

6.1 INTRODUCTION

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) states that an environmental impact report shall describe and analyze a range of reasonable alternatives to a project. These alternatives should feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, while avoiding or substantially lessening one or more of the significant environmental impacts of the project. See Section 3.0 for project objectives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project, nor is it required to consider alternatives that are infeasible. The discussion of alternatives shall focus on those which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if they impede the attainment of the project objectives to some degree or would be more costly [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b)].

In accordance with the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, the following alternatives to the proposed project are evaluated:

- Alternative 1 - No Project
- Alternative 2 – Reduced Residential Density Alternative
- Alternative 3 – Open Space Alternative

Alternatives 2 and 3 were selected for analysis based on the mix of land uses proposed as well as the existing land uses in the vicinity of the project site. The environmental effects of each of these alternatives are identified and compared with significant or potentially significant impacts associated with the project from the proposed project. A table at the end of this section provides a summary of the comparisons. Also, an “environmentally superior” alternative is identified.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS

Due to the size and nature of the proposed project, true environmental benefits would not be achieved by the selection of an alternative site. Currently, there are no large vacant land areas within the City that are not either already approved for development or have a pending development application. Many sites within the City currently have applications for development, including the Sterling Meadows site, Sutter Elk Grove Master Plan site, and the Southeast Policy Area site (please refer to **Table 4.0-1** for a complete list of projects). In addition, if a site could be relocated, environmental benefits over the proposed project would not likely be achieved. It is likely that impacts to air quality, land use, noise, and traffic would occur at an alternative location. Therefore, an alternative site alternative was not selected for analysis in this report.

A reduced commercial use alternative was not specifically identified, as this would be comparable to the No Project Alternative. The project site, a total of 79.7 acres, currently allows for 23.2 acres residential, (11.8 acres RD-10, 12.5 acres RD-15, and 14.5 acres RD-20), and 56.5 acres designated as Shopping Commercial (SC). The proposed project requests an increase of 23.2 acres of additional SC, which would result in a reduction of 24.3 acres of residential and an expected loss of between 285 to 341 residential units.

Additionally, an all residential alternative was considered but not selected for analysis. An all residential alternative would not meet any the basic objectives of the project such as providing employee centers to create an improved jobs/housing balance, supporting retail and commercial growth by providing proximate housing, providing locations for neighborhood-serving commercial projects, and designating adequate acreage to support a regional medical facility. As a result, the all residential alternative was not selected for analysis.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

6.2 ALTERNATIVE 1 - NO PROJECT

Alternative 1 is the No Project Alternative. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1) states that a No Project Alternative must be analyzed in every EIR. The purpose of describing and analyzing a No Project Alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving a proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. However, the No Project Alternative analysis is not the baseline for determining whether the environmental impacts of a proposed project may be significant, unless the No Project Alternative analysis is identical to the environmental setting for each environmental issue area.

CHARACTERISTICS

The No Project Alternative is the continuation of the existing land use and zoning designations on the project site, which would allow for development under the existing Laguna Ridge Specific Plan. This approach is consistent with the requirements identified at Section 15126.6(e)(3)(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, which state "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 existing plan, policy or operation into the future." The Laguna Ridge Specific Plan, approved June 2004, provided specific land use development standards and patterns and master planning of infrastructure facilities, and established a financing plan or program for plan area infrastructure needs. This plan involves the development of residential, commercial, park, public school, and mixed-use land uses within an approximate 1,870-acre site. The proposed project site is 95.3± acres within the Specific Plan area, currently zoned with a combination of Multi-Family Residential/20-25 dwelling units per acre (RD-20), Medium Residential/15.1-20 dwelling units per acre (RD-15), and Single-Family/10 dwelling units per acre (RD-10), and Shopping Commercial (SC). Under this No Project Alternative, existing land use designations and zoning for the project site would not be changed.

Under the existing land use designations, it is expected that the LRSP would allow for approximately 597 to 731 residential dwelling units and approximately 862,052 square feet of shopping center within the proposed project area. The LRSP EIR is intended to be used to evaluate subsequent projects under the approved LRSP and specifically states that additional environmental review under CEQA may be necessary based on subsequent projects' consistency with the LRSP and the analysis in the EIR. The LRSP EIR is intended to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project to the greatest extent possible. The LRSP EIR should be used as the primary environmental document to evaluate all subsequent planning and permitting actions associated with the project. Subsequent actions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Adoption of the Laguna Ridge Specific Plan;
- Approval of financing plans and programs for the plan area;
- Approval of the rezone of the plan area;
- Approval of subsequent tentative and final maps;
- Actions and permits from any responsible agency;
- Improvement plans;
- Grading plans; and
- Building permits.

COMPARATIVE IMPACTS

Land Use

There were no significant or potentially significant impacts identified with the proposed Laguna Ridge Town Center project; therefore, no analysis of the No Project Alternative is necessary.

Air Quality

Construction-Related Air Quality Impacts (Impact 4.2.1)

Impact 4.2.1 indicates that construction activities associated with the development of the proposed project may emit pollutants that exceed California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for PM₁₀ pollutants as well as exceed the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) significance criterion for NO_x pollutants. This is considered to be a significant and unavoidable impact. Construction under the existing land use designations would also result in emissions in association with implementation of the No Project Alternative. As demonstrated in Section 4.2, Air Quality (see **Tables 4.2-8 and 4.2-9**), the proposed project land use reconfiguration would result in construction-related air quality impacts during development of the project site that would be slightly reduced in comparison to development of the site under the LRSP EIR. The No Project Alternative would result in construction-related air quality impacts that would be similar to the proposed project.

Long-term Increases of Criteria Air Pollutants (Impact 4.2.3)

Impact 4.2.3 indicates that project emissions could result in long-term increases in criteria air pollutants which exceed SMAQMD's significance threshold. As discussed in Section 4.2, Air Quality (see **Table 4.2-10**), NO_x and ROG emissions during both winter and summer months of the year would exceed SMAQMD's recommended significance threshold of 65 lbs/day. This is considered to be a significant and unavoidable impact. The proposed project and No Project Alternative would both exceed the 65 lb/day threshold for ROG or NO_x during both the summer and winter months (see **Table 4.2-10**); however, the proposed project would be environmentally better than the No Project Alternative as it would result in fewer emissions.

Regional Air Plan Impacts (Impact 4.2.4)

Impact 4.2.4 indicates that implementation of the proposed Laguna Ridge Town Center project along with potential development in the region would exacerbate existing regional problems with ozone and particulate matter. Existing air quality impacts associated with residential and commercial development would continue in association with the No Project Alternative. These impacts are considered significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and the No Project Alternative. Overall, cumulative regional air impacts would be similar in association with the No Project Alternative and the proposed project.

Noise

Long-term Noise Levels – Proposed Medical Center (Impact 4.3.2)

Impact 4.3.2 indicates that the proposed medical office land uses could result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels that could exceed the City's noise standards at nearby noise-sensitive land uses. This is considered to be a significant and unavoidable impact. The No

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Project Alternative would result in residential and commercial development and would be better as it would avoid significant and unavoidable impacts associated with potential medical center and/or hospital operations.

Traffic and Circulation

Operations on Elk Grove Boulevard between Laguna Springs Drive and SR 99 (Impact 4.4.6)

Impact 4.4.6 indicates that the addition of project traffic to cumulative volumes would increase the volume to capacity ratio on this roadway segment, and the proposed project will exacerbate an unacceptable LOS on Elk Grove Boulevard between Laguna Springs Drive and SR 99. This impact could be mitigated by extending the existing auxiliary lane on eastbound Elk Grove Boulevard from Laguna Springs Drive to SR 99; however, this is not considered feasible because it would impact existing development along Elk Grove Boulevard. The Laguna Ridge Specific Plan EIR did not study the impacts of traffic along this roadway. Therefore, it is assumed that additional traffic and circulation impacts along this roadway segment would occur as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project would result in additional impacts than the No Project Alternative.

Operations at Elk Grove Boulevard/Bruceville Road Intersection (Impact 4.4.8)

Impact 4.4.8 indicates that the addition of project traffic to cumulative no project volumes would increase the average delay at this roadway segment, and the proposed project will exacerbate an unacceptable LOS at the Elk Grove Boulevard/Bruceville Road intersection. This impact is reduced to less than cumulatively significant through mitigation that includes conversion of the westbound right turn into an overlapping phase. Under the No Project Alternative, the LRSP EIR requires additional mitigation measures to improve the LOS of the Elk Grove Boulevard/Bruceville Road intersection. Therefore, it is assumed that additional traffic and circulation impacts at this intersection would occur as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project would result in additional impacts than the No Project Alternative.

Cumulative Operations at Intersections in the Project Vicinity (Impact 4.4.9)

Impact 4.4.9 indicates that the addition of project traffic to existing conditions volumes would increase the average delay at multiple project vicinity intersections and exacerbate the unacceptable LOS. Although measures can be implemented to reduce the significance of these intersection impacts, impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. Overall, operation of intersections in the project vicinity, with the exception of Elk Grove Boulevard/Big Horn Boulevard, Elk Grove Boulevard/Laguna Springs Drive, Elk Grove Boulevard/Auto Center Drive, Elk Grove Boulevard/SR 99 Southbound Ramps, and Elk Grove Boulevard/East Stockton Boulevard intersections, would be similar in association with the No Project Alternative and the proposed project. However, the proposed project would have a considerable contribution to intersections in the project vicinity by significantly increasing delay; this increase in delay would not occur without the proposed project. While the intersections would operate unacceptably with development under the existing designations, the increase in severity of this impact associated with the proposed project would be significant and unavoidable. Although this impact will include improvements to the intersections, the impact cannot be reduced to less than significant. The proposed project would result in additional impacts than the No Project Alternative.

6.3 ALTERNATIVE 2 – REDUCED RESIDENTIAL DENSITY ALTERNATIVE

CHARACTERISTICS

Alternative 2 is similar to the proposed project, with the exception that there would be fewer residential units developed. As stated in the Project Description, one of the objectives of the proposed Laguna Ridge Town Center project is to designate adequate acreage (approximately 28 acres) to support a regional medical facility. A reduction in commercial potential is discussed under the No Project Alternative and Alternative 3. Impacts associated with development of the project are not associated with the configuration of the uses, but rather the density of proposed uses. As analysis of alternative locations and analysis of reduced commercial potential have been considered, the remaining potentially feasible alternative is to reduce residential development potential. The Reduced Residential Density Alternative is provided to reduce environmental impacts associated with air quality and traffic while achieving the project objective of increasing the area designated for commercial use. The Reduced Residential Density Alternative would reduce the density of residential development by changing the 15.6 acres of proposed RD-20 to RD-10 and retaining the proposed 79.7 acres of SC. This would equate to a reduction of approximately 156 to 234 total units, which would reduce the residential population to between 466 to 699 people and 1,028 to 1,542 fewer vehicle trips (6.59 daily, .46 AM peak hour, and .58 PM peak hour trips). Under the Reduced Residential Density Alternative, the project residential designation of RD-10 would be similar to the surrounding residential uses, while still allowing for a higher density residential zoning.

COMPARATIVE IMPACTS

Land Use

There were no significant or potentially significant impacts identified with the proposed Laguna Ridge Town Center project; therefore, no analysis of the Reduced Residential Density Alternative is necessary.

Air Quality

Construction-Related Air Quality Impacts (Impact 4.2.1)

Impact 4.2.1 indicates that construction activities associated with the development of the proposed project may emit pollutants that exceed California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for PM₁₀ pollutants as well as exceed the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) significance threshold for NO_x pollutants. This is considered to be a significant and unavoidable impact. Implementation of the Reduced Residential Density Alternative would also result in construction of commercial and residential uses. As demonstrated in Section 4.2, Air Quality (see Tables **4.2-8 and 4.2-9**), the proposed project land use reconfiguration would result in similar construction-related air quality impacts as the existing land use designations of the project site. Therefore, it is likely that the Reduced Residential Density Alternative would result in similar construction-related air quality impacts compared to the proposed project.

Long-term Increases of Criteria Air Pollutants (Impact 4.2.3)

Impact 4.2.3 indicates that project emissions could result in long-term increases in criteria air pollutants which exceed SMAQMD's significance threshold. Under the Reduced Residential

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Density Alternative, long-term increases in criteria air pollutants would also occur from development of the project site, of which emissions of ROG and NO_x are of particular concern. As discussed in Section 4.2, Air Quality (see **Table 4.2-10**), NO_x and ROG emissions during both winter and summer months of the year would exceed SMAQMD's recommended significance threshold of 65 lbs/day. This is considered to be a significant and unavoidable impact. The Reduced Residential Density Alternative would also likely exceed the 65 lb/day threshold for ROG or NO_x during both the summer and winter months; however, it is likely that this alternative would result in fewer emissions than the proposed project.

Regional Air Plan Impacts (Impact 4.2.4)

Impact 4.2.4 indicates that implementation of the proposed Laguna Ridge Town Center project along with potential development in the region would exacerbate existing regional problems with ozone and particulate matter. Existing air quality impacts associated with residential and commercial development would continue in association with the Reduced Residential Density Alternative. These impacts are considered significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and the Reduced Residential Density Alternative. Overall, regional air impacts would be similar in association with the Reduced Residential Density Alternative and the proposed project.

Noise

Long-term Noise Levels – Proposed Medical Center (Impact 4.3.2)

Impact 4.3.2 indicates that the proposed medical office land uses could result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels that could exceed the City's noise standards at nearby noise-sensitive land uses. This is considered to be a significant and unavoidable impact. The Reduced Residential Density Alternative would result in the same commercial development; however the residential development would occur at a reduced density. This alternative would likely result in similar impacts associated with long-term noise levels, as the potential development of a medical center and/or hospital operations would contribute to area noise levels.

Traffic and Circulation

Operations on Elk Grove Boulevard between Laguna Springs Drive and SR 99 (Impact 4.4.6)

Impact 4.4.6 indicates that the addition of project traffic to cumulative volumes would increase the volume to capacity ratio on this roadway segment, and the proposed project will exacerbate an unacceptable LOS on Elk Grove Boulevard between Laguna Springs Drive and SR 99. This impact could be mitigated by extending the existing auxiliary lane on eastbound Elk Grove Boulevard from Laguna Springs Drive to SR 99; however, this is not considered feasible because it would impact existing development along Elk Grove Boulevard. With a reduction of residential trips with the Reduced Residential Density Alternative, the impact to the segment of Elk Grove Boulevard between Laguna Springs Drive and SR 99 would remain significant and unavoidable. The impact would be reduced with the Reduced Residential Density Alternative in comparison to the proposed project.

Operations at Elk Grove Boulevard/Bruceville Road Intersection (Impact 4.4.8)

Impact 4.4.8 indicates that the addition of project traffic to cumulative no project volumes would increase the average delay at this roadway segment, and the proposed project will exacerbate an unacceptable LOS on Elk Grove Boulevard/Bruceville Road intersection. This impact is reduced to less than cumulatively significant through mitigation that includes

conversion of the westbound right turn into an overlapping phase. The LRSP EIR requires additional mitigation measures to improve the LOS of the Elk Grove Boulevard/Bruceville Road Intersection. The Reduced Residential Density Alternative would likely reduce operations at this intersection in comparison to the proposed project.

Cumulative Operations at Intersections in the Project Vicinity (Impact 4.4.9)

Impact 4.4.9 indicates that the addition of project traffic to existing conditions volumes would increase the average delay at multiple project-vicinity intersections and exacerbate the unacceptable LOS. Although measures can be implemented to reduce the significance of these intersection impacts, impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. While project vicinity intersections would function unacceptably under both the Reduced Residential Density Alternative and the proposed project, the reduction in trips associated with the Reduced Residential Density Alternative would result in slightly better operations at these intersections.

6.4 ALTERNATIVE 3 – OPEN SPACE ALTERNATIVE

CHARACTERISTICS

The Open Space Alternative proposes to reduce commercial uses on the project site and replace those uses with open space. The Shopping Commercial designation would be replaced on the 15.0-acre parcel proposed on the northeast side of the project site with 10 acres designated open space/parkway and 5 acres designated for a local park. The Open Space Alternative is provided to reduce environmental impacts associated with air quality and traffic by decreasing the area of the site designated for commercial uses, while still achieving a project objective of designating a large enough commercial area to accommodate a future medical facility. This alternative would allow for additional open space and park uses in the project area, as well as decrease the interface between commercial and residential uses. Additionally, the park and open space area could provide connectivity to other local parks and activities in the area, including the park to the south of the project site, as well as connection with the Civic Center to the east. The majority of the Open Space Alternative would be consistent with future uses established in the Laguna Ridge Specific Plan and the General Plan. This alternative would also require an amendment to the General Plan, Laguna Ridge Specific Plan, and zoning designations on the project site.

The Open Space Alternative would reduce the proposed commercial acreage of 79.7 acres to 64.7 acres. This would result in a reduction of approximately 225,204 square feet of commercial uses.

COMPARATIVE IMPACTS

Land Use

There were no significant or potentially significant impacts identified with the proposed Laguna Ridge Town Center project; therefore, no analysis of the Open Space Alternative is necessary.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Air Quality

Construction-Related Air Quality Impacts (Impact 4.2.1)

Impact 4.2.1 indicates that construction activities associated with the development of the proposed project may emit pollutants that exceed California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for PM₁₀ pollutants as well as exceed the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) significance threshold for NO_x pollutants. This is considered to be a significant and unavoidable impact. Implementation of the Open Space Alternative would also result in construction of commercial, local park, and residential uses. As demonstrated in Section 4.2, Air Quality (see **Tables 4.2-8 and 4.2-9**), the Open Space Alternative land use reconfiguration would result in similar construction-related air quality impacts as the existing land use designations of the project site. However, it is likely that the Open Space Alternative would reduce overall development of the site, thus reducing construction-related air quality impacts.

Long-term Increases of Criteria Air Pollutants (Impact 4.2.3)

Impact 4.2.3 indicates that project emissions could result in long-term increases in criteria air pollutants which exceed SMAQMD's significance threshold. Under the Open Space Alternative, long-term increases in criteria air pollutants would also occur from development of the project site, of which emissions of ROG and NO_x are of particular concern. As discussed in Section 4.2, Air Quality (see **Table 4.2-10**), NO_x and ROG emissions during both winter and summer months of the year would exceed SMAQMD's recommended significance threshold of 65 lbs/day. This is considered to be a significant and unavoidable impact. The Open Space Alternative would also exceed the 65 lb/day threshold for ROG or NO_x during both the summer and winter months. However, the reduction in commercial uses would result in fewer emissions than the proposed project, and this alternative would reduce impacts associated with long-term increases of criteria air pollutants in comparison to the proposed project.

Regional Air Plan Impacts (Impact 4.2.4)

Impact 4.2.4 indicates that implementation of the proposed Laguna Ridge Town Center project along with potential development in the region would exacerbate existing regional problems with ozone and particulate matter. Existing air quality impacts associated with residential and commercial development would continue in association with the Open Space Alternative. These impacts are considered significant and unavoidable for both the proposed project and the Open Space Alternative. Overall, cumulative contribution to regional air impacts would be less in association with the Open Space Alternative than the proposed project.

Noise

Long-term Noise Levels – Proposed Medical Center (Impact 4.3.2)

Impact 4.3.2 indicates that the proposed medical office land uses could result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels that could exceed the City's noise standards at nearby noise-sensitive land uses. This is considered to be a significant and unavoidable impact. The Open Space Alternative would result in a reduction in commercial development; therefore this alternative would be likely result in reduced impacts associated with long-term noise levels.

Traffic and Circulation

Operations on Elk Grove Boulevard between Laguna Springs Drive and SR 99 (Impact 4.4.6)

Impact 4.4.6 indicates that the addition of project traffic to cumulative volumes would increase the volume to capacity ratio on this roadway segment, and the proposed project will exacerbate an unacceptable LOS on Elk Grove Boulevard between Laguna Springs Drive and SR 99. This impact could be mitigated by extending the existing auxiliary lane on eastbound Elk Grove Boulevard from Laguna Springs Drive to SR 99; however, this is not considered feasible because it would impact existing development along Elk Grove Boulevard. With a reduction in commercial trips, the Open Space Alternative would result in a reduction in the impact to Elk Grove Boulevard between Laguna Springs Drive and SR 99 in comparison to the proposed project.

Operations at Elk Grove Boulevard/Bruceville Road Intersection (Impact 4.4.8)

Impact 4.4.8 indicates that the addition of project traffic to cumulative no project volumes would increase the average delay at this roadway segment, and the proposed project will exacerbate an unacceptable LOS on Elk Grove Boulevard/Bruceville Road intersection. This impact is reduced to less than cumulatively significant through mitigation that includes conversion of the westbound right turn into an overlapping phase. The LRSP EIR requires additional mitigation measures to improve the LOS of the Elk Grove Boulevard/Bruceville Road Intersection. Although there will be a reduction in traffic as a result of the Open Space Alternative, it would still be necessary to implement MM 4.4.8 to reduce traffic impacts at the Elk Grove Boulevard/Bruceville Road intersection to accommodate commercial and residential uses. Overall, traffic would be reduced under the Open Space Alternative in comparison with the proposed project.

Cumulative Operations at Intersections in the Project Vicinity (Impact 4.4.9)

Impact 4.4.9 indicates that the addition of project traffic to existing conditions volumes would increase the average delay at multiple project vicinity intersections and exacerbate the unacceptable LOS. Although measures can be implemented to reduce the significance of these intersection impacts, impacts cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. Overall, there would be a reduction in traffic, and the severity of the impact would be decreased with the Open Space Alternative.

6.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Table 6.0-1, on the following page, provides a summary of the potential impacts of the alternatives evaluated in this section, as compared with the potential impacts of the proposed project.

6.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

**TABLE 6.0-1
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

Issue	Alternative 1 - No Project	Alternative 2 - Reduced Density	Alternative 3 - Open Space
Air Quality			
Construction-Related Air Quality Impacts (Impact 4.2.1)	S	S	B
Long-term Increases of Criteria Air Pollutants (Impact 4.2.3)	W	B	B
Regional Air Plan Impacts (Impact 4.2.4)	S	S	B
Noise			
Long-term Noise Levels – Proposed Medical Center (Impact 4.3.2)	B	S	B
Traffic			
Operations on Elk Grove Boulevard between Laguna Springs Drive and SR 99 (Impact 4.4.6)	B	B	B
Operations at Elk Grove Boulevard/Bruceville Road Intersection (Impact 4.4.8)	B	B	B
Cumulative Operations at Intersections in the Project Vicinity (Impact 4.4.9)	B	B	B

B - Impacts better than those under proposed project

S - Impacts the same as those under proposed project, or no better or worse

W - Impacts worse than those under proposed project

Based upon the evaluation described in this section, the Open Space Alternative (Alternative 3) is considered the environmentally superior alternative. The Open Space Alternative was determined to have fewer adverse environmental impacts than the proposed project as shown in **Table 6.0-1**. Additionally, Alternative 3 will meet the project objectives of providing employee centers for job opportunities, supporting retail and commercial growth by providing proximate housing, providing locations for neighborhood-serving commercial projects, and designating adequate acreage (approximately 30 acres) to support a regional medical facility.

The No Project Alternative would have a greater adverse impact on long-term increase of air pollutants than the proposed project. Additionally, the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the objectives of the proposed project.

Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 (e)(2), if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, another environmentally superior alternative must be identified. For purposes of analysis of this project, the No Project Alternative may have worse environmental impacts than the proposed project due to the existing intensive residential land use designations. Alternative 3 has no environmental impacts that are worse than those under the proposed project and have a better impact on seven environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIR. Therefore, Alternative 3 is considered the better alternative.