VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The State 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 State 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 decisionmaking 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

Greenhouse gas emissions from future land uses within the project are anticipated to be cumulatively significant, and the project's impact with regard to greenhouse gas emissions would remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation.

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

As stated above, the range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project. The objectives of the proposed project are as follows:

- Subdivision of the property into residential, commercial, open space and park lots in a manner that is consistent with the City of Chico's land use plans, policies, and regulations;
- Construction of infrastructure to serve all proposed lots;
- Preserve a significant amount of open space on the site, over 100 acres, so as to retain the areas of highest biological resource value;
- Enhance public access to and protect the integrity of the Butte Creek Diversion Channel and adjacent habitats;
- Create residential neighborhoods in the project that offer a variety of housing types at various densities and price points to help meet the City's housing needs;
- Development of a project that is consistent with City design policies and Design Guidelines Manual;
- Provide commercial centers near major intersections to serve the surrounding residential neighborhoods and greater community; and
- Provide revenue to local businesses during project construction and operation.

Overview of Selected Alternatives

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

Alternative A: No Project Alternative

Alternative B: Elimination of RS-20 Lots

Alternative C: Existing Zoning Alternative

Alternatives Considered but Rejected as 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 for detailed study, and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Furthermore, Section 15126(f)(1) states that "among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries…and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire or control or otherwise have access to the alternative site. No one of these factors established a fixed limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives."

An alternative involving development only west of Bruce Road was rejected as infeasible as it would not meet most of the project objectives including the objectives to provide a significant number of single family (460 lots) and multi-family residential units (12.4 acres) to help meet the City's needs for housing. This alternative was further deemed infeasible, as it would not provide revenue to local businesses during project construction and operation in a financially feasible manner.

An off-site alternative was rejected as infeasible because the project applicant does not own any other property that would be feasible for this project or that could accommodate the density of this project in the City of Chico and cannot "reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to [an] alternative site" (refer to §15126.[f][1] of the CEQA Guidelines). In addition, the proposed project is not unique in that development of a similar project elsewhere would not preclude nor eliminate demand for the development of the project on this project site.

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 two alternatives with those of the proposed project for the environmental topics analyzed in detail in Sections IV.B – IV. Q of the Draft EIR.

A. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires that an EIR evaluate a "No Project Alternative," which is intended to allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. In cases where the project constitutes a land development project, the No Project Alternative is the "circumstance under which the project does not proceed." For many projects, the No Project Alternative represents a "No Development" or an "Existing Conditions" scenario, in which the project site remains in its existing condition and no new development occurs for the foreseeable future. However, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) establishes that "If disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others such as the proposal of some other project, this 'no project' consequence should be discussed." Therefore, Alternative A. the No Project Alternative would be the scenario in which the no grading or development would occur on the project site and the existing site conditions would remain.

Impact Analysis

Under Alternative A, no grading or development would occur on the project site and the existing site conditions would remain. The analysis of Alternative A assumes the continuation of existing physical conditions on the site. Accordingly, this alternative would avoid all of the proposed project's significant impacts (including significant unavoidable greenhouse gas emission impacts), as well as the need to implement any mitigation measures.

Relationship of the Alternative to the Project Objectives

The No Project Alternative would not meet the following project objectives:

- Subdivision of the property into residential, commercial, open space and park lots in a manner that is consistent with the City of Chico's land use plans, policies, and regulations;
- Construction of infrastructure to serve all proposed lots;
- Preserve a significant amount of open space on the site, over 100 acres, so as to retain the areas of highest biological resource value;
- Enhance public access to and protect the integrity of the Butte Creek Diversion Channel and adjacent habitats;
- Create residential neighborhoods in the project that offer a variety of housing types at various densities and price points to help meet the City's housing needs;
- Development of a project that is consistent with City design policies and Design Guidelines Manual;
- Provide commercial centers near major intersections to serve the surrounding residential neighborhoods and greater community; and
- Provide revenue to local businesses during project construction and operation.

Conclusion

The Alternative A would avoid the proposed project's significant impacts and would have less impact on all environmental topical areas. However, it would meet only one of the eight objectives for the proposed project.

B. ELIMINATION OF RS-20 LOTS ALTERNATIVE

Under Alternative B, the 45 proposed suburban-residential (RS-20) lots in the southeast portion of the project site would be eliminated and approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) would be shifted to Low Density Residential (R1) development, Figure VII.Alts-1. All other portions of the project would remain the same as the proposed project.

Elimination RS-20 Lots

Alternative B would eliminate the need to extend infrastructure and utilities east of the Butte Creek Diversion Channel with the project. The area previously associated with the RS-20 lots, which contains 1.2 acres of occupied Butte County meadowfoam habitat, would be added to the open space preserve and habitat monitoring plan to be established as part of the project.

Commercial-to-Residential Shift

Under Alternative B, approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) would be shifted to Low Density Residential (R1) development. The approximately 7-acre commercial lot would still be situated at the intersection of Bruce Road and East 20th Street, and the remaining 13 acres (nearest Parkhurst Street and Laredo Way) would be platted out with R1 lots appropriate for single-family residential development. Based on an average gross density of 5 units per acre, the additional 13 acres of R1-zoned property would correspond to approximately 65 homes. Thus, Alternative B would result in the following changes to the project totals listed on Page III-10:

Open Space: 131.1 acres (up from 108.8 acres)
Single-family residential, standard lots (489 lots): 94.0 acres
Single-family, half-acre lots (0 lots): 0 acres (down from 22.3 acres)
Commercial: 23.6 acres (down from 36.6 acres)

Changes to the amount of public right-of-way dedication will depend upon the specific street network design for the added R1 lots, but is anticipated to remain around approximately 42 acres.

Alternative B would require the following, but not necessarily limited to, discretionary approvals:

- Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map
- General Plan Amendment
- Rezone
- Boundary Line Modification
- Grading permits
- Building permits

Study Area (317.03 ac.)

Lot 471
13 - acres
R1 - low density residential
7 - acre commercial

North Addendum Area - 0.80 acre

West Addendum Area - 1.00 acre

Project Footprint

Figure VII.Alts-1. Alternative B Project Footprint

N
W E
S

wra
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

Stonegate Vesting Tentative Subdivision
Map and GPA/Rezone
City of Chico, California

0 250 500 1,000
Feet

Map Prepared Date: 4/6/2018
Map Prepared By: smortensen
Base Source: Esri Streaming - NAIP 2014
Data Source(s): WRA, Rolls Anderson & Rolls, Foothill

Path: L:\Acad 2000 Files\26000\26061\GIS\ArcMap\CEQA\2018\Project Footprint.mxd

Aesthetics

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, and shifting approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development. All other project features would be located in the same locations, and be used for land use activities similar to those of the proposed project. Additionally, similar exterior light fixtures and illumination elements would be installed. The elimination of RS-20 lots would reduce blockage of the slopping foothills adjacent to the site, which would be beneficial from a visual perspective. Therefore, the Alternative B would have less impact on aesthetics, light, and glare than the proposed project.

Air Quality

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, and shifting approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development. Alternative B would generate fewer overall trips and vehicle miles traveled than the proposed project and, therefore, would reduce operational emissions of criteria pollutants, toxic air contaminants, and greenhouse gas emissions. The reduction in daily trip generation would lessen the severity of air quality impacts as shown in Table VII.ALTS-1.

Table VII.ALTS-1: Alternative B Operational Emissions

Scenario	ROG	NOx	PM_{10}
Unmitigated - *Daily*			
Maximum Daily Emissions (pounds)	51.7 lbs.	39.1 lbs.	71.9 lbs.
BCAQMD Thresholds (pounds/day)	*25* lbs.	*25* lbs.	*80* lbs.
Exceed Threshold?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**
Mitigated - *Daily*			
Mitigated Maximum Daily Emissions (pounds)	51.7 lbs.	39.1 lbs.	71.9 lbs.
BCAQMD Thresholds (pounds/day)	*25* lbs.	*25* lbs.	*80* lbs.
Exceed Threshold?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**

The same mitigation measures as presented in the Air Quality section would apply under Alternative B, though the anticipated monetary amount needed to mitigate residual impacts would be lower. Based on the current calculations (26.7 pounds ROG + 14.1 pounds NO_x = 40.8 pounds/day x 180/2,000 = 3.67 tons/year/5.5 = 0.67 x 25 x $18,260 = $304,776), this would result in a payment of $304,776 to the Off-site Mitigation Program, which would be

utilized by the BCAQMD for a variety of emission reduction programs located throughout the Air District. Mitigation Measure AIR-2C/GHG-1 requires the project applicant to participate in an Off-site Mitigation Program in order to reduce ROG and NO_x operational emissions to less than significant levels, consistent with the BCAQMD's CEQA Handbook and current practices. Therefore, Alternative B would have comparable but less impact on air quality emissions than the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, thereby avoiding the need to excavate under the Diversion Channel and through intervening sensitive biological habitats. Shifting approximately 13 acres of the proposed 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development would not affect biological resources. Sensitive species and habitat, as described in Section IV.D, would still be impacted under Alternative B, though to a lesser degree, and the impacts can be completely mitigated by implementing the mitigation measures listed in Section IV.D. Development under Alternative B would avoid Impacts BIO-1b (pallid bat), BIO-1e (Valley elderberry longhorn beetle), and BIO-3a (riparian habitat disturbance), and would significantly reduce Impact BIO-2 (Butte County Meadowfoam) as quantified below. Alternative B would result in the following reductions to the impacts identified in Section IV.D:

Table VII.ALTS-2: Direct Impact Reductions within the Study Area

Resources	Total (acres)
Butte County meadowfoam	1.20 (52% percent reduction)
Mixed Riparian Woodland	0.02
Non-native Annual Grassland	28.02
Wetlands and Waters	0.24

Table VII.ALTS-3: Direct Impact Reductions within the Study Area

Resources	Total (acres)
Butte County meadowfoam	0.15
Mixed Riparian Woodland	0.56
Non-native Annual Grassland	16.66
Wetlands and Waters	2.01

Therefore, Alternative B would have less impact on biological resources than the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, and shifting approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development. Similar ground-disturbing activities would occur and therefore, mitigation identical to the proposed project for historic resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and burial sites would be implemented. However, elimination of the RS-20 lots would reduce potential impacts to the stone walls that abut the eastern boundary of the project site. This alternative would not require cuts into the walls to allow access to the RS-20 lots. Therefore, Alternative B would have less cultural resources impacts than the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, and shifting approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development. The project site would still be subjected to ground shaking and related hazards under both Alternative B and the proposed project. As with the proposed project, all structures would be constructed in accordance with the latest adopted seismic safety standards, and erosion control measures would be implemented. Therefore, Alternative B would have geology, soils, and seismicity impacts similar to the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, and shifting approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development. Alternative B would generate fewer overall trips and vehicle miles traveled than the proposed project and, therefore, would reduce operational emissions of criteria pollutants, toxic air contaminants, and greenhouse gas emissions. The reduction in daily

trip generation would lessen the severity of greenhouse gas emissions impacts as shown in Table VII.ALTS-4.

Table VII.ALTS-4: Alternative B Mitigated Annual Project GHG Emissions (CO_2e) in Metric Tons

Source Category	Proposed Project 2035
Area	225
Energy Consumption	2,116
Mobile	7,051
Solid Waste Generation	1,491
Water Usage	206
Total	11,090
Threshold	**1,100 MT of CO2e/per year**
Cumulatively Considerable?	***Yes***
Service Population Capita Emissions[1]	**4.64**
Threshold	**4.6 MT of CO2e/capita**
Significant?	***Yes***

[1] Based on an estimated service population 1,784 Residents + 606 Employees, Total 2,390

The same mitigation as presented in the Greehouse Gas Emissions section would apply under Alternative B, and after implementation of mitigation GHG operational emissions would remain ***significant and unavoidable***. Therefore, Alternative B would have greenhouse gas emissions impacts similar to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, and shifting approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development. As with the proposed project, no hazardous conditions exist on-site and the project's end users would not expose surrounding receptors to hazardous materials; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, Alternative B would have hazards and hazardous materials impacts similar to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, and shifting approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development. This alternative would require less impermeable surfaces on the project site. The reduction in impermeable surfaces on the project site would cause a reduction in runoff rates and velocities compared to the proposed project. Eliminating the RS-20 lots also avoids placing fill and structures within flood hazard zones located east of the levee, which is discussed under Impacts HYDRO-3 and HYDRO-4, and required Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1. Therefore, surface hydrology impacts from Alternative B would be less than those associated with the proposed project, and only Mitigation Measure HYDRO-2 would be needed to reduce hydrology impacts to less-than-significant levels. Water quality impacts associated with Alternative B would be subject to mandatory compliance with the City of Chico's Phase II National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water Management Plan.

Land Use and Planning

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, and shifting approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development. This alternative would require the same entitlements as the proposed project, and would yield similar conclusions in terms of land use. Buffering the existing single-family residential uses that abut proposed Lot 471 with similar single-family homes would improve neighborhood compatibility. Reducing the size of the commercial site from 20 acres to approximately 7 acres would also likely result in smaller-scale commercial development with a more localized market area and neighborhood-serving uses. Alternative B would have land use impacts similar to the proposed project.

Noise

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, and shifting approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development. Alternative B would generate fewer overall traffic trips than the proposed project. Potential noise impacts associated with future commercial development (parking areas, loading docks and truck routes) at the southwest corner of East 20th Street and Bruce Road would apply relative to the new residences added under this alternative instead of the existing residences along Parkhurst Street and Niagra Way which would be buffered from new commercial uses by the added residences. Although both Alternative B and the proposed project would have less than significant impacts with regard to noise generation, the reduction in daily trip generation associated with Alternative B would be more beneficial from a noise perspective. Therefore, Alternative B would have less impact on noise than the proposed project.

Population and Housing

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, and shifting approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development. The net effect of Alternative B with regard to future housing and population would be 20 additional single-family homes and approximately 50 additional persons compared to the proposed project. The amount of housing and population growth under Alternative B would be approximately the same as the proposed project, comprising 10% of the housing growth and 13% of the population growth predicted by BCAG between 2017 and 2030. Therefore, Alternative B would have similar impacts on population and housing as the proposed project.

Public Services

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, and shifting approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development. Because this alternative includes approximately 3% more units than the proposed project, it would slightly increase demands for fire protection, police protection, school and library services, and parks compared to the proposed project. However, this small increase in demands would not change the conclusion that impacts on public services would be less than significant. Therefore, Alternative B would have similar impacts on public services as the proposed project.

Recreation

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, and shifting approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development. Because this alternative includes approximately 3% more units than the proposed project, it would slightly increase needs for recreation facilities. However, this small increase in need would not change the conclusion that impacts on recreation facilities would be less than significant. Therefore, Alternative B would have similar impacts on recreation facilities as the proposed project.

Transportation and Traffic

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, and shifting approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development. This alternative would result in 20 additional residential units and a reduction of approximately 140,000 square feet of commercial uses relative to the proposed project. These changes in future land uses correspond to an approximately 37% reduction in anticipated total daily trips from the site compared to the proposed project. Although this is a large reduction in estimated trips, it is not anticipated to affect conclusions in the Traffic section (IO.V) regarding the need to improve certain intersections during project build-out. Mitigation Measures TRANSPORTATION-1/-6, and TRANSPORTATION-2/-7 require

signalizing Bruce Road at Raley Boulevard and Skyway at Forest Avenue, respectively, based primarily on future traffic anticipated from the southern commercial medical/dental office uses (Lot 472), and that would not change under Alternative B. Mitigation Measure TRANSPORTATION-5 would also still apply under this alternative to support the provision of future transit service along the Bruce Road corridor.

Conversely, eliminating the RS-20 lots would alleviate the need to add bike lanes and pedestrian facilities along Skyway between Potter Road and Bruce Road pursuant to Mitigation Measures TRANSPORTATION-3 and TRANSPORTATION-4, respectively. Overall, Alternative B would have less impact on transportation than the proposed project.

Utilities and Service Systems

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, and shifting approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development. Because this alternative would result in 20 additional residential units and a reduction of approximately 140,000 square feet of commercial uses relative to the proposed project, it would have a corresponding overall reduction in demand for water and energy, and less generation of wastewater and solid waste. As the proposed project was found to have a less than significant impact on utilities, the same conclusion would apply to this alternative. Therefore, Alternative B would have less impact on utilities and service systems than the proposed project.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Alternative B includes the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure, and shifting approximately 13 acres of the 20-acre commercial lot (Lot 471) to Low Density Residential (R1) development. Similar ground-disturbing activities would occur and therefore, mitigation identical to the proposed project for tribal cultural resources would be implemented. Therefore, Alternative B would have tribal cultural resources impacts similar to the proposed project.

Relationship of the Alternative to the Project Objectives

Alternative B would meet the following project objectives:

- Subdivision of the property into residential, commercial, open space and park lots in a manner that is consistent with the City of Chico's land use plans, policies, and regulations;
- Construction of infrastructure to serve all proposed lots;
- Preserve a significant amount of open space on the site, over 100 acres, so as to retain the areas of highest biological resource value;
- Provide a significant number of single family (460 lots) and multi-family residential units (12.4 acres) to help meet the City's needs for housing;
- Development of a project that is consistent with City design policies and Design Guidelines Manual;
- Provide a community commercial area to serve the surrounding residential neighborhoods; and
- Provide revenue to local businesses during project construction and operation.

Conclusion

Alternative B would lessen the severity of significant impacts that can be reduced to a level of less than significant with mitigation (e.g., aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, hydrology and water quality, noise, and traffic and transportation).

The Alternative B would meet all of the project objectives, although several would be advanced to a lesser degree than the proposed project primarily because of the reduction in development potential from the elimination of the RS-20 lots and associated infrastructure.

C. EXISTING LAND USE DESIGNATIONS ALTERNATIVE

Under Alternative C, the proposed project would not include amendments to the General Plan and Zoning land use designations. The project would be developed under the current General Plan and Zoning land use designations. Table VII. Alts-5 shows the project site's existing land use designations.

Table VII. Alts-5: Existing General Plan and Zoning Land Use Designations

APN/acres	Existing GP Designation	Existing Zoning District
002-190-041 / 48.0 acres	LDR/RCO OMU/RCO	R1-RC OR-RC
018-510-007 / 100.2 acres	VLDR/RCO POS SOS	RS-20-PD-RC OS1 OS2
018-510-008 / 111.1 acres	LDR/RCO MHDR/RCO SOS	R1-RC R3-RC OS2
018-510-009 / 53.7 acres	LDR/RCO OMU/RCO SOS	R1-RC OR-RC OS2
002-220-006 / 7.75 acres[1]	SOS	OS2

[1] Approximately 1.0 acre of this parcel would be included in the proposed project.

Under Alternative C, the project would not include any community commercial, as it is not permitted under the existing land use designations. This alternative would retain the open space zoning that conforms to the Butte Creek Diversion Channel corridor (approximately 6 acres), but would not establish a large open space preserve as would the proposed proposed project. Development under Alternative C instead would include more low density residential throughout the project site. Higher-density multifamily would be shifted from the northern portions of the project site along Bruce Road to the southern border adjacent to Skyway. A limited amount of office residential would be permitted at the corners of Bruce Road and East 20th Street. Half-acre suburban residential (RS-20) lots would be developed on the entire area east of the Diversion Channel.

Alternative C would require the following, but not necessarily limited to, discretionary approvals:

- Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map
- Boundary Line Modification
- Grading permits
- Building permits

Aesthetics

Alternative C would include the project site being developed under existing land use designations. Alternative C would be subject to the same design review, lighting, and glare requirements as the proposed project. The project site development would occur across more of the site; however, building heights would be lower. Lower building heights would reduce the amount of blockage of foothill views available to the east of the project site, which would be beneficial from a visual perspective. Alternative C would have less impact on aesthetics, light, and glare than the proposed project.

Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Alternative C includes the elimination of the community commercial. The buildout potential of this alternative would be more than the proposed project and, therefore, would result in higher levels of construction emissions. Although construction emissions impacts would be higher, it is likely that they could still be mitigated to a level of less than significant. Because residential uses have lower trip-generation rates than community commercial uses, Alternative C would generate fewer weekday daily trips and fewer Saturday daily trips than the proposed project and, therefore, would reduce operational emissions of criteria pollutants, toxic air contaminants, and greenhouse gas emissions. The community commercial aspects of the proposed project account for a significant amount of trips. The reduction in daily trip generation would lessen the severity of the proposed project's air quality and greenhouse gas emissions impacts. Therefore, Alternative C would have less impact on air quality/greenhouse gas emissions than the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Alternative C would include the project site being developed under existing land use designations. Sensitive species, as described in Section IV.D, could potentially use the project site. Construction and operation activities under Alternative C would impact these species more than the proposed project, particularly with regard to Butte County meadowfoam where all 5.14 acres of onsite occupied habitat would be removed. These impacts are substantially greater than those associated with the proposed project, and it is not apprarent if they would be completely mitigated by implementing the mitigation measures listed in Section IV.D. This alternative would result in potentially significant impacts that can be mitigated to less-than-

significant levels for jurisdictional waters, riparian habitat, and invasive plant species. Alternative C would have more impacts to biological resources than the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Alternative C would include the project site being developed under existing land use designations. Similar ground-disturbing activities would occur and therefore, mitigation identical to the proposed project for historic resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and burial sites would be implemented. Therefore, Alternative C would have cultural resources impacts similar to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

Alternative C would include the project site being developed under existing land use designations. The project site would still be subjected to ground shaking and related hazards under both Alternative C and the proposed project. As with the proposed project, all structures would be constructed in accordance with the latest adopted seismic safety standards, and erosion control measures would be implemented. Therefore, Alternative C would have geology, soils, and seismicity impacts similar to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Alternative C would include the project site being developed under existing land use designations. As with the proposed project, no hazardous conditions exist on-site and the project's end users would not expose surrounding receptors to hazardous materials; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, Alternative C would have hazards and hazardous materials impacts similar to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Alternative C would include the project site being developed under existing land use designations. The development of additional single family homes instead of community commercial would reduce impermeable surfaces in some areas while adding homes where the proposed project plans open space would increase impermeable surfaces which would increase runoff rates and velocities compared to the proposed project. Therefore, surface hydrology impacts from Alternative C would be greater than those associated with the proposed project, although the project's significant hydrology impacts can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Furthermore, water quality impacts associated with Alternative C would be subject to mandatory compliance with the City of Chico's Phase II National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water Management Plan.

Land Use and Planning

Alternative C would include the project site being developed under existing land use designations. Therefore, Alternative C would be consistent with land use plans. Impacts would be similar to the proposed project.

Noise

Alternative C would include the project site being developed under existing land use designations. The buildout potential of this alternative would be less than the proposed project and, therefore, construction noise impacts would be less severe than the proposed project, although these impacts can be mitigated to a level of less-than-significant. Alternative C would generate fewer weekday daily trips and fewer Saturday daily trips than the proposed project, as housing creates less trips than commercial uses. Although the proposed project was found to have less than significant impacts with regard to roadway noise, the reduction in daily trip generation would be considered more beneficial from a noise perspective. Therefore, the Alternative C would have less impact on noise than the proposed project.

Population and Housing

Alternative C would include the project site being developed under existing land use designations. Under Alternative C, more housing would be developed than the proposed project. Additional housing units would increase the number of future residents of the project. Impacts under the proposed project were found to have a less than significant impact on population and housing. Even though Alternative C would result in less than significant impacts, impacts associated with this alternative would be greater than proposed project.

Public Services

Alternative C would include the project site being developed under existing land use designations. Under Alternative C, more housing would be developed in the place of community commercial, which would have similar demand for fire protection and police protection. The proposed project was found to have a less than significant impact on fire protection and police protection, and this alternative have similar impacts compared to the proposed project.

Additional housing units would increase the number of future residents of the project. The increase in population would have a corresponding increase in demand for school services and parks. Although, the proposed project was found to have a less than significant impact on school services and parks, Alternative C would have greater impacts to schools services and parks.

Recreation

Alternative C would include the project site being developed under existing land use designations. Under Alternative C, more housing would be developed in the place of community commercial, a corresponding increase in population would occur. An increase in population would create a higher demand associated with the project for recreation facilities. Although the proposed project and Alternative C would have a less than significant impacts on recreation facilities, this alternative would be greater than proposed project. Therefore, Alternative C would have greater impacts on recreation facilities than the proposed project.

Transportation and Traffic

Alternative C would include the project site being developed under existing land use designations. Under Alternative C, more housing would be developed, instead of community commercial under the proposed project. Because residential uses have lower trip-generation rates than community commercial uses, Alternative C would generate fewer trips and would impact intersections in the area to a lesser degree. Overall, Alternative C would have less impact on transportation than the proposed project.

Utilities and Service Systems

Alternative C would include the project site being developed under existing land use designations. Under Alternative C, more housing would be developed, instead of community commercial under the proposed project. The elimination of the community commercial development would have a corresponding reduction in demand for water and energy, and less generation of wastewater and solid waste. Although the proposed project was found to have a less than significant impact on utilities, the reduction in utility demand would be considered beneficial. Therefore, Alternative C would have less impact on utilities and service systems than the proposed project.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Alternative C would include the project site being developed under existing land use designations. Similar ground-disturbing activities would occur and therefore, mitigation identical to the proposed project for tribal cultural resources would be implemented. Therefore, Alternative C would have tribal cultural resources impacts similar to the proposed project.

Relationship of the Alternative to the Project Objectives

Alternative C would not meet the following project objectives:

- Provide commercial centers near major intersections to serve the surrounding residential neighborhoods and greater community;

- Preserve a significant amount of open space on the site, over 100 acres, so as to retain the areas of highest biological resource value;
- Enhance public access to and protect the integrity of the Butte Creek Diversion Channel and adjacent habitats.

Alternative C would meet the following project objectives:

- Subdivision of the property into residential, commercial, open space and park lots in a manner that is consistent with the City of Chico's land use plans, policies, and regulations;
- Construction of infrastructure to serve all proposed lots;
- Create residential neighborhoods in the project that offer a variety of housing types at various densities and price points to help meet the City's housing needs;
- Development of a project that is consistent with City design policies and Design Guidelines Manual;
- Provide revenue to local businesses during project construction and operation.

Conclusion

Alternative C would lessen the severity of significant impacts that can be reduced to a level of less than significant with mitigation (e.g., aesthetics, air quality/greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and traffic and transportation). However, it would increase impacts related to biological resources, hydrology and water quality, population and housing, schools, parks, and recreation facilities.

The Alternative C would not meet the objective of providing a community commercial area to serve the surrounding residential neighborhoods, nor the objective to provide a large open space preserve to protect biological resources. It would meet other objectives, although several would be met to a lesser degree than the proposed project, primarily due to the elimination of community commercial land uses.

D. 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. Identification of the environmentally superior alternative is an informational procedure and the alternative selected may not be the alternative that best meets the goals or needs of the City and/or project applicant.

In this case, Alternative A (No Project Alternative) would result in the least amount of significant environmental impacts (see Table VII. Alts-6). However, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that another environmentally superior alternative be selected in addition to the No Project Alternative. Based on the analysis provided above and in the Alternatives Comparison Table (see Table VII. Alts-6), it has been determined that Alternative B (Elimination of RS-20 lots Alternative) would be the environmentally superior alternative.

Table VII. Alts-6: Alternatives Comparison

Environmental Topic Area	PROPOSED PROJECT	ALTERNATIVE A (No Project Alternative)	ALTERNATIVE B (Elimination of RS-20 lots)	ALTERNATIVE C (Existing Land Use Designations)
Aesthetics, Light, and Glare	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	No Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Air Quality	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	No Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Biological Resources	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	No Impact	Less Impact	Greater Impact
Cultural Resources	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	No Impact	Less Impact	Similar Impact
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Significant Unavoidable	No Impact	Similar Impact	Less Impact
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	No Impact	Less Impact	Greater Impact
Land Use Planning	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
Noise	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	No Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Population and Housing	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Similar Impact	Greater Impact
Public Services	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact
Recreation	Less Than Significant	No Impact	Similar Impact	Greater Impact
Transportation and Traffic	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	No Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Utilities and Service Systems	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	No Impact	Less Impact	Less Impact
Tribal Cultural Resources	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	No Impact	Similar Impact	Similar Impact