

# CHAPTER FOUR PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

## 4.1 Introduction

The California Environmental Quality Act and the implementing CEQA Guidelines require that alternatives to the proposed project be discussed in the EIR. The value of such discussion is to inform public decision-makers of the differential environmental impacts which may be associated with each potential alternative, and to enable a reasoned judgment to be made as to which alternative to the proposed project may be environmentally superior. Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines provides the following description of what should be included in the alternatives discussion in an EIR:

- (a) Alternatives to the Proposed Project. 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 comparative 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.
- (b) Purpose. Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), 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 the project objectives, or would be more costly.
- (c) Selection of a range of reasonable alternatives. 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.

- (d) Evaluation of Alternatives. The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. A matrix displaying the major characteristics and significant environmental effects of each alternative may be used to summarize the comparison. If an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the significant effects of the alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.
- (e) “No Project” alternative.
  - (1) The specific alternative of “no project” shall also be evaluated along with its impact. The purpose of describing and analyzing a no project alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. The no project alternative analysis is not the baseline for determining whether the proposed project’s environmental impacts may be significant, unless it is identical to the existing environmental setting analysis which does establish that baseline (see Section 15125).
  - (2) The “no project” analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. If the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.
  - (3) A discussion of the “no project” alternative will usually proceed along one of two lines:
    - (A) When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy or ongoing operation, the “no project” alternative will be the continuation of the plan, policy or operation into the future. Typically this is a situation where other projects initiated under the existing plan will continue while the new plan is developed. Thus, the projected impacts of the proposed plan or alternative

plans would be compared to the impacts that would occur under the existing plan.

- (B) If the project is other than a land use or regulatory plan, for example a development project on identifiable property, the “no project” alternative is the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Here the discussion would compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state against environmental effects which would occur if the project is approved. 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. In certain instances, the no project alternative means “no build” wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained. However, where failure to proceed with the project will not result in preservation of existing environmental conditions, the analysis should identify the practical result of the project’s non-approval and not create and analyze a set of artificial assumptions that would be required to preserve the existing physical environment.
  - (C) After defining the no project alternative using one of these approaches, the lead agency should proceed to analyze the impacts of the no project alternative by projecting what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.
- (f) Rule of reason. The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making.
- (1) Feasibility. 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 (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can

reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent). No one of these factors establishes a fixed limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives.

- (2) Alternative locations.
  - (A) Key question. The key question and first step in analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR.
  - (B) None feasible. If the lead agency concludes that no feasible alternative locations exist, it must disclose the reasons for this conclusion, and should include the reasons in the EIR. For example, in some cases there may be no feasible alternative locations for a geothermal plant or mining project which must be in close proximity to natural resources at a given location.
  - (C) Limited new analysis required. Where a previous document has sufficiently analyzed a range of reasonable alternative locations and environmental impacts for projects with the same basic purpose, the lead agency should review the previous document. The EIR may rely on the previous document to help it assess the feasibility of the potential project alternatives to the extent the circumstances remain substantially the same as they relate to the alternative.
- (3) An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.

The sections of the chapter that follow present a description of the alternatives considered and an analysis of the alternatives in the context of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The range of alternatives addressed includes an evaluation of the no project alternative (which is required to be addressed), a one access alternative, and a reduced project size alternative. Finally, this chapter presents an analysis of the comparative environmental superiority of the various alternatives, as required by CEQA.

## **4.2 Project Objectives**

As stated in Section Two of the DEIR, the objective of the project is to develop a residential subdivision with a variety of lot sizes and values including 213 units on 289 acres. The project will create additional affordable housing, cluster development to minimize environmentally sensitive areas, provide a network of trail systems for public use, and open space corridors for wildlife migration. Objectives of the project include the following:

- Create a residential community compatible with adjacent neighborhoods
- Provide low impact recreational opportunities for the public
- Provide open space areas that serve as wildlife migration corridors
- Cluster development to avoid environmentally sensitive areas
- Provide affordable housing opportunities

## **4.3 Alternatives Rejected**

According to the CEQA Guidelines, two major provisions are necessary for an adequate alternative site analysis – feasibility and location. The EIR should consider alternate project locations if a significant project impact could be avoided or substantially lessened by moving the project to an alternate site. An alternative site for the proposed project would not be feasible for two reasons:

1. The act of moving the proposed project to an alternate site would not necessarily avoid or substantially lessen many of the significant environmental impacts. Many of the same significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project site would occur at an alternate site (e.g., increased traffic, air quality, and noise impacts).
2. The project proponent does not own or have access to a site in the vicinity of the proposed project site of similar size that would meet the project objectives.

Therefore, a discussion of an alternative site would not be feasible, nor would it meet the “rule of reason” under CEQA. This alternative was eliminated from further consideration in this EIR.

## **4.4 Project Alternatives**

The alternatives to be evaluated should include those that offer substantial environmental advantages over the proposed project and that may feasibly be accomplished considering the various economic, environmental, technological, social and legal factors. Two such alternatives to the proposed project and the no project alternative were evaluated, as follows:

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2: One Access Alternative
- Alternative 3: Reduced Density Alternative
- Alternative 4: Clustered Development

#### **4.4.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE**

This alternative is required under CEQA, and will consist of describing the effects of taking no action or not receiving project approval. This alternative entails a general discussion of what can reasonably be expected to occur in the plan area in the foreseeable future if the proposed project is not approved, based on the existing general plan land use designation, zoning, and available infrastructure and services.

As of the date of publication of this EIR, the plan area is zoned Residential (RS-1) and Open Space (OS). RS-1 allows the construction of one single family dwelling unit per one acre. In accordance with Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines, this “No Project” alternative assumes a continuation of the existing Town of Truckee General Plan designations and policies currently governing the plan area. This alternative identifies the practical result of the project’s non-approval. In this case, the “No Project Alternative” is not a “No Build” Alternative since the Town of Truckee has designated this area for residential development. Additionally, this area is adjacent to existing neighborhoods, has infrastructure available and is located in a highly desirable area. It is highly unlikely that this site would remain undeveloped if this project is not approved.

Under the Town of Truckee General Plan, the project site is designated as RS-0.5-1.0 (Residential- 0.5-1.0 dwelling unit per acre) and RC/OS (Resource Conservation/Open Space) (Figure 3.8-1). The allowable density based on current RS zoning standards is 214 lots.

The Resource Conservation/Open Space (RC/OS) land use designation is applied to lands containing significant natural resources such as forest land, rangeland, mineral resources, and open space uses such as bikeways, trails, and access to the Truckee River and other public areas; and to lands with environmentally sensitive features such as important wildlife habitat, wildlife movement corridors, and significant vistas.

#### **4.4.2 ONE ACCESS ALTERNATIVE**

This alternative is the same as the proposed project, except that access to the site would be provided via Martis Peak Road to the north of the site, not via Edinburgh Drive. Under this alternative Edinburgh Drive would be used for emergency access only. Although this alternative is conceptual in nature, a reduction of vehicular access would not change the site plan design. It is assumed that the project density will be the same, and the entire site developed in a similar manner to the proposed project.

#### **4.4.3 REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE**

This alternative is a reduced density development project design in which there would be a 25% reduction in the number of residential units from the proposed 213 units to approximately 160 units. This alternative would develop in areas of the project site where the environmental impacts would be minimized and leave the remaining sensitive areas undeveloped. It is assumed that parcel sizes would be similar or slightly greater than the proposed project.

#### **4.4.4 CLUSTERED ALTERNATIVE**

This alternative is a development project design which would be the same as the proposed project except that the residential units would be clustered, allowing for more open space on site between the residential unit clusters. Overall, the project density would remain the same as and the entire site developed in a similar manner to the proposed project.

### **4.5 Analysis of Project Alternatives**

The discussion below presents an analysis of each alternative. The discussion focuses on a comparison of the environmental impacts of the alternatives. CEQA does not require the alternatives to be analyzed at the same level of detail as the proposed project; rather, the alternatives discussion can be based on a qualitative analysis and comparative methodology to identify the environmentally superior alternative.

#### **4.5.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE**

##### ***Aesthetics***

In the worst case under the No Project Alternative, the site would be developed as residential (RS-1). Under current zoning in the Town of Truckee, RS-1 would allow the construction of one single family dwelling unit per one acre which would allow 214 units. Additional zoning at the project site is for open space, which under this alternative would not be built out. Both the proposed project and no project alternative would result in the construction of residential housing units, the existing visual character of the site would change. Neither the proposed project nor this alternative would result in impacts to views or visual resources within a scenic highway. Under this alternative, aesthetic impacts are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

##### ***Air Quality***

Under this alternative the site would be developed as residential and would generate similar vehicle trips compared to the proposed project. Construction activities and wintertime operation emission similar the proposed project would require mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts. Since a similar amount of development would be allowed, the alternative would likely have the same emissions of PM<sub>10</sub> and ozone precursors. Under this alternative, air quality impacts are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

### ***Biological Resources***

Since the property could still be developed under the existing zoning, the No Project Alternative would have similar impacts in terms of biological resources. There would be no impact to designated open spaces; however, due to the potential biological impacts with the introduction of additional housing units in the area, mitigation measures would be required to protect potential nesting sites and sensitive habitat. Under this alternative, biological impacts are ***unchanged*** as compared to the proposed project.

### ***Cultural Resources***

Under this alternative the project site would be disturbed during development, similarly to the proposed project. This alternative would be similar in terms of cultural resources. Identical mitigation measures would be required to protect unknown cultural resources during construction, since disturbance of vegetation and soil surfaces could result in the discovery of unidentified cultural and historical resources. Under this alternative, cultural impacts are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

### ***Geology and Soils***

The alternative and proposed project will result in site improvements, which are likely to cause soil erosion and instability during the construction phase. Exposure of structures and people residing or working the project area are at risk of earthquakes and ground shaking that would require identical mitigation measures. Under this alternative, geological impacts are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

### ***Hazards and Hazardous Materials***

Under this alternative, the project site would be developed with residential housing. The project site conditions would be similar to the proposed project. The entire Town of Truckee is located in a high fire severity zone, therefore, identical mitigation measures would be required. Under this alternative, impacts from fire hazards are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

### ***Hydrology and Water Quality***

Under this alternative, similar effects on water quality would occur as a result of grading, excavation and potential cut and fill activity similar to the proposed project. Identical mitigation measures would be required. Under this alternative, impacts to hydrology and water quality are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

### ***Land Use, Planning and Recreation***

Under this alternative the project site would be developed similar to the proposed project. Since the alternative would be developed as low density residential under the alternative, this alternative, similar to the proposed project would result in no land use conflicts. Under this alternative, land use impacts are ***unchanged*** as compared to the proposed project.

## **Noise**

This alternative would generate the same traffic than the proposed project and correspondingly similar noise levels. However, similar to the proposed project, the alternative would result in increases in temporary ambient noise levels during development, requiring identical mitigation measures. Under this alternative, noise impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

## **Population and Housing**

Under this alternative the project site would be developed similar to the proposed project. Therefore, sewer and water lines would not be extended from the town, reducing growth-inducing impacts. The current zoning would allow 214 units as compared to the 213 units, which is virtually the same. Under this alternative, population and housing impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

## **Public Services and Utilities**

Both the alternative and the proposed project will result in similar impacts to public services and utilities. Impacts to school services would require identical mitigation measures as the proposed project. Under this alternative, public services/utilities impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

## **Transportation/Traffic**

Under this alternative the project site would be developed under the Town of Truckee General Plan designations of residential (RS-1, one residential unit per acre) and open space. The alternative would develop low density residential compared to the proposed project; however, the total number of units would be similar and result in the same or a similar number of vehicle trips. There would be increased traffic on similar roadways and intersections of the proposed project requiring similar mitigation measures. Under this alternative, impacts from transportation/traffic are *unchanged* as compared to the proposed project.

### **4.5.2 ONE ACCESS ALTERNATIVE**

#### **Aesthetics**

Under this alternative the project site would have the same visual impacts as the proposed project. There would be less visual impacts to the south of the project site with the absence of vehicle traffic on Edinburgh Drive as this would be used for emergency purposes only. Under this alternative, aesthetic impacts are *lesser* compared to the proposed project.

#### **Air Quality**

Implementation of the alternative would be similar to the proposed project resulting in similar construction and operation emissions; however, there would be an increase the length of trips to and from the project site as a result of reduced site access. Residents would either elect to use

Highway 80 and access from the north to Martis Valley Road or drive all the way on Glenshire Drive. This would result in many residents having to travel back to the southern areas of the project site, increasing the vehicle miles traveled. Mitigation measures would be required to reduce potential impacts as a result of limited access. Under this alternative, air quality impacts are *greater* as compared to the proposed project.

### ***Biological Resources***

Implementation of the alternative would result in the same impacts as the proposed project. Assuming that Edinburgh Drive would be used exclusively for emergency purposes, there would be lesser impacts to wildlife from traffic and noise from that area of the project site. An emergency access road would still need to be constructed and the overall development would be very similar to the proposed project. Similar impacts would still result due to development of the site requiring similar mitigation measures as the proposed project. Under this alternative, biological impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Cultural Resources***

Both the alternative and the proposed project will disturb the same amount of land. Both the alternative and the proposed project have the potential to disturb prehistoric cultural deposits in the project area. Under this alternative, cultural impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Geology and Soils***

Both the alternative and the proposed project will remove surface vegetation and disturb soil by grading. Construction activities will result in the disturbance of soils, which could cause soil erosion and instability. Under this alternative, geological impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Hazards and Hazardous Materials***

Under this alternative, the project site would be developed with residential housing. The project site conditions would be similar to the proposed project. Due to the limited site access of the alternative, there may be a potential for increased risk from hazardous materials transport; however, this would be minimal since neither the proposed project nor alternative are expected to transport hazardous materials that would result in impacts to the environment or human health. The entire Town of Truckee is located in a high fire severity zone, therefore, identical mitigation measures, with additional mitigation addressing the limited site access would be required. Only having one primary access point would expose more people to wildland fire risk and it would be more difficult to evacuate the area under this alternative. Under this alternative, impacts from fire hazards are *greater* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Hydrology and Water Quality***

Under this alternative, similar effects on water quality would occur as a result of grading, excavation and potential cut and fill activity similar to the proposed project. Identical mitigation

measures would be required. Under this alternative, impacts to hydrology and water quality are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Land Use, Planning and Recreation***

Under this alternative the project site would develop the same amount of land as the proposed project. Under this alternative, land use impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Noise***

Implementation of the alternative would possibly result in lower noise levels to the south at Edinburgh Drive as a result of limiting access to the project site primary access route, Martis Peak Road. However, the alternative would still result in increase noise levels as a result of the development requiring the same mitigation measures as the proposed project. Under this alternative, noise impacts are generally *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Population and Housing***

This alternative would develop the same area as the proposed project and involve the same expansion of public infrastructure, which could be growth-inducing. Population and housing impacts are *unchanged* under this alternative.

### ***Public Services and Utilities***

Both the proposed project and alternative would develop the same amount of land, requiring expansion of public infrastructure. Public services and utility systems impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Transportation/Traffic***

Under the alternative 2006 LOS would not exceed Town of Truckee standards. However, 2025 LOS would exceed town standards with or without the alternative requiring similar mitigation measures as the proposed project. This alternative could result in greater through traffic on Glenshire Drive for residents to reach the north end of the project site. There would likely be more vehicle miles traveled as well since residents coming from the Town of Truckee and other locations would have to pass the site and many would have to drive back south to their residences. Under this alternative, transportation/traffic impacts are *greater* as compared to the proposed project.

## **4.5.3 REDUCED DENSITY ALTERNATIVE**

### ***Aesthetics***

Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would have a lesser impact on aesthetics by leaving more of the project site and its natural features undisturbed. However, the project site would still be converted from an undeveloped natural setting to a residential development

permanently degrading the visual character and quality of the project site and its surroundings. The project site is not viewable from any scenic highways. This alternative would result in reduced number of residential units producing less glare and nighttime light. These impacts can be fully mitigated under both scenarios. Under this alternative, aesthetic impacts are *lesser* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Air Quality***

Implementation of the alternative would develop as low density residential, thereby reducing the number of vehicle trips to and from the site compared to the proposed project. There would be a reduction of construction and operation related emissions as a result of a 25 percent reduction in residential units proposed under this alternative. Under this alternative, air quality impacts are *lesser* as compared to the proposed project.

### ***Biological Resources***

This alternative would result in a smaller area of the project site being developed resulting in lesser impacts to biological resources. In particular, the preservation of the deer migratory corridor and natural buffers as well as the creation of additional open space would reduce the amount of habitat converted to residential dwellings. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans; however, there are local policies protecting biological resources in the Town of Truckee. In terms of biological resources, this alternative would have a *lesser* impact than the proposed project.

### ***Cultural Resources***

This alternative would require less grading and other construction activities that have the potential to disturb unknown cultural resources. There are no structures on the project site and there are no cultural resources that are eligible for preservation. Under this alternative, cultural resources impacts are *lesser* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Geology and Soils***

Both the alternative and the proposed project will remove surface vegetation and disturb soil by grading. Construction activities will result in the disturbance of soils, which could cause soil erosion and instability. Under this alternative, geological impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Hazards and Hazardous Materials***

Both the alternative and the proposed project would result in the same hazards from wildland fires, and require the same mitigations measures. In terms of hazards/hazardous materials, this alternative is *unchanged* in comparison to the proposed project.

### ***Hydrology and Water Quality***

This alternative would develop the fewer number of residential units compared to the proposed project. However, the alternative would still result in impacts from construction related activities requiring similar mitigation measures as the proposed project. Under this alternative, impacts would be *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Land Use, Planning and Recreation***

This alternative will occupy a smaller amount of land as compared to the proposed project and involve similar land use designations and zoning. The project would remain consistent with General Plan policies and would have less impact on surrounding land uses due to the reduced density. Under this alternative, land-use impacts are *lesser* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Noise***

Implementation of the alternative would reduce the number of residential units compared to the proposed project. The reduced density development may result in fewer vehicle trips, thereby reducing the impact of noise on surrounding land uses. Under this alternative noise impacts would be *lesser* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Population and Housing***

This alternative would develop the same area as the proposed project and involve the same expansion of public infrastructure, which could be growth-inducing. The increase in population would be less under this alternative. With 160 units, it would be expected that there would be approximately 430 additional residents as compared with approximately 560 under the proposed project. Population and housing impacts are *lesser* under this alternative.

### ***Public Services and Utilities***

Both the proposed project and alternative would require expansion of public infrastructure. Public services and utility systems impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Transportation/Traffic***

Both the alternative and proposed project would have the similar impacts on transportation/traffic; although this alternative would generate slightly fewer trips due to the reduction in the number of residents. Traffic mitigation measures similar to the proposed project would be required, including improvements to local roadways to accommodate the projected level of service. Traffic impacts are *lesser* under this alternative.

## **4.5.4 CLUSTERED ALTERNATIVE**

### ***Aesthetics***

Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would have a lesser impact on aesthetics by leaving more of the project site as open space. However, the project site would still be converted

from an undeveloped natural setting to a residential development permanently degrading the visual character and quality of the project site and its surroundings. The project site is not viewable from any scenic highways. This alternative would result in consolidating the location of residential units producing larger areas of open space between each clustered development. The clustered development would reduce the visual appearance of a larger scale development. These impacts can be fully mitigated under both scenarios. Under this alternative, aesthetic impacts are *lesser* as compared to the proposed project.

### ***Air Quality***

Implementation of the alternative would produce the same traffic trip generation rates, distributions and assignments thereby not changing the overall project net impact on air quality. The number of vehicle trips to and from the site compared to the proposed project would not change. The operation related emissions would be the same as the proposed project under this alternative. Under this alternative, air quality impacts are *unchanged* as compared to the proposed project.

### ***Biological Resources***

This alternative would result in an overall smaller area of the project site proposed for development resulting in lesser impacts to biological resources. In particular, the clustered development would provide for the creation of additional open space resulting in the reduction of the amount of habitat converted to residential dwellings. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans; however, there are local policies protecting biological resources in the Town of Truckee. In terms of biological resources, this alternative would have a *lesser* impact then the proposed project.

### ***Cultural Resources***

This alternative would require grading of an overall smaller area and other construction activities that have the potential to disturb unknown cultural resources. Although there are no structures on the project site or cultural resources that are eligible for preservation located on the site, the potential does exist for the discovery of unknown artifacts during ground disturbing activities. Under this alternative, cultural resources impacts are *lesser* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Geology and Soils***

Both the alternative and the proposed project will remove surface vegetation and disturb soil by grading. Construction activities will result in the disturbance of soils, which could cause soil erosion and instability. Under this alternative, geological impacts are *unchanged* compared to the proposed project.

### ***Hazards and Hazardous Materials***

Both the alternative and the proposed project would result in the same hazards from wildland fires, and require the same mitigations measures. In terms of hazards/hazardous materials, this alternative is *unchanged* in comparison to the proposed project.

### ***Hydrology and Water Quality***

This alternative would develop the same number of residential units as compared to the proposed project. In light of this, the alternative would also result in impacts from construction related activities requiring the same mitigation measures as the proposed project. Under this alternative, impacts would be ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

### ***Land Use, Planning and Recreation***

This alternative proposes the same land uses as the proposed project and involves the same land use designations and zoning. The proposed project and this alternative would not remain consistent with General Plan policies as a Class I bicycle facility, consistent with the *Truckee Trails and Bikeway Master Plan*, would not be constructed. However, the same mitigation measure identified for the proposed project would be applicable to this alternative thereby obtaining consistency with the General Plan through implementation of the proposed mitigation. Under this alternative, land-use impacts are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

### ***Noise***

Implementation of the alternative would not reduce the number of residential units as compared to the proposed project. The clustered development would result in the same vehicle trips thereby producing the same impact of noise on surrounding land use as the proposed project. Under this alternative noise impacts would be ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

### ***Population and Housing***

Although this alternative would develop the same area as the proposed project in a different configuration, it would involve the same expansion of public infrastructure. This alternative would also be considered growth-inducing as the resulting increase in population would be the same as the proposed project under this alternative. Population and housing impacts are ***unchanged*** under this alternative.

### ***Public Services and Utilities***

Both the proposed project and alternative would require expansion of public infrastructure. Public services and utility systems impacts are ***unchanged*** compared to the proposed project.

### ***Transportation/Traffic***

The clustered alternative proposes the same land uses as the proposed project and the trip generation, trip distribution, traffic assignment, its impact to traffic volumes as well as impacts to the Donner Pass Road/Glenshire Drive intersection are the same as under the proposed project. Traffic mitigation measures similar to the proposed project would be required, including improvements to local roadways to accommodate the projected level of service. Traffic impacts are ***unchanged*** under this alternative.

## 4.6 Environmentally Superior Alternative

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(d), this section compares the impacts of the three alternatives under consideration to those of the proposed project. Table 4-1 shows whether each of the thirteen impact areas are unchanged, lesser, or greater, compared to the proposed project.

**Table 4-1**  
**Summary of Impact Comparison Between Proposed Project and Alternatives**

Issue	No Project Alternative	One Access Alternative	Reduced Density Alternative	Clustered Alternative
Aesthetics	Unchanged	Lesser	Lesser	Unchanged
Air Quality	Unchanged	Greater	Lesser	Unchanged
Biological Resources	Unchanged	Unchanged	Lesser	Unchanged
Cultural Resources	Unchanged	Unchanged	Lesser	Unchanged
Geology and Soils	Unchanged	Unchanged	Unchanged	Unchanged
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Unchanged	Greater	Unchanged	Unchanged
Hydrology and Water Quality	Unchanged	Unchanged	Unchanged	Unchanged
Land Use , Planning and Recreation	Unchanged	Unchanged	Lesser	Unchanged
Noise	Unchanged	Unchanged	Lesser	Unchanged
Population and Housing	Unchanged	Unchanged	Lesser	Unchanged
Public Services and Utilities	Unchanged	Unchanged	Unchanged	Unchanged
Transportation/Traffic	Unchanged	Greater	Lesser	Unchanged
Number of Impacts Reduced	0	1	8	0
Number of Impacts Increased	0	3	0	0
Number of Impacts Unchanged	12	8	4	12

Source: Quad Knopf, Inc.

The Reduced Density alternative is the environmentally superior alternative because it would reduce impacts in Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Land Use/Planning, Noise, Population and Housing and Transportation.