

10. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

10.1 INTRODUCTION

The Alternatives Analysis chapter of the EIR includes consideration and discussion of a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, as required pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6. Generally, the chapter includes discussions of the following: the purpose of an alternatives analysis; alternatives considered but dismissed; a reasonable range of project alternatives and their associated impacts in comparison to the proposed project's impacts; and the environmentally superior alternative.

10.2 PURPOSE OF ALTERNATIVES

The primary intent of the alternatives evaluation in an EIR, as stated in Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, is to “[...] describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” In the context of CEQA Guidelines Section 21061.1, “feasible” is defined as:

...capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors.

Section 15126.6(f) of CEQA Guidelines states, “The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.” Section 15126.6(f) of CEQA Guidelines further states:

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 determined could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project.

In addition, an EIR is not required to analyze alternatives when the effects of the alternative “cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.”

The CEQA Guidelines provide the following guidance for discussing alternatives to a proposed project:

- An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[a]).
- Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these



alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[b]).

- The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination [...] Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[c]).
- The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. A matrix displaying the major characteristics and significant environmental effects of each alternative may be used to summarize the comparison (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[d]).
- 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[d]).
- The specific alternative of "no project" shall also be evaluated along with its impact. The purpose of describing and analyzing a no project alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. The no project alternative analysis is not the baseline for determining whether the proposed project's environmental impacts may be significant, unless it is identical to the existing environmental setting analysis which does establish that baseline (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[e][1]).
- If the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[e][2]).

Project Objectives

Based on the above, reasonable alternatives to the project must be capable of feasibly attaining most of the basic objectives of the project. The proposed project is being pursued with the following objectives:

1. Establish a place where the evolution of winter sports in the Sierra Nevada and the 1960 Winter Olympics can be researched, studied, and displayed in an inspiring, environmentally beautiful building; collect, preserve, archive, and assemble in one place, artifacts and memorabilia relating to the snow sports history presently distributed throughout the community;
2. Ensure consistency with existing and potential future Olympic Valley Park uses;
3. Mitigate environmental and community impacts to the extent feasible;
4. Establish an Olympic Museum to commemorate the events of the 1960 Winter Olympic Games held in Olympic Valley and Lake Tahoe and the ensuing effects on regional and western ski history;
5. Establish a museum of Sierra Nevada ski history beginning with the Washoe Tribe traveling on hand-hewn snowshoes to 19th century gold miners on 14-foot longboards to California and Nevada veterans of the 10th Mountain Division to current World Cup athletes;
6. Establish a place for events that will be available to the residents and visitors to enjoy and participate in exhibits, films, conferences, lectures, dinners, and community events in a



- mountain-modern building with state-of-the-art facilities, including a multi-purpose community room and classroom where patrons can reserve a space for events;
7. Establish a visitor center or kiosk that will provide information on recreational activities, hiking and biking trails, lodging, camping, dining, and backcountry winter access;
 8. Establish a small café and museum shop as an accessory to the museum;
 9. Construct a community multi-purpose room available for local meetings and events, and a classroom for educational programming;
 10. Establish a hall of fame to honor winter sports athletes and leaders of the California and Nevada winter sports industry;
 11. Construct publicly accessible restrooms for Olympic Valley Park users, and the addition of water and sewer lines for the existing park bathrooms, and a new water fountain for the pickleball courts;
 12. Use an available site location that is not fragmented with respect to ownership, easements, or restrictions;
 13. Use an available site location that is not owned by a private third party, which could exert control over, diminish, or eliminate future museum operations (sites that have been examined in the vicinity of Palisades Tahoe Resort); and
 14. Use an available site location that is not affected by electromagnetic radiation, underground contamination, unacceptable visual impacts, land-use restrictions due to high voltage power lines, or other such environmental limitations (the parcels on the north side of Olympic Valley Road).

Impacts Identified in the EIR and Initial Study

In addition to attaining the majority of project objectives, reasonable alternatives to the project must be capable of reducing the magnitude of, or avoiding, identified significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. The significance level of impacts identified in the EIR and Initial Study (see Appendix A) are presented below.

Less Than Significant or No Impact

The Initial Study prepared for the proposed project during the scoping period includes a detailed environmental checklist addressing a range of technical environmental issues. For each technical environmental issue, the Initial Study identifies the level of impact for the proposed project. The Initial Study identifies the environmental effects as either “no impact,” “less-than-significant,” “less-than-significant with mitigation incorporated,” or “potentially significant.” Impacts identified for the proposed project in the Initial Study and EIR as “no impact” or “less-than-significant” are listed below, and summarized further in Chapter 1, Introduction, of this EIR:

- ***Aesthetics.*** The EIR determined that impacts related to having a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista and substantially degrading the existing visual character or quality of public views of the project site and/or the site’s surroundings would be less than significant. In addition, all cumulative impacts were determined to be less than cumulatively considerable.
- ***Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Energy.*** The EIR determined that impacts related to conflicting with or obstructing a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, or conflicting with or obstructing implementation of the applicable air quality plan during both project construction and operation, would be less than significant. In addition, the EIR determined that the project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or



resulting in other emissions affecting a substantial number of people. With respect to cumulative impacts, all such impacts, including impacts related to the emissions of greenhouse gas (GHG), were determined to be less than cumulatively considerable.

- **Noise.** The EIR determined that impacts related to the generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies, as well as impacts related to the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, would be less than significant. Cumulative impacts related to the generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels associated with cumulative development of the proposed project in combination with future development would be less than cumulatively considerable.
- **Transportation.** The EIR determined that a less-than-significant impact would occur related to a conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, as well as the project conflicting or being inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b), or substantially increase hazards to vehicle safety due to inadequate emergency access, hazardous design features, and incompatible uses. In addition, the EIR determined that cumulative impacts related to a substantial increase in hazards to vehicle safety under Cumulative Plus Project conditions would be less than cumulatively considerable.
- **Wildfire.** The EIR determined that a less-than-significant impact would occur related to substantially impairing an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, as well as requiring the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. In addition, the EIR determined that a less-than-significant impact would occur related to exposing people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Furthermore, cumulative impacts related to an increase in wildfire risk attributable to the proposed project in combination with cumulative development was determined to be less than significant.
- **Initial Study.**
 - **Aesthetics.** The Initial Study determined that a less-than-significant impact would occur related to substantially damaging scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway.
 - **Agricultural and Forest Resources.** The Initial Study determined that a less-than-significant impact would occur related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. In addition, the Initial Study determined that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact regarding a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, a Williamson Act contract, or a Right-to-Farm Policy. Furthermore, the Initial Study determined that the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)),



timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g)), and a less-than-significant impact would occur. The Initial Study also determined that the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact regarding the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; thus, a less-than-significant impact would occur. Finally, the Initial Study determined that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact regarding a conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations.

- **Biological Resources.** The Initial Study determined that a less-than-significant impact would occur related to the proposed project interfering substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impeding the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The Initial Study also determined that the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinances, would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, and would not have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands; thus, no impact would occur.
- **Cultural Resources.** The Initial Study determined that a less-than-significant impact would occur related to implementation of the proposed project causing a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5. In addition, the Initial Study determined that impacts related to having the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values, or restricting existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area would be less than significant.
- **Energy.** The Initial Study determined that a less-than-significant impact would occur related to implementation of the proposed project resulting in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.
- **Geology and Soils.** The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would have no impact related to having soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water.
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. In addition, the Initial Study determined that a less-than-significant impact would occur related to emitting hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Furthermore, the Initial Study determined that the proposed project would not be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area; thus, no impact would occur.



- **Hydrology and Water Quality.** The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to violating any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality, as well as substantially decreasing groundwater supplies or interfering substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. In addition, the Initial Study determined that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact regarding conflicting or obstructing implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Furthermore, the Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would not place housing or improvements within a 100-year flood hazard area either as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map which would impede or redirect flood flows, expose people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, or risk release of pollutants due to project inundation, and no impact would occur.
- **Land Use and Planning.** The Initial Study determined that a less-than-significant impact would occur related to physically dividing an established community, as well as resulting in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts, and causing economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration.
- **Mineral Resources.** The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state, or in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. Therefore, the Initial Study determined that no impact would occur regarding the aforementioned impacts.
- **Noise.** The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. Therefore, no impact would occur.
- **Population and Housing.** The Initial Study determined that impacts related to inducing substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (i.e., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure) would be less-than-significant. In addition, the Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, and no impact would occur.
- **Public Services.** The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to resulting in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any public services, including fire protection, sheriff protection, schools, parks, other public facilities, and maintenance of public facilities, including roads.



- **Recreation.** The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to increasing the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, as well as including recreational facilities or requiring the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.
- **Transportation.** The Initial Study determined that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to resulting in insufficient parking capacity on- or off-site.
- **Utilities and Service Systems.** The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to requiring or resulting in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects. In addition, the Initial Study determined that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact regarding having sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years, as well as resulting in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments, generating solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals, and complying with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Less Than Significant with Mitigation

Environmental impacts (including cumulative impacts) of the proposed project that have been identified in the EIR and the Initial Study as requiring mitigation measures to ensure that the level of significance is ultimately less than significant include the following:

- **Aesthetics.** The EIR determined that because the proposed project would increase the amount of light on the project site in the form of light fixtures on the exteriors of the building, spillover light from the interior lighting of the building, and increased motor vehicle traffic within the parking lot, implementation of the proposed project could substantially increase the amount of light and glare generated on-site, which could be visible from residences and roadways in the project vicinity. However, the EIR requires mitigation in order to ensure that the aforementioned impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.
- **Noise.** The EIR determined that implementation of the proposed project could result in a significant impact related to the generation of a substantial temporary increase (i.e., construction) in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. However, the EIR requires mitigation in order to ensure that the aforementioned impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.
- **Transportation.** The EIR determined that implementation of the proposed project could result in a significant impact related to a conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy,



except LOS, addressing the circulation system during construction activities. However, the EIR requires mitigation in order to ensure that the aforementioned impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

- **Wildfire.** The EIR determined that implementation of the project could have a significant impact due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbating wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. However, the EIR requires mitigation to ensure that the aforementioned impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

- **Initial Study.**
 - **Biological Resources.** The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service. In addition, the Initial Study determined that the proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or regulated by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, or Regional Water Quality Control Board. Furthermore, the Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect on federal or state protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) or as defined by state statute, through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. However, the Initial Study required mitigation to ensure that the aforementioned impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level.
 - **Cultural Resources.** The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5, as well as disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries, and a significant impact could occur. However, the Initial Study required mitigation to ensure that the aforementioned impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level.
 - **Geology and Soils.** The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. In addition, the Initial Study determined that the proposed project would have the potential to be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse, or be located on expansive soils, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property. Furthermore, the Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic or physical feature, result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil, result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features, or result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, seismic-related ground



- failure, or similar hazards. However, the Initial Study required mitigation to ensure that the aforementioned impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level.
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. However, the Initial Study required mitigation to ensure that the aforementioned impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.
 - **Hydrology and Water Quality.** The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite, or would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems; thus, a significant impact could occur. In addition, the Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project could create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality either during construction or in the post-construction condition, and, thus, could result in a significant impact. However, the Initial Study required mitigation to ensure that the aforementioned impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level.
 - **Tribal Cultural Resources.** The Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. Although a significant impact could occur, the Initial Study required mitigation to ensure that such impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level.

The alternatives discussed herein have been chosen based on feasibility to meet most of the project objectives, as well as the ability to reduce one or more significant project impacts identified within this EIR. Thus, as is appropriate pursuant to CEQA, the following evaluation of alternatives focuses on those resource topics regarding which the proposed project would have a significant impact, according to the EIR analysis. As shown above, the EIR (including Initial Study) identified significant project impacts for 10 CEQA topical categories. These 10 categories are the subject of the comparative alternatives analysis that follows, unless otherwise noted. All other project impacts were deemed less than significant, and thus, do not require discussion in the alternatives analysis below.



10.3 SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES

The requirement that an EIR evaluate alternatives to the proposed project or alternatives to the location of the proposed project is a broad one; the primary intent of the alternatives analysis is to disclose other ways that the objectives of the project could be attained, while reducing the magnitude of, or avoiding, one or more of the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. Alternatives that are included and evaluated in the EIR must be feasible alternatives. However, the CEQA Guidelines require the EIR to “set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.” As stated in Section 15126.6(a), an EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. The CEQA Guidelines provide a definition for “a range of reasonable alternatives” and thus limit the number and type of alternatives that may need to be evaluated in a given EIR. According to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f):

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 determined could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project.

First and foremost, alternatives in an EIR must be feasible. In the context of CEQA Guidelines Section 21061.1, “feasible” is defined as:

...capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors.

Finally, an EIR is not required to analyze alternatives when the effects of the alternative “cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.”

Alternatives Considered But Dismissed From Further Analysis

Consistent with CEQA, primary consideration was given to alternatives that could reduce one or more significant project impacts, while still meeting most of the basic project objectives.

As stated in Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are:

- (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives,
- (ii) infeasibility, or
- (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

Regarding item (ii), infeasibility, among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent). None of these factors establish a fixed limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives.

The following off-site alternatives were considered but dismissed from detailed analysis in this EIR. The reason(s) for dismissal, within the context of the three above-outlined permissible reasons, are provided below.



Old Fire Station Off-Site Alternative

The possibility of an off-site location was considered as an alternative to the proposed project. The Old Fire Station Off-Site Alternative would be located at 1810 Chamonix Place, west of the proposed project site. The alternative site is currently occupied by two buildings which constitute a fire station. The fire station is only staffed during peak traffic periods within Olympic Valley, such as weekends during the ski season, but is leased out during the off season. Buildout of the Alternative would be similar to the proposed project and would meet most of the project objectives. Because the Old Fire Station Off-Site Alternative would not construct publicly accessible restrooms for Olympic Valley Park users, add water and sewer lines for the existing park bathrooms, or create a new water fountain for the pickleball courts, Project Objective 11 would not be met.

Development of the project at the Old Fire Station Off-Site Alternative would most likely require demolition of the existing on-site buildings, both to make room for the proposed museum, but also to provide sufficient parking space. Because demolition activities are not anticipated as part of the proposed project, the Alternative would most likely result in greater impacts related to air quality and GHG emissions than the proposed project. The Old Fire Station Off-Site Alternative site is located on the western end of Olympic Valley. As such, placing the proposed museum and cultural center at that site would have the potential to increase traffic congestion within the Valley, and in the event of an emergency evacuation, require visitors and staff to travel longer distances on Olympic Valley Road to reach SR 89. Therefore, the Old Fire Station Off-Site Alternative could result in greater impacts related to wildfire and transportation than the proposed project. Because the proposed project site is occupied by willow scrub habitat and a drainage swale, the Old Fire Station Off-Site Alternative would avoid impacts upon biological resources associated with the proposed project, due to the lack of similar features on the alternative site.

As noted above, CEQA Guidelines state that the primary intent of an alternative is to reduce one or more of the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project, while meeting the basic objectives of the proposed project. While the Old Fire Station Off-Site Alternative would eliminate the proposed project's impacts related to biological resources, it is reasonably anticipated that the Alternative would increase impacts related to air quality, transportation, and wildfire. As a result, the Old Fire Station Off-Site Alternative is dismissed from detailed evaluation.

Nevada Pavilion Off-Site Alternative

The Nevada Pavilion Off-Site Alternative would be located at the site of the existing Nevada Pavilion, at 1700 Olympic Valley Road. The Nevada Pavilion is one of the only remaining buildings left from the 1960 Olympics. Buildout of the Alternative would be similar to the proposed project, and, therefore, the majority of the project objectives would be met. Because the Nevada Pavilion Off-Site Alternative site is currently owned by Palisades Tahoe, and because the Alternative would not construct publicly accessible restrooms for Olympic Valley Park users, add water and sewer lines for the existing park bathrooms, or create a new water fountain for the pickleball courts, Project Objectives 11, 12, and 13 would not be met.

With respect to the site's historical significance, an evaluation would be required to determine if the building is on the federal or State Historic Register, or if it is capable of attaining that status. This status could limit how and to what degree the building could be modified. Regardless, the existing structure would require a major investment to remodel, and requires significant structural, mechanical, and environmental evaluation to determine if remodeling is feasible for the intended purpose. In addition, the setting of the building in the center of a parking lot would require a major



investment in site reconfiguration and landscaping to properly compliment the museum's desired aesthetics. Similar to the Old Fire Station Off-Site Alternative, the Nevada Pavilion Off-Site Alternative would be located in the western portion of Olympic Valley, potentially resulting in greater impacts related to wildfire (i.e., emergency evacuation) and transportation, as discussed above. In addition, similar to the Old Fire Station Off-Site Alternative, the Nevada Pavilion Off-Site Alternative would avoid impacts to the willow scrub habitat and drainage swale located on the proposed project site, thus avoiding impacts to biological resources associated with the proposed project.

As noted above, CEQA Guidelines state that the primary intent of an alternative is to reduce one or more of the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. While the Nevada Pavilion Off-Site Alternative would avoid biological impacts associated with the proposed project, the Alternative could result in increased impacts related to transportation and wildfire, as well as feasibility concerns related to the cost of the site, ability to acquire the site, and necessary modifications to the existing building and surrounding parking lot. For these reasons, the Alternative would not achieve the intent of a feasible alternative under CEQA. As a result, the Nevada Pavilion Off-Site Alternative is dismissed from detailed evaluation.

Olympic Valley Stables Off-Site Alternative

The Olympic Valley Stables Off-Site Alternative would be located at 1525 Olympic Valley Road. The alternative site is currently occupied by the Olympic Valley Stables and associated outbuildings. Buildout of the Alternative would be similar to the proposed project, and, therefore, most of the Project Objectives would be met. Because the Olympic Valley Stables Off-Site Alternative site would need to be purchased from the current owners, and because the Alternative would not construct publicly accessible restrooms for Olympic Valley Park users, add water and sewer lines for the existing park bathrooms, or create a new water fountain for the pickleball courts, Project Objectives 11, 12, and 13 would not be met.

The Olympic Valley Stables Off-Site Alternative site is readily visible and accessible from Olympic Valley Road. Current views of the alternative site consist of stable structures with an immediate backdrop of Olympic Valley meadow and the forested mountains that ring the meadow. Such fairly dramatic views are currently unscreened and would be partially obstructed by the development of the proposed two-story museum and community center. Therefore, the Olympic Valley Stables Off-Site Alternative would be reasonably expected to result in greater aesthetic impacts than the proposed project. In addition, similar to the two Off-Site Alternatives discussed above, the Olympic Valley Stables Off-Site Alternative is located in the western portion of the Olympic Valley and would result in increased traffic congestion within Olympic Valley, thus potentially hindering emergency evacuations, and leading to greater impacts related to wildfire and transportation. The alternative site is also occupied by wetlands, thus creating potential impacts upon water and biological resources. In addition, the existing zoning designation of the site would need to be changed from Forest Reserve to allow the proposed use. Finally, buildout of the proposed museum on the Olympic Valley Stables Off-Site Alternative site would require demolition of the existing on-site structures.

As noted above, CEQA Guidelines state that the primary intent of an alternative is to reduced one or more of the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. Considering the Olympic Valley Stables Off-Site Alternative is not anticipated to avoid any impacts of the proposed project, and could result in additional impacts related to aesthetics, wildfire, and transportation, and similar impacts to biological resources, the Alternative would not achieve the intent of a feasible



alternative under CEQA. As a result, the Olympic Valley Stables Off-Site Alternative is dismissed from detailed evaluation.

Alternatives Considered in this EIR

The following alternatives are considered and evaluated in this section:

- No Project (No Build) Alternative;
- 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative; and
- Reduced Project Alternative.

See Table 10-1 at the end of the chapter for a comparison of the environmental impacts resulting from the considered alternatives and the proposed project.

No Project (No Build) Alternative

CEQA requires the evaluation of the comparative impacts of the “No Project” alternative (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[e]). Analysis of the no project alternative shall:

“... discuss [...] 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.” (*Id.*, subd. [e][2]) “If the project is other than a land use or regulatory plan, for example a development project on identifiable property, the ‘no project’ alternative is the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Here the discussion would compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in the property’s existing state versus environmental effects that would occur if the project were approved. If disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as the proposal of some other project, this ‘no project’ consequence should be discussed. In certain instances, the no project alternative means ‘no build,’ wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained. However, where failure to proceed with the project would not result in preservation of existing environmental conditions, the analysis should identify the practical result of the project’s non-approval and not create and analyze a set of artificial assumptions that would be required to preserve the existing physical environment.” (*Id.*, subd. [e][3][B]).

The County has decided to evaluate a No Project (No Build) Alternative, which assumes that the project site would remain in its current condition and would not be developed. As described in this EIR, the project site consists predominantly of montane coniferous forest, which largely contains white fir and pine trees native to the area. Patches of willow scrub occur on-site in scattered locations within stormwater detention basins constructed for the Olympic Valley Park, and an existing parking lot is located within the project site. Because development of the site would not occur, land disturbance, and any associated physical environmental impacts related to such land disturbance, would not occur; however, the No Project (No Build) Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives.

Aesthetics

The EIR determined that the proposed project could have a significant impact to nearby sensitive receptors as a result of the introduction of substantial new sources of light and glare. The No Project (No Build) Alternative would consist of the continuation of the existing conditions of the project site. Because the No Project (No Build) Alternative would not introduce any new structures or buildings on the site, creation of substantial new sources of light or glare would not occur. Thus, impacts related to aesthetics would not occur under the No Project (No Build) Alternative.



Noise

The No Project (No Build) Alternative would not generate construction noise, and, thus, the significant construction noise impact identified for the proposed project would not occur, and Mitigation Measure 6-1, which ensures that noise impacts resulting from construction activities are reduced to a less than significant level, would not be required. Thus, impacts related to noise would not occur under the No Project (No Build) Alternative.

Transportation

The No Project (No Build) Alternative would not generate construction traffic on local roadways and, thus, the significant impact identified for the proposed project related to conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy, except level of service (LOS), addressing the circulation system during construction activities, and Mitigation Measure 7-1, related to the preparation and implementation of a construction signage and traffic control plan, would not be required. Thus, impacts related to transportation would not occur under the No Project (No Build) Alternative.

Wildfire

Given the project site would remain as is under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, impacts due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbating wildfire risks, and thereby exposing project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire, would not occur; thus, Mitigation Measure 8-2 would not be required. Thus, impacts related to wildfire would not occur under the No Project (No Build) Alternative.

Other

The other CEQA topics regarding which the proposed project could have significant impacts, as identified in the Initial Study (biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, tribal cultural resources), would not be impacted as a result of this alternative, and are not discussed further.

7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative

The 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative would involve construction of the SNOW Sports Museum and Community Cultural Center, as proposed, on a portion of the 4.6-acre parcel to the north of the site, across Olympic Valley Road, which is partially developed with a 7-Eleven Convenience Store, Tahoe Dave's Ski and Snowboard Rentals, and an associated parking lot; the remainder of the site is occupied primarily by forest. A shallow open drainage ditch is present along the southern and eastern boundaries of the alternative site; this ditch runs north along the western side of SR 89 to a point that is coterminous with the approximate rear of the 7-11 building, at which point the ditch is piped under SR 89, where it then sheet flows into the Truckee River. The alternative location is zoned Entrance Commercial (EC).

The proposed SNOW Sports Museum and Community Cultural Center would require an approximately 10,000 square-foot (sf) building footprint, and an additional 13,000 sf for parking, for a total of approximately 25,000 sf (i.e., an extra 2,000 sf to allow for some design flexibility). The intent would be to locate the museum and cultural center building on the currently disturbed portions of the alternative site to the maximum extent feasible in order to avoid impacts to forested habitat. At an estimated development footprint of 25,000 sf, the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative would require demolition of all on-site structures, and likely some disturbance and/or removal of on-site vegetation, though to a lesser extent than the proposed project.



The Alternative would require improvements to the site similar to the improvements proposed for the project, including, but not limited to, construction of a sewer pump station and approximately 1,000 linear feet of force main. In addition, while the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative would still require approval of a Text Amendment to Section 12.24.040 of the Placer County Government Code, and Design Review, similar to the proposed project, the Alternative would not require a Rezone, a Conditional Use Permit, or a Potential Minor Land Division to create a new land use district to accommodate the proposed project, allow a museum and community cultural center within the new land use district, and create a new parcel for the proposed project, respectively. Furthermore, while the project site is bound by a deed restriction, which does not allow the use of the property for private development of a commercial, residential, or industrial nature, the alternative location would not be bound by such restrictions.

Because the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative would include the development of the SNOW Sports Museum and Community Cultural Center, Project Objective 1, Project Objectives 3 through 10, and Project Objective 14 would be met. However, because the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative would not involve development within Olympic Valley Park, Project Objectives 2 and 11 would not be met. In addition, because the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative is currently developed with existing structures and is privately-owned, Project Objectives 12 and 13 would not be met.

Aesthetics

The EIR determined that, without mitigation, the proposed project would have a significant impact related to the creation of a new source of substantial light and glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area. While the proposed project site is primarily undeveloped, the site is located adjacent to a parking lot, which is an existing source of light. Similarly, the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative would be constructed on a site that has been previously developed and is subject to existing sources of light. In addition, neither the proposed project site nor the Alternative site is immediately bordered by sensitive light receptors. Rather, in general, both sites are located between major roadways and forest. Therefore, the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative would result in similar impacts as the proposed project related to the creation of new sources of substantial light and glare. However, because the types and specific locations of light sources have not yet been determined for the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative, Mitigation Measure 4-3 would still be required for the Alternative.

Overall, impacts related to aesthetics could be considered similar under the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative compared to the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Although buildout of the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative would avoid disturbance of on-site vegetation to the maximum extent feasible, demolition and construction activities could include the removal of on-site trees. Thus, similar to the proposed project, Mitigation Measures IV-1 and IV-2, related to the protection of bat species and migratory birds and raptors, respectively, would still be required. A Biological Resources Assessment prepared for the proposed project identified the potential for wetlands and riparian habitat to be impacted on the project site. While a specific survey has not been conducted for the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative site, it is known that an open drainage ditch is present on the southern and eastern boundaries of the alternative site, which is piped underneath SR 89, directly into the Truckee River. In addition, from a review of aerial imagery, it appears that hydrophytic vegetation is present in the northeast corner of the project site, where the open drainage ditch is piped under SR 89. While it may be possible to avoid impacting such vegetation at the northeastern corner of the parcel during design and construction



of the alternative, it cannot be known with certainty at this time whether this can in fact be achieved. In addition, the drainage ditch is culverted under the current driveway into the 7-Eleven store parking lot from SR 89. Construction of the Alternative may require modifying this driveway, which could impact the ditch that flows directly into the Truckee River during storm events. As such, buildout of the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative could result in significant impacts upon sensitive habitats, and thus, Mitigation Measures IV-3 and IV-4 would still be required. Overall, impacts related to biological resources would be similar under the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative compared to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Similar to the proposed project, ground-disturbing activities associated with construction of the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative could potentially disturb previously unknown archeological resources or human remains located on the project site. Therefore, Mitigation Measures V-1 and V-2 would still be required. However, because the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative site has been subject to significant disturbance, and the development footprint for the alternative would be located within existing disturbed areas to the maximum extent feasible, the potential for the Alternative to result in a significant impact upon cultural resources could be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

The total disturbance area associated with the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative would be similar to the proposed project. Whereas the proposed project would be developed on a site that is primarily undeveloped, the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative would be constructed on a site that has been previously graded and paved. Therefore, impacts related to creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property, significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of on-site soils, and/or substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features would be similar or slightly increased under the Alternative. Similarly, impacts related to erosion, unstable geologic units/soils, and expansive soils would be similar or slightly increased compared to the proposed project. Mitigation would continue to be required for the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative in order to ensure such impacts are reduced to less-than-significant levels. In addition, while the potential for the alternative site to contain a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic or physical feature is unknown, because the alternative site has been previously disturbed and developed, the probability of the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative to result in impacts to such resources is reduced as compared to the proposed project. However, Mitigation Measure VII-4 is required to ensure that impacts to such resources does not occur.

Overall, the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative would result in similar or slightly increased impacts to geology and soils as compared to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

According to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared for the proposed project, the project site contains fill of an unknown origin. As such, the Initial Study included Mitigation Measure IX-1 to require assessment, and if necessary, removal of contaminated soils should they be encountered during construction, in order to reduce impacts related to creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. While a Phase I ESA has not been prepared for the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative site, because the alternative site has been previously developed and graded, there is a possibility that fill soil of an unknown origin also occurs beneath the alternative site. Therefore, Mitigation Measure IX-1 would



still be required for the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative. In addition, the age of the on-site structures is currently unknown; thus, the potential exists for the on-site structures to contain asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint. The proposed project site does not contain any structures, and as such, there is no potential for asbestos-containing materials or lead-based paint to occur. Overall, the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative could result in greater impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials as compared to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Because the proposed project would involve development of a mostly undisturbed site, thus creating more impervious surfaces, the Initial Study determined that the proposed project would have the potential to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site, or create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, as well as potentially create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality either during construction or in the post-construction condition. Because the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative would require the demolition of all on-site structures on the alternative site, all mitigation measures included in the Initial Study associated with impacts related to hydrology and water quality would still be required. Furthermore, as discussed above, an open drainage ditch is present on the southern and eastern borders of the alternative site, which flows underneath SR 89 and directly into the Truckee River. The drainage ditch is piped underneath the 7-Eleven's access driveway from SR 89. Construction of the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative may require improvements to the access road and underlying drainage ditch, which could result in impacts to water quality, including the quality of the Truckee River. Therefore, buildout of the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative could result in greater impacts to hydrology and water quality than the proposed project.

Noise

The EIR determined that with implementation of Mitigation Measure 6-1, the proposed project's significant impact related to the generation of a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project would be less-than-significant. The construction of the alternative at the 7-Eleven site would involve additional construction activities associated with demolition of the existing buildings. Mitigation Measure 6-1 would still be required to ensure construction noise associated with the development of the alternative is less than significant. Overall, the Alternative may have a greater impact related to the generation of construction noise than the proposed project.

Transportation

Similar to the proposed project, the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative would add construction vehicle traffic to area roadways, thereby potentially conflicting with existing traffic patterns. As such, Mitigation Measure 7-1, related to preparation and implementation of a construction signage and traffic control plan, would still be required. Impacts related to conflicting with a program, plan, ordinance, or property addressing the circulation system during construction activities would be similar to the proposed project.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Similar to the Cultural Resources discussion above, ground-disturbing activities associated with construction of the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative could potentially disturb previously unknown tribal



cultural resources located on the project site. Therefore, Mitigation Measures XVIII-1, which requires implementation of Mitigation Measures V-1 and V-2, would still be required, and impacts upon tribal cultural resources could be similar to the proposed project. However, because the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative site has been subject to significant disturbance, and the development footprint for the alternative would be located within existing disturbed areas to the maximum extent feasible, the potential for the Alternative to result in a significant impact upon tribal cultural resources could be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Wildfire

The 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative is located in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site. Thus, the topography of the alternative site is relatively level, similar to the project site. Because the alternative site, similar to the project site, contains on-site vegetation, impacts related to construction equipment (with internal combustion engines) increasing wildfire risk due to sparks would be similar to the proposed project. Thus, the Alternative would still require the implementation of Mitigation Measure 8-2, requiring utilization of CAL FIRE-approved spark arrestors on all construction equipment with internal combustion engines, and a similar impact would occur related the exposure of project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors exacerbating wildfire risks.

Reduced Project Alternative

The Reduced Project Alternative would consist of buildout of the project site with the proposed SNOW Sports Museum; however, development of the Community Cultural Center would not be included as part of the Reduced Project Alternative. As such, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in the development of approximately 1,404 sf less building space than the proposed project. For the proposed project, the Community Cultural Center would be located on the second story of the building, which would be at grade level of the existing Olympic Valley Park parking lot. Therefore, because the Reduced Project Alternative would eliminate the portion of the building's second floor dedicated to the Community Cultural Center, the building would be reduced in scale when viewed from the parking lot. In addition, because the Community Cultural Center would not be developed, after-hours events such as lectures, film screenings, and private parties would not occur as part of project operations. Nonetheless, a text amendment to Section 12.24 of the Placer County Code would still be required to allow for limited museum operations to occur later than specified in the Code. The Reduced Project Alternative would still require all other on- and off-site improvements included as part of the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, the Alternative would require approval of a Rezone, Conditional Use Permit, Design Review, and Potential Minor Land Division.

Because the Reduced Project Alternative would include development of the SNOW Sports Museum without the Community Cultural Center, the Alternative would not meet Project Objectives 6 or 9. However, the remaining Project Objectives would be met by the Reduced Project Alternative.

Aesthetics

Although the Reduced Project Alternative would involve the development of approximately 1,404 sf less building space than the proposed project, the building design would not be significantly altered, and thus, visual impacts related to public views of the Alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project, which the DEIR determined would be less-than-significant. In addition, although the Reduced Project Alternative would not include after-hours events associated with the Community Cultural Center, the Alternative would still require a text amendment to the Placer



County Code to allow limited museum operations to occur later than specified in the Code. Depending on the time of year, some of these after-hours museum operations could occur during nighttime. Thus, similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would introduce new sources of light to the project vicinity, and the types and specific locations of lighting have not yet been determined for the Alternative. Therefore, the Alternative would have a similar impact related to the introduction of new sources of light and glare in the project vicinity as compared to the proposed project, and Mitigation Measure 4-3 would still be required for the Alternative.

Noise

Because the Reduced Project Alternative would involve similar construction activities as the proposed project, the significant project impact related to construction noise would still occur, and Mitigation Measure 6-1 would still be required. However, because the Alternative would include the construction of 1,404 sf less building space than the proposed project, the duration of noise levels during construction may be reduced as compared to the proposed project. In addition, while not identified as a significant project impact, it is noted that because operations of the Reduced Project Alternative would not include after-hours events associated with the Community Cultural Center, operational noise could be reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Overall, because the Reduced Project Alternative would involve reduced construction activity, the Alternative may result in fewer impacts related to noise as compared to the proposed project.

Transportation

Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative would add construction vehicle traffic to area roadways, thereby potentially conflicting with existing traffic patterns. As such, Mitigation Measure 7-1, related to preparation and implementation of a construction signage and traffic control plan, would still be required, and impacts related to conflicting with a program, plan, ordinance, or property addressing the circulation system during construction activities would be similar to the proposed project.

Wildfire

Because the Reduced Project Alternative would include development of the same parcel as the proposed project, the risks and requirements related to wildfire would be similar to the proposed project. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 8-2 would still be required, and impacts related to wildfire would be similar to the proposed project.

Other

Given that development of the Reduced Project Alternative would involve the same disturbance footprint as the proposed project, the significant impact categories identified in the Initial Study for the proposed project would be anticipated to be similar or lesser in scale under the Reduced Project Alternative, and are therefore not discussed further.

10.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

An EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated. The environmentally superior alternative is generally the alternative that would be expected to generate the least amount of significant impacts. Identification of the environmentally superior alternative is an informational procedure and the alternative selected may not be the alternative that best meets the goals or needs of the County. Section 15126(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an environmentally superior alternative be designated and states, "If the environmentally superior alternative is the 'no project' alternative,



the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.” In this case, the No Project (No Build) Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative, because the project site is assumed to remain in its current condition under the alternative. Consequently, many of the impacts resulting from the proposed project would not occur under the Alternative, as shown in Table 10-1.

The No Project (No Build) Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives. Both the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative and the Reduced Project Alternative would meet most project objectives. As previously noted, the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative would not meet Project Objectives 2 and 11-13; the Reduced Project Alternative would not meet Project Objectives 6 and 9.

As discussed throughout this chapter and shown in Table 10-1, the 7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative could result in greater impacts than the proposed project related to hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, and construction noise; fewer impacts related to cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, and similar impacts to the proposed project for the remaining topics. However, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in fewer impacts related to construction noise, and similar impacts to the proposed project for the remaining topics.

Based on the above, the Reduced Project Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project.



**Table 10-1
Comparison of Environmental Impacts for Project Alternatives**

Resource Area	Proposed Project	No Project (No Build) Alternative	7-Eleven Off-Site Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative
Aesthetics	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation	None	Similar	Similar
Biological Resources	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation	None	Similar	Similar
Cultural Resources	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation	None	Fewer	Similar
Geology and Soils	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation	None	Similar	Similar
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation	None	Greater	Similar
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation	None	Greater	Similar
Noise	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation	None	Greater	Fewer
Transportation and Circulation	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation	None	Similar	Similar
Tribal Cultural Resources	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation	None	Fewer	Similar
Wildfire	Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation	None	Similar	Similar
Total Fewer:		4	2	1
Total Similar:		0	5	9
Total Greater:		0	3	0

Note: No Impact = "None;" Less than Proposed Project = "Fewer;" Greater than the Proposed Project = "Greater," and Similar to Proposed Project = "Similar"

