CHAPTER 5 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project or to the location of the project that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project while reducing significant project impacts. An EIR is not required to consider every conceivable alternative to a project; rather, it must consider a range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. In addition, an EIR should evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. Therefore, this chapter sets forth potential alternatives to the proposed project and evaluates them, as required by CEQA.

Key provisions of the CEQA Guidelines relating to the alternatives analysis (Section 15126.6 *et seq*.) are summarized below:

- The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location that 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.
- The "no project" alternative shall be evaluated along with its impact. The "no project" analysis shall discuss the existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project is not approved.
- The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason"; therefore, the EIR must evaluate 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.
- For alternative locations, only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR.
- An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.

5.1.1 Rationale for Selecting Potentially Feasible Alternatives

Since the CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR state why an alternative is being rejected, a preliminary rationale for rejecting an alternative is presented, below, in this section. If the City ultimately rejects an alternative, the rationale for the rejection will be presented in the findings that are required to be made before the City certifies the EIR and takes action on the project.

The alternatives may include no project, a different type of project, modification of the proposed project, or suitable alternative project sites. However, the range of alternatives discussed in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason" which CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f) defines as:

> … set[ting] 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.

Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives (as described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f][1]) are environmental impacts, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the project proponent could reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to an alternative site. An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effects could not be reasonably identified, and whose implementation is remote or speculative. Those alternatives found to be infeasible are described in Section 4.3 of this chapter.

For purposes of this analysis, the project alternatives are evaluated to determine the extent to which they attain the basic project objectives, while significantly lessening any significant effects of the project. The objectives for both the City of Huntington Beach and the Applicant are stated as follows:

5.2 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

A total of five alternatives were initially identified as alternatives to the proposed project. Three scenarios, representing a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project or to the location of the project, were selected for detailed analysis. The goal for evaluating any of these alternatives is to identify ways to avoid or lessen the significant environmental effects resulting from implementation of the proposed project, while attaining most of the project objectives. Alternatives that did not achieve this goal were not evaluated in detail, and these alternatives are summarized in Section 5.3. Alternatives selected for further analysis include the following:

- **No Project/No Development Alternative:** This alternative assumes maintenance of the project site in its current status, and no changes would occur.
- **Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative:** Under this alternative, the proposed project would not be developed, and the reasonably foreseeable use for the site would be 431,000 square feet of light industrial uses.
- **Reduced Project Alternative:** This alternative would reduce the density of the residential uses, and result in development of 104 single family residences.

5.2.1 No Project/No Development Alternative

Description

The No Project/No Development Alternative represents the status quo, or maintenance of the project site in its current state. The purpose of examining such an alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the effects of approving the project with the effects of not approving the project. Currently the majority of the project site is vacant and undeveloped, with disturbed or no vegetation occupying most of the site. The northeast corner of the site is used as an RV/boat storage facility. Since the project site

would not be developed under this alternative, these existing uses and conditions on the property would remain.

Relationship to Project Objectives

Implementation of the No Project/No Development Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives listed above for either the Lead Agency or the Applicant, as no new uses would be developed.

Impacts

In general, no new environmental effects would directly result from the selection of this alternative. Maintenance of the project site in its present state would avoid any environmental impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, traffic, and utilities and service systems that were identified for the proposed project. In addition, although implementation of this alternative would not result in environmental changes to the existing hydrologic or soil conditions at the project site, erosion and siltation may occur due to the current undeveloped nature of the site. In contrast, the proposed project would direct flows away from adjacent sensitive areas. Continued erosion and siltation could affect adjacent sensitive wetland habitat over the long term, resulting in greater impacts on biological resources and hydrology and water quality compared to the proposed project. In terms of land use, the present state of the project site as a vacant and undeveloped parcel of land would remain as an underutilized parcel of land. As this alternative represents continuation of existing conditions, no significant and adverse environmental impacts directly or cumulatively associated with the No Project/No Development Alternative would occur. However, potential effects on sensitive resources could occur.

5.2.2 Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative

Description

The consideration of the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative is required by Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines and describes the use of the project site if the proposed project were not to occur, but a reasonably foreseeable use for the project site were to occur. The Applicant has identified that, if the proposed project is not approved, then the project site would be developed with a light industrial use, such as research and development, in order to be as compatible as possible with surrounding residential land uses. Approximately 431,000 square feet of industrial buildings would be developed, assuming development over 22 acres of the site, with a floor area ratio (FAR) of 45 percent. Infrastructure site improvements required for the proposed project would remain, such as site surcharge and elevation increase, utility connections, and internal circulation improvements. Table 5-1 summarizes key components of the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative.

Table 5-1	Summary of Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative
Component	*Site Characteristics*
Proposed Land Use	Light Industrial
Total Site Development	431,000 square feet
Building Height	Maximum three stories above grade (up to 40 feet); however, no building or structure shall exceed 18 ft. within 45 ft. of a residential district
Open Space	Common open space throughout, no parkland dedication
Project Access	Vehicular: Newland Street (one access point) and Lomond Drive (emergency access only) Pedestrian: Newland Street and Lomond Drive

SOURCE: W.L. Direct, 2005.

Relationship to Project Objectives

This project would not provide any additional housing for the City, and would provide no affordable housing. It would not achieve the objective of creating a development compatible with and sensitive to the existing land uses in the project area to the same extent as the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would not achieve the objective of expanding residential land use opportunities in the City of Huntington Beach for a greater number and variety of housing options.

Impacts

Aesthetics

This alternative would result in an industrial development that would be assumed to conform to Zoning Code requirements, and would be assumed not to be visually unattractive. As with the proposed project, development of this alternative would represent a change in visual character to the site, though one that would generally be considered more intensive due to the lack of parkland and typical massing of industrial buildings. Thus, although the light industrial use would be as compatible as possible with surrounding residential uses, the overall use would not be aesthetically compatible due to the variation in land uses. However, this alternative would comply with existing regulations for the site and would represent a less-than-significant impact. This impact would be greater under this alternative than under the proposed project.

The building heights under this alternative could be approximately five feet higher than those under the proposed project. However, no building or structure would exceed 18 ft. within 45 ft. of existing residential uses. The structures under this alternative would be set back even further than those under the proposed project, such that the light industrial development would not cast shadows on adjacent light-sensitive uses for a duration of longer than three hours. Because the structures under this alternative would be taller but set back further than those under the proposed project, this impact would be similar to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

The surface area of the proposed structure under this alternative would, as with the proposed project, have the potential to create daytime glare by reflecting sunlight, and night lighting. Impacts could be

reduced through implementation of mitigation measures, similar to the proposed project. However, the increased size of the overall structure (as compared to multiple smaller structures) under this alternative would result in an impact that is greater than under the proposed project.

Air Quality

Operational and construction-related vehicle and equipment emissions from this alternative would be increased under this alternative, compared to the proposed project, as the light industrial use would generate more traffic. Construction activities could still result in NOx emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds, as surcharge of the site would still be required. Construction impacts would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed project. Nearly three times the number of vehicular trips would be generated under this alternative, increasing operational impacts to air quality. It is anticipated that VOC emissions could exceed thresholds, resulting in significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality. This impact would be greater than under the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Although implementation of this alternative would result in different land uses, similar ground clearing activities and installation of new landscaping would be required. As such, biological resource impacts associated with disturbance to potential special status wildlife and special status plant species that could occur on the site would be the same as under the proposed project. The potential for disturbance to nesting habitat could be addressed with mitigation measures identified for the proposed project. Impacts to adjacent wetlands would be less than significant, as post project drainage would convey flows away from adjacent sensitive areas. In addition, impacts associated with consistency with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would be less than significant. Impacts to biological resources would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels, similar to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Although type of use at the project site would change, the amount of site coverage and extent of excavation would be similar to the proposed project. As such, impacts to potential cultural materials could still occur and be affected to the same extent under this alternative as the proposed project. Impacts could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with incorporation of the identified mitigation measures.

Geology and Soils

Although type of use at the project site would change, on-site persons and structures would remain exposed to seismic- and soil-related hazards. Impacts related to development on potentially unstable soils and long-term exposure of persons and property to seismic risks would still be reduced to less-than-significant levels by incorporation of the identified mitigation measures described for the proposed project. Soil erosion as a result of wind and water would occur during project construction, which would be similar to conditions under the proposed project. Geology impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level under this alternative, similar to the proposed project

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Although type of use at the project site would change, risks associated with hazards and hazardous materials would remain, similar to the proposed project. Hazardous material impacts could result from the potential exposure of construction personnel and the public to unidentified contamination present in the soil during grading and excavation of the site. In addition, potential damage to existing abandoned oil wells on the site could occur during implementation of this alternative. Hazards associated with methane and hydrogen sulfide gas would also remain. Potential issues associated with hazardous materials could be addressed by mitigation measures identified for the proposed project. Impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels, similar to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

More stormwater runoff could occur under this alternative as more impermeable surface area would be created for the light industrial use because development would cover approximately 22 acres of the site, and there would be no park. The quantity and constituents of stormwater runoff could be greater than the proposed project due to the light industrial use. Although new development affecting water quality would occur, similar to the proposed project, this development would be governed by existing regulations, including the NPDES process. As with the proposed project, implementation of BMPs would ensure that impacts would remain less than significant. Similar storm drain infrastructure improvements would occur, and therefore, impacts to the storm drain system would be substantially similar to the proposed project. This alternative would also raise the project site and would place additional structures in an area of moderate tsunami risk, similar to the proposed project. Overall, it is assumed that hydrology and water quality impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level and similar to the proposed project.

Land Use

Implementation of this alternative would result in uses currently allowed under the City's existing General Plan. No General Plan amendment or zone change would be required. Implementation of this alternative would be consistent with applicable land use plans. However, development of light industrial uses would differ from adjacent residential uses located across Lomond Drive. The type of light industrial use envisioned, such as research and development, would not be expected to result in substantial land use compatibility issues as was previously analyzed and considered in the 1996 General Plan Update. Incorporation of setbacks, landscaped buffers, and other design features could minimize effects associated with compatibility. As such, although compatibility of the proposed uses under this alternative would be less than significant, impacts would be greater than compared to the proposed project.

Noise

It is assumed that implementation of the light industrial uses under this alternative would require similar construction activities, such as import of fill and surcharge of the site, along with the necessary utility improvements. Therefore, daily construction activities would be anticipated to be the same, such that

resulting construction noise levels would be the same as described for the proposed project. This alternative would produce nearly three times the number of traffic trips than under the proposed project. Because vehicle trips would be substantially increased, roadway noise impacts would be greater than those described for the proposed project and could be significant. On-site noise impacts would also be greater than that of the proposed project, with more vehicular noise due to more cars arriving and departing from the project site as compared to the proposed project. However, the increased noise levels at the project site may not exceed the noise levels in excess of City standards because the noise standard for industrial uses is higher than that for residential uses. Interior noise levels would not exceed City standards, similar to the proposed project. Overall noise impacts would be greater under this alternative compared to the proposed project due to the substantial increase in vehicular trips and the resulting increase in roadway noise.

Population and Housing

No additional population would be directly generated by this alternative. Additional jobs could be generated by new employment opportunities. Due to the size of the site, the number of employment opportunities that would be anticipated would not be substantial or result in in-migration of workers. In addition, no additional housing would be developed, such that the project would not assist in furtherance of City goals to provide a mix of housing types accessible to a broad range of home purchasers, as directed by Policies HE 3.1.1 and 4.1.2 of the City's Housing Element. As such, no beneficial effects on housing supply would result, although project impacts would be less than significant.

Public Services

The change in proposed land use from residential to light industrial would not result in additional impacts on public services beyond those identified for the proposed project. Fire protection could be adequately provided by existing services, and this impact would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project. Additional demands on police personnel from this alternative would not be substantial. The ratio of population to police officers would remain the same, and this alternative does not include any unique uses or features requiring substantial police service. Impacts on police protection would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project. With regards to schools, because project would not result in additional population on site, no additional students would be generated. No impacts would result on schools, and this impact would be less than the proposed project.

Recreation

No direct population increase would be associated with this alternative. Site employees may use nearby City parks either before or after work, or during lunchtime. Payment of parkland fees would be required to address these demands. As such, demands on recreational resources within the City would be less than significant. Because no direct population increase would occur, this impact would be less than the proposed project.

Transportation

This alternative would generate approximately 3,004 trips, or nearly three times the number of trips as the proposed project. Impacts at the intersections of Beach/Atlanta and Beach/PCH could be exacerbated, and impacts to additional intersections could occur. Impacts would be significant, and would be greater than the proposed project.

Utilities and Service Systems

The City's 2000 Urban Water Management Plan and Water Master Plan indicated that adequate water supply exists to serve the proposed project. This alternative would result in fewer additional demands on water. Therefore, impacts associated with sufficient water supply under this alternative would also be less than significant. This alternative is anticipated to result in demands of approximately 34,188 gpd[16], which is over half that compared to the proposed project. In addition, since the project Applicant has agreed to fund the construction of new water lines serving the project site to improve the City's distribution system beyond its present capabilities, sufficient fire flows would also exist.

Adequate capacity exists in the Coast Trunk Sewer and OCSD's existing wastewater treatment facilities to serve the proposed project. This alternative would result in approximately 18,942 gpd[17] of wastewater, which is less than compared to the proposed project. Because the existing facilities would adequately serve the project, this alternative, which has a lower wastewater generation, would also be adequately served and this impact would also be less than significant.

This alternative would result in annual solid waste generation at the project site of approximately 9,816.49 tons,[18] which is significantly higher than the proposed project (148.92 tons per year). Consequently, impacts under this alternative would be greater than the proposed project, and would be significant.

Adequate ability exists to provide electrical and natural gas demands to serve the proposed project. This alternative would result in approximately 3,792,800[19] kWh/yr of electricity, which is more than double electricity than compared to the proposed project. Demand for natural gas would be approximately 689,600[20] ft^3/month, which is substantially less than compared to the proposed project. These utilities are provided upon request of service; there is an adequate supply of electricity and natural gas to serve this alternative. While more electrical demands would result, this alternative would be adequately served and this impact would also be less than significant.

[16] Water demand of 1,480 gallons per acre per day. City of Huntington Beach, 2005 Draft Water Master Plan Update.
[17] Wastewater generation of 820 gallons per acre per day. City of Huntington Beach. Citywide Sewer Master Plan, Appendix D.
[18] Solid waste generation of 41.6 pounds/day/employee for industrial uses. Assumes 3 employees per 1,000 sf. City of Huntington Beach. General Plan EIR.
[19] Electrical demand of 8.8 (kilowatt/hr/year)/sf. City of Huntington Beach. General Plan EIR.
[20] Natural gas demand of 1.6 cubic feet/month/sf. City of Huntington Beach. General Plan EIR.

5.2.3 Reduced Project Alternative

The reduced project alternative that has been identified for the site is a low density residential project of detached homes. A General Plan Amendment would be proposed to change the designation of the site to the RL Residential Low Density designation. A total of 140 single family residences would be developed on the site, assuming 2 acres of the site is dedicated to the City as a public park and 1 acre of the site is used for street and ancillary improvements. Homes would average 5,000 sf in size. Infrastructure site improvements required for the proposed project would remain, such as site surcharge and elevation increase, utility connections, and internal circulation improvements. Table 5-2 summarizes key components of the Reduced Project Alternative.

Table 5-2 Summary of Reduced Project Alternative

Component	*Site Characteristics*
Proposed Land Use	Single Family Residential
Residential Dwelling Units Proposed	140 units
Building Height	Maximum three stories above grade (up to 35 feet)
Open Space	Public Park: 2.0 acres, in addition to private open space
Project Access	Vehicular: Newland Street (one access point) and Lomond Drive (emergency access only) Pedestrian: Newland Street and Lomond Drive

SOURCE: W.L Direct 2005.

Relationship to Project Objectives

This project would provide additional housing for the City, and would also include affordable housing. It would not achieve the objective of providing a mix of housing types to the same extent as the proposed project.

Impacts

Aesthetics

This alternative would be compatible in massing and character with adjacent residential uses. The less intensive uses associated with this alternative would reduce the contribution of the project to the overall density of development in the nearby area. However, this alternative would not change the project effects to the visual character. Impacts under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

The building heights under this alternative would be no higher than those under the proposed project. Thus, the low density residential development would not cast shadows on adjacent light-sensitive uses for a duration of longer than three hours, and this impact would be less than significant. This impact would be similar to the proposed project in magnitude.

The surface area of the proposed structures under this alternative would, as with the proposed project, have the potential to create daytime glare by reflecting sunlight and night lighting, which would constitute a potentially significant impact that could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of mitigation measures, similar to the proposed project.

Air Quality

Operational and construction-related vehicle and equipment emissions from this alternative would be increased under this alternative, compared to the proposed project, as low density residential uses would generate more traffic. Construction activities could still result in NOx emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds, as surcharge of the site would still be required. Construction impacts would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the proposed project. More vehicular trips would be generated under this alternative, although the approximate 12 percent increase in traffic would not be anticipated to result in exceedance of thresholds. Operational impacts to air quality would be less than significant, although this impact would be greater than under the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Although implementation of this alternative would result in a different land use density, ground clearing activities and installation of new landscaping would be required. As such, biological resource impacts associated with disturbance to potential special status wildlife and special status plant species that could occur on the site would be the same as under the proposed project. The potential for disturbance to nesting habitat could be addressed with mitigation measures identified for the proposed project. Impacts to adjacent wetlands would be less than significant, as post project drainage would convey flows away from adjacent sensitive areas. In addition, impacts associated with consistency with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would be less than significant. Impacts to biological resources would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels, similar to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Although intensity of use at the project site would change, the amount of site coverage and extent of excavation would be similar to the proposed project. As such, impacts to potential cultural materials could still occur and be affected to the same extent under this alternative as the proposed project. Impacts could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with incorporation of the identified mitigation measures.

Geology and Soils

Although intensity of use at the project site would change, on-site persons and structures would remain exposed to seismic- and soil-related hazards. Impacts related to development on potentially unstable soils and long-term exposure of persons and property to seismic risks would still be reduced to less-than-significant levels by incorporation of the identified mitigation measures described for the proposed project. Soil erosion as a result of wind and water would occur during project construction, which would be similar to conditions under the proposed project. Geology impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level under this alternative, similar to the proposed project

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Although intensity of use at the project site would change, risks associated with hazards and hazardous materials would remain, similar to the proposed project. Hazardous material impacts could result from the potential exposure of construction personnel and the public to unidentified contamination present in the soil during grading and excavation of the site. In addition, potential damage to existing abandoned oil wells on the site could occur during implementation of this alternative. Hazards associated with methane and hydrogen sulfide gas would also remain. Potential issues associated with hazardous materials could be addressed by mitigation measures identified for the proposed project. Impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels, similar to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The quantity and constituents of stormwater runoff would be anticipated to be substantially similar to the proposed project. New development affecting water quality would occur, and similar to the proposed project, this development would be governed by existing regulations, including the NPDES process. As with the proposed project, implementation of BMPs would ensure that impacts would remain less than significant. Similar storm drain infrastructure improvements would occur, and therefore, impacts to the storm drain system would be substantially similar to the proposed project. This alternative would also raise the project site and would place additional structures in an area of moderate tsunami risk, similar to the proposed project. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level and would be substantially similar to the proposed project.

Land Use

Implementation of this alternative requires a General Plan amendment, although the redesignation of the site would be to RL Residential Low Density designation. This alternative would result in the loss of industrially designated land in the City, similar to the proposed project. For reasons described in the impact analysis for the proposed project, however, this effect would not be significant. Low density uses would be compatible with similar, adjacent residential uses. Impacts would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

Noise

While less overall development would occur, daily construction activities would be anticipated to be the same, such that resulting construction noise levels would be the same as described for the proposed project. Although the number of residential units would be reduced under this alternative, the detached single-family housing would produce slightly more traffic than under the proposed project. Thus, because vehicle trips would be increased, it is assumed that roadway noise impacts could be slightly greater than those described for the proposed project. On-site noise impacts related to the reduced residential development could also be greater than that of the proposed project, with more vehicular noise due to slightly more cars arriving and departing from the project site as compared to the proposed project. The increased noise levels would still expose new residential land uses on site to exterior noise levels in excess of City standards. Implementation of MM 4.9-3 would be expected to reduce impacts to

a less-than-significant level. Noise levels would be mitigated to meet City standards, similar to the proposed project. Impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant, although due to additional noise generated, impacts would be and would be greater than the proposed project.

Population and Housing

A population increase of approximately 371 persons (2.65 pph x 140 units) would be generated by this alternative. The population increase would be less than the proposed project, and would not result in growth that could not be accommodated in the City. Affordable housing requirements for 10 percent of the total units to be designated as affordable housing would still be required. Impacts would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

Public Services

The change in density would not measurably affect impacts on fire and police services. This alternative would result in fewer residential units. As fire and police protection could be adequately provided to the proposed project, it could similarly be provided to this reduced density alternative. These impacts would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

The project would result in fewer persons on site, and correspondingly fewer students generated. Students could be accommodated at local public schools, although this may result in fewer students from outside the district attending HBCSD and HBUHSD schools. Impacts would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

Recreation

With a population of 371 persons associated with this alternative, a total of 1.86 acres of parkland would be required to meet City requirements. As such, dedication of a two acre park on site would meet the recreational needs of the proposed project. No additional land dedication or fee payment would be required. Impacts would be less than significant, and less than the proposed project. The same amount of recreational facilities would be developed under this alternative, and, consequently, impacts associated with construction of recreational facilities, would occur, similar to the proposed project.

Transportation

This alternative would generate approximately 1,343 average daily trips, which is 145 (12 percent) more trips than the proposed project. Impacts at the intersections of Beach/Atlanta and Beach/PCH could be exacerbated. It is not anticipated that substantial impacts to additional intersections would occur. Impacts would be significant, and would be greater than the proposed project.

Utilities and Service Systems

Under this alternative, the decrease in the density of development would result in fewer demands on utilities. Overall, utilities and service systems impacts would be less severe under this alternative than the proposed project since less development would occur.

The City's 2000 Urban Water Management Plan and Water Master Plan indicated that adequate water supply exists to serve the proposed project. This alternative would result in fewer additional demands on water. Therefore, impacts associated with sufficient water supply under this alternative would also be less than significant. This alternative is anticipated to result in demands of approximately 36,821 gpd[21], which less than the proposed project. In addition, since the project Applicant has agreed to fund the construction of new water lines serving the project site to improve the City's distribution system beyond its present capabilities, sufficient fire flows would also exist.

Adequate capacity exists in the Coast Trunk Sewer and OCSD's existing wastewater treatment facilities to serve the proposed project. This alternative would result in approximately 36,960 gpd[22] of wastewater, which is less generation of wastewater compared to the proposed project. Because the existing facilities would adequately serve the project, this alternative, which has a lower wastewater generation, would also be adequately served and this impact would also be less than significant.

This alternative would result in annual solid waste generation at the project site of 102.2 tons,[23] which is approximately 46.72 tons less than the proposed project. As impacts for the proposed project would be less than significant, impacts under this alternative would also be less than significant, and would be less than the proposed project.

Adequate ability exists to provide electrical and natural gas demands to serve the proposed project. This alternative would result in approximately 787,710[24] kWh/yr of electricity, which is less than compared to the proposed project. Demand for natural gas would be approximately 933,100[25] ft^3/month, which is less than compared to the proposed project. These utilities are provided upon request of service, and there is an adequate supply of electricity and natural gas to serve this alternative. As fewer electrical demands would result this alternative, impacts would be less than the proposed project, and would be less than significant.

5.3 OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

This section discusses alternatives that were considered but not carried forward for detailed analysis. These alternatives were part of the initial screening process, which identified a range of potential alternatives. Alternatives were not evaluated in detail because they either did not meet project objectives, and/or did not reduce significant project impacts.

5.3.1 Alternative Site

Potential for development of an alternative site was reviewed as an alternative to the project site. Due to the developed nature of the City, there are a limited number of sites that are at least 23 acres in size and

[21] Water demand of 1,594 gallons per acre per day. City of Huntington Beach, 2005 Draft Water Master Plan Update.
[22] Wastewater generation of 1,600 gallons per acre per day. City of Huntington Beach. Citywide Sewer Master Plan, Appendix D.
[23] Solid waste factor of 4 pounds/day/unit for residential uses. City of Huntington Beach. General Plan EIR.
[24] Electrical demand of 5626.50 kWh/unit/year. SACQMD Handbook.
[25] Natural gas demand of 6,665 cubic feet/unit/month. SACQMD Handbook.

could accommodate the proposed project components. Two sites that were considered include the NESI site and the AERA property. The NESI site, located at the southwest corner of Magnolia Street and Hamilton Avenue is large enough to accommodate the proposed project and is zoned for residential uses. However, this site includes extensive contamination and is not likely to be available for development until approximately 2010. The AERA property, located along Pacific Coast Highway between Goldenwest and Seapoint, is large enough to accommodate the project, but would require amendments to the Zoning Code, General Plan, and Local Coastal Plan, as it is currently not designated for residential uses. In addition, this site is planned to be in active oil production for the next 15 to 20 years. Further, development at an alternative site would result in either a similar residential project proposed on site, or development of the Reasonably Foreseeable Development alternative, analyzed in this section. Therefore, use of an alternative site is not feasible and would not achieve a net reduction in on-site impacts.

5.3.2 Alternative Configuration

Consideration was given to an alternative configuration that could provide a greater level of protection to adjacent wetlands. No wetlands have been identified on site, and impacts to off-site wetlands would be less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required to reduce operational impacts to wetlands. As such, an alternative configuration would not further reduce impacts to off-site wetlands.

5.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

A comparison of the proposed project with the alternatives analyzed in this section provides the basis for determination of the environmentally superior alternative. Impacts of each of the alternatives are compared to the proposed project in Table 5-3. Impacts to a particular resource that would be greater than the proposed project are indicated with a plus (+) sign, and impacts to a particular resource that would be less than the proposed project are indicated with a minus (–) sign. Impacts to resources that would be roughly equivalent to the proposed project are indicated with an equals (=) sign in the table below.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would result in fewer impacts to the site, although it could result in greater impacts on biological resources and hydrology and water quality. Due to the environmentally sensitive habitat that would be affected, this alternative would not be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project.

Table 5-3 indicates that both the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative and the Reduced Project Alternative would primarily result in impacts similar to the proposed project, but would also result in some impacts that would be either less than or greater than the proposed project. The Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would result in fewer impacts to population and housing and recreation. This alternative would result in greater impacts on aesthetics, air quality, land use, noise, transportation, and utilities (solid waste). It is possible that impacts to air quality, noise, transportation, and utilities (solid waste) could be significant and unavoidable. This alternative could result in impacts that would be substantially greater than the proposed project, and it is not the

environmentally superior alternative. The Reduced Project Alternative would result in fewer impacts to utilities due to its reduced density. However, development of single family residences would generate more traffic, even though fewer residences could be built. This would increase impacts on air quality, noise, and transportation. Noise impacts may not be mitigable, due to feasibility related to screening exterior noise levels on single family residences. This alternative could result in impacts that would be substantially greater than the proposed project, and it is not the environmentally superior alternative. Therefore, the proposed project is the environmentally superior alternative.

Table 5-3 Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Environmental Issue Area	*No Project/No Development Alternative*	*Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative*	*Reduced Project Alternative*
Aesthetics	–	+	=
Air Quality	–	+	+
Biological Resources	+	=	=
Cultural Resources	–	=	=
Geology and Soils	–	=	=
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	–	=	=
Hydrology and Water Quality	+	=	=
Land Use	–	+	=
Noise	–	+	+
Population and Housing	–	–	=
Public Services	–	=	=
Recreation	–	–	=
Transportation	–	+	+
Utilities	–	+	–

(–) = Impacts considered to be less when compared with the proposed project.
(+) = Impacts considered to be greater when compared with the proposed project.
(=) = Impacts considered to be equal or similar to the proposed project.