

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

17.0	ALTERNATIVES .....	17-1
17.1	CEQA Requirements .....	17-1
17.2	Alternatives Considered .....	17-1
17.3	Alternatives Considered But Rejected .....	17-9
17.4	Comparison of Alternatives .....	17-9

### **Figures**

**No table of figures entries found.**

### **Tables**

Table 17-1	Project Alternatives Summary .....	17-9
------------	------------------------------------	------



# 17.0 Alternatives

## 17.1 CEQA REQUIREMENTS

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(a) requires a description of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. It also requires an evaluation of the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project, but must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(b) further requires that the discussion of alternatives focus on those alternatives capable of eliminating any significant adverse environmental impacts or reducing them to a level of insignificance, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly. CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e) stipulates that a no project alternative be evaluated along with its impacts.

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(d) requires the EIR to present enough information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis and comparison with the proposed project. 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. CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e) requires the identification of an environmentally superior alternative. If the "No Project" alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, then the environmentally superior alternative amongst the remaining alternatives must be identified.

## 17.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The following alternatives to the project are considered:

1. Alternative 1: No project/no development;
2. Alternative 2: No project/minimum use;
3. Alternative 3: No project/existing zoning; and
4. Alternative 4: Reduced project.

Each of these alternatives is described below, followed by an analysis of how each alternative may reduce impacts associated with the proposed project.

## **Alternative 1: No Project/No Development**

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6 (e) requires the “no project” alternative be evaluated along with its impacts. The “no project” alternative analysis must discuss the existing conditions, 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.

### **Alternative Description**

The “no project/no development” alternative assumes no development would occur on the project site. The project site would continue to be vacant land, partially used for grazing. Under this alternative, there would be no potential adverse impacts to aesthetics, air quality biological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, transportation and traffic, or water supply.

## **Alternative 2: No Project/Minimum Use**

### **Alternative Description**

The “no project/minimum use” alternative assumes the proposed project would not be constructed or operated on the project site. Instead, this alternative considers the construction of the minimum allowable use on the subject property, which would be one single family dwelling and any accessory structures considered incidental to residential use, such as barns and storage buildings.

### **Aesthetics**

The proposed project would impact scenic vistas and the visual character of the site, and would introduce new sources of light and glare to the project site and vicinity. Impacts to scenic vistas, the visual character of the site, and the introduction of new sources of light and glare would be potentially significant impacts, but would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the application of Mitigation Measures AES-1, AES-2, AES-3, and AES-4.

Alternative 2 would have less aesthetic-related impacts than the proposed project. Although possible to have aesthetic impacts based on the size and location on the project site of any structures related to a single-family residence, any potential impacts would be less than the proposed project. However, this form of development may still be within the public viewshed from scenic vista points, would change the visual character of the site from undeveloped to developed, and would also introduce new sources of light and glare to the project site and vicinity. Similar mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level as for the proposed project would likely be applicable to Alternative 2,

depending on proposed site design. However, as there would be no discretionary approval for the project, having enforceable mitigation measures applied to the site would be unlikely.

## **Air Quality**

The proposed project would have air quality-related impacts related to emissions during construction of the proposed project on the site. These impacts would be potentially significant impacts, but would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the application of Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3, and AQ-4.

Alternative 2 would have less air quality-related impacts than the proposed project. Construction activities on the project site for one single family residence and associated structures would have construction related emissions; however, based on the reduced scale of construction, construction emissions would not represent significant impacts and no mitigation measures would likely be required to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

## **Biological Resources**

The proposed project would impact biological resources, including potential loss or disturbance of American badgers, potential loss or disturbance of burrowing owls, potential loss or disturbance of Monterey dusky-footed woodrats, potential loss or disturbance of special-status bats, and potential loss or disturbance of nesting birds. All potential impacts can be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-5, and BIO-6. The proposed project would also have a less-than-significant impact on impeding the movement of common wildlife.

Alternative 2 would have much fewer potential biological impacts than the proposed project. Construction activities on the project site for one single family residence and associated structures would minimal impacts significant impacts to biological resources because of a much smaller building footprint.

## **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

The proposed project's greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. Alternative 2 would result in fewer greenhouse gas emissions, which would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

## **Transportation and Traffic**

As a combined assisted living facility (100 beds) and detached assisted living units units (26 units; 42 beds), based on ITE trip generation rates for each category, the proposed project would generation approximately 363 daily trips (266 for assisted living facility and 96 for the detached assisted living units. The proposed project would result in less-than-significant

impacts to area intersections and roadways segments of River Road. However, the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact of adding additional traffic to SR 68.

Based on trip generation rates for single family homes in the Las Palmas development, one single family residences on the project site would generate approximately 7.1 daily trips.

Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in a decreased amount of daily trips to and from the project site and can be expected to have less impacts than the proposed project. However, as even one single family residence could result in additional traffic on SR 68 during the AM and/or PM peak hours, Alternative 2 would also result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

### **Water Supply**

The proposed project would have an estimated water demand of 11.376 AFY. Applying the water demand assigned to the casita units of the proposed project (2.876 AFY for 26 units) for the conceptual build-out of one single family residential unit on the project site would be significantly less. Therefore, while the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to water supply, Alternative 2 would result in a lower water demand.

## **Alternative 3: No Project/Existing Zoning**

### **Alternative Description**

The “no project/existing zoning” alternative assumes the proposed project would not be constructed or operated on the project site. However, considering that the project site is designated for medium density residential development, it is reasonable to assume that up to 40 dwelling units could be approved and constructed on the project site. Although, it is worth noting that other use categories could also be considered for this alternative. Based on existing zoning for the project site, the following uses could be established on the project site:

- Public and quasi-public uses including churches, cemeteries, parks, playgrounds, schools, public safety facility, public utility facilities;
- Mobile home park;
- Agricultural employee housing;
- Christmas tree cutting and removal and other uses of similar agricultural nature;
- Other uses of a similar nature, density and intensity;
- Transitional Housing; or
- Supportive Housing.

Supportive housing is defined by the Monterey County Code as housing with no limit on length of stay that is occupied by a target population. ("Target population" means persons

with low income having one or more disabilities, including mental illness, HIV or AIDS, substance abuse, or other chronic health conditions, or individuals eligible for services provided under the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (California Welfare and Institutions Code, section 4500 et seq.) and may include, among other populations, adults, emancipated youth, families, families with children, elderly persons, young adults aging out of the foster care system, individuals exiting from institutional settings, veterans, and homeless people (MCC 21.06.1278)) and is linked to onsite or offsite services that assist the supportive housing resident in retaining the housing, improving their health status, and maximizing their ability to live and, when possible, work in the community. Transitional housing and transitional housing development is considered as buildings configured as rental housing developments, but operated under program requirements that call for the termination of assistance and recirculation of the assisted unit to another eligible program recipient at some predetermined future point in time of no less than six months. The county's zoning code describes each use as being contained within allowed housing units of the zoning district (Monterey County 2017).

Therefore, for purposes of this analysis, Alternative 3 considers that the 40 single-family residential units on the site could also be considered as 40 supportive housing units, or 40 transitional housing units. Each unit could have multiple bedrooms and house a number of persons. For purposes of this alternatives analysis, 40 units of single-family, supportive housing, or transitional units are considered to be roughly equivalent.

## **Aesthetics**

The proposed project would impact scenic vistas and the visual character of the site, and would introduce new sources of light and glare to the project site and vicinity. Impacts to scenic vistas and the introduction of new sources of light and glare would be potentially significant impacts, but would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the application of Mitigation Measures AES-1, AES-2, AES-3, and AES-4.

Alternative 3 would have similar aesthetic-related impacts as the proposed project, as development on the site of up to 40 residential units would be expected to occur. This form of development would still be within the public viewshed from scenic vista points, would change the visual character of the site from undeveloped to developed, and would also introduce new sources of light and glare to the project site and vicinity. Mitigation measures applicable to the proposed project would also apply to Alternative 3.

## **Air Quality**

The proposed project would have air quality-related impacts related to emissions during construction of the proposed project on the site. These impacts would be potentially significant impacts, but would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the application of Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3, and AQ-4.

Alternative 3 would have similar air quality-related impacts as the proposed project, as development on the site of up to 40 residential units would be expected to occur. Construction activities on the project site for up to this number of residences would have construction related emissions which would be potentially significant. Mitigation measures applicable to the proposed project would also apply to Alternative 3.

### **Biological Resources**

The proposed project would impact biological resources, including potential loss or disturbance of American badgers, potential loss or disturbance of burrowing owls, potential loss or disturbance of Monterey dusky-footed woodrats, potential loss or disturbance of special-status bats, and potential loss or disturbance of nesting birds. All potential impacts can be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-5, and BIO-6. The proposed project would also have a less-than-significant impact on impeding the movement of common wildlife.

Alternative 3 would have similar biological impacts as the proposed project, as development on the site of up to 40 residential units would be expected to occur. Mitigation measures applicable to the proposed project would also apply to Alternative 3.

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

The proposed project's greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. Alternative 3 would also result in greenhouse gas emissions which would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

### **Transportation and Traffic**

As a combined assisted living facility (100 beds) and detached assisted living units (26 units; 42 beds), based on ITE trip generation rates for each category, the proposed project would generation approximately 362 daily trips (266 for assisted living facility and 96 for senior adult housing units). The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to area intersections and roadways segments of River Road. However, the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact of adding additional traffic to SR 68.

Based on trip generation rates for single family homes in the Las Palmas development, 40 single family residences on the project site would generate approximately 284 daily trips.

Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in an increased amount of daily trips to and from the project site and can be expected to have greater impacts than the proposed project. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would also result in a significant and unavoidable impact to SR 68. Mitigation measures applicable to the proposed project would also apply to Alternative 3.



## **Water Supply**

The proposed project would have an estimated water demand of 11.376 AFY. Applying the water demand assigned to the casita units of the proposed project (2.876 AFY for 26 units) for the conceptual build-out of up to 40 single family residential units on the project site would likely be less than 5.00 AFY. Therefore, while the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to water supply, Alternative 3 would result in a lower water demand.

## **Alternative 4: Reduced Project**

### **Alternative Description**

The “reduced project” alternative includes a reduced development footprint. For conceptual purposes, Alternative 4 eliminates the casitas from the proposed project. This would result in the loss of 26 living units with 42 beds, representing 30 percent of the total beds of the proposed project, and would result in a proportionate reduction in environmental impacts. Therefore, under this reduced project scenario, development on the project site would include the assisted living facility and memory care living facility, and other associated site improvements.

### **Aesthetics**

The proposed project would impact scenic vistas and the visual character of the site, and would introduce new sources of light and glare to the project site and vicinity. Impacts to scenic vistas and the introduction of new sources of light and glare would be potentially significant impacts, but would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the application of Mitigation Measures AES-1, AES-2, AES-3, and AES-4.

Alternative 4 would have similar, albeit slightly less, aesthetic-related impacts as the proposed project, as development on the site of the assisted living facility and memory care facility would still be within the public viewshed from scenic vista points and would also introduce new sources of light and glare to the project site and vicinity. Mitigation measures applicable to the proposed project would also apply to Alternative 4.

### **Air Quality**

The proposed project would have air quality-related impacts related to emissions during construction of the proposed project on the site. These impacts would be potentially significant impacts, but would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the application of Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3, and AQ-4.

Alternative 4 would have similar air quality-related impacts as the proposed project, but to a lesser extent based on a reduced amount of construction activities that would occur on the site. Mitigation measures applicable to the proposed project would also apply to Alternative 4.

## **Biological Resources**

The proposed project would impact biological resources, including potential loss or disturbance of American badgers, potential loss or disturbance of burrowing owls, potential loss or disturbance of Monterey dusky-footed woodrats, potential loss or disturbance of special-status bats, and potential loss or disturbance of nesting birds. All potential impacts can be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-3, BIO-4, BIO-5, and BIO-6. The proposed project would also have a less-than-significant impact on impeding the movement of common wildlife.

Alternative 4 would have similar impacts to biological resources as the proposed project, but to a lesser extent based on a reduced amount of development which would occur on the site. Mitigation measures applicable to the proposed project would also apply to Alternative 4.

## **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

The proposed project's greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. Alternative 4 would also result in greenhouse gas emissions that would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required. Furthermore, based on overall reduced development on the site, greenhouse gas emissions from Alternative 4 would be less than the proposed project.

## **Transportation and Traffic**

As a combined assisted living facility (100 beds) and detached senior adult housing units (26), based on ITE trip generation rates for each category, the proposed project would generate approximately 362 daily trips (266 for assisted living facility and 96 for senior adult housing units). The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to area intersections and roadway segments of River Road. However, the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact of adding additional traffic to SR 68 in the AM and PM peak hours.

Based on ITE trip generation rates for assisted living facilities, Alternative 4 would generate approximately 266 daily trips, as compared to 362 daily trips of the proposed project. Alternative 4 would result in fewer impacts to traffic than the proposed project. However, Alternative 4 would also result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

## **Water Supply**

The proposed project would have an estimated water demand of 11.376 AFY. Demand for water supply of Alternative 4 would be less than the proposed project, based on the overall reduction in development on the project site, reflecting an overall reduced water demand for the site. The estimated water demand for Alternative 4 would be 8.5 AFY. Alternative 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact on water supply, however to a lesser extent than the proposed project.

### 17.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

An alternative site was considered, but rejected from further consideration. The site is considered to be an appropriate location for the proposed project based upon the specific plan land use designation, County zoning designations, and the space available to allow the creation of a tranquil, park-like setting while also being located in a neighborhood setting. The proposed location also offers nearby amenities including hospitals and doctors on Romie Lane in west Salinas, shopping, and regional roadway access.

Having an alternative access to the project site was also considered as an alternative, but rejected from further consideration. Alternative access either directly from River Road or as a new internal subdivision roadway would not decrease impacts of the proposed project and may result in increased impacts as compared to the proposed project, such as increased traffic, visual, biological, and impacts to recreational areas associated with entry from River Road.

### 17.4 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives are summarized and compared in a matrix format in [Table 17-1, Project Alternatives Summary](#).

**Table 17-1 Project Alternatives Summary**

Environmental Topic	No Project/No Development	No Project/Min. Development	No Project/ Existing Zoning	Reduced Project
Aesthetics	-	-	=	-
Air Quality	-	-	=	-
Biological Resources	-	-	=	-
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	-	-	=	-
Transportation and Traffic	-	-	+	-
Water Supply	-	-	-	-
Project Objectives	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Partially Met

SOURCE: EMC Planning Group 2017

NOTE: (—) less, (=) similar, (+) greater

The no project/no development alternative would result in no potential adverse environmental impacts, but would not meet any of the proposed project objectives. The no project/minimum development alternative would result in less environmental impacts than the proposed project, but would not meet any of the proposed project’s objectives. The no project/existing zoning alternative would result in a similar level of impacts as the proposed project; however, and would not meet the objectives of the proposed project. The reduced

project would have an overall reduction in intensity of potential impacts based on the overall reduction in development on the project site, but the reduced project alternative would only partially meet the objectives of the proposed project and may prove to be economically infeasible. Therefore, the environmentally superior alternative that would partially meet the objectives of the proposed project would be the reduced project alternative.