town's General Plan to a level nearly satisfactory to the proposed Project. The Reduced Project Density Alternative maintains the districts proposed in the Old Town Yucca Valley Specific Plan and the regulations and guidelines. Goals that will likely be met with the Reduced Project Density include the following:

- ◆ Implement the General Plan Policies by presenting more detailed direction for the Old Town areas to improve its overall walkability, traffic circulation and economic viability.
- ◆ Establish high-quality architectural design, in both scale and character, to address the future growth of the area.
- ◆ Development safe motor vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation systems, emphasizing the pedestrian experience along the "Main Street" within the Old Town area and mitigating potential future impacts at SR-62 intersections.
- ◆ Carry forward the vision Plan, guiding principles and community input and consensus generated during the community outreach program, through more detailed plans, guidelines, and regulations.

Reduced Density Alternative B, would comply with all plan regulations and guidelines discussed in the proposed Specific Plan, therefore the Alternative would have similar results in the SPA as the proposed Project. The following goal will may not be achieved to the degree intended by the proposed Project:

- ◆ Provide a diversity of housing opportunities that responds to a variety of local needs, incomes, densities and promote a vibrant Old Town area.

The ability to insure adequate "economic vitality" and "vibrancy" because the reduction in residential units means business may be more reliant on an economic draw from residents from outside the SPA. Since regulations and guidelines were established to support a local population, business may suffer. However, as previously stated, it is difficult to predict the exact effect increased density would have on businesses in a particular area. It is also uncertain whether the marked demand would have resulted in a density of up to 40 du/ac and 30du/ac and it is possible the reduction would have no impact. With this Alternative, the intent of the proposed Specific Plan and the goals and objectives of Town, lists above, would be adequately achieved.



7.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The determination of an environmentally superior alternative is based on the consideration of how the alternative fulfills the Project objectives and how the alternative either reduces significant, unavoidable impacts or substantially reduces the impacts to the surrounding environment. In consideration of these factors, the Reduced Density Alternative B would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative to the proposed Project.

The Reduced Density Alternative B would result in reduced development and reduced environmental impacts to public services and utilities. Although some impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, the Reduced Density Alternative B would reduce traffic and circulation, air quality and wastewater impacts. When compared to the proposed Project, the Reduced Density Alternative B would be environmentally superior and most adequately fulfill the Project objectives compacted to the other alternatives. Table 7-3, Comparison of Alternatives, displays a breakdown of the three Alternatives compared to the proposed Project.

**Table 7-3
Comparison of Alternatives**

Sections	No Project	Reduced Density Alternative A	Reduced Density Alternative B
Traffic and Circulation	=	=	=
Air Quality	∇	=	=
Hydrology, Drainage and Water Quality	=	=	=
Public Services	=	=	=
Utilities	∇	∇	∇
▲ Indicates an impact that is greater than the proposed Project (environmentally inferior). ∇ Indicates an impact that is less than the proposed Project (environmentally superior). = Indicates an impact that is equal to the proposed Project (neither environmentally superior or inferior).			