

## VI. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

### A. INTRODUCTION

CEQA, §15126.6(a), requires an EIR to “describe a reasonable range of alternatives to a project, or to the location of a project, which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives”. This chapter discusses a range of alternatives to the proposed project, including alternative locations, alternative designs, and a No Project Alternative.

Criteria used to evaluate the range of alternatives and remove certain alternatives from further consideration are addressed. CEQA *Guidelines* §15126.6 provides direction for the discussion of alternatives to the proposed project. This section requires:

- Description of “...a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of a 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.” [15126.6(a)]
- A setting forth of alternatives that “...shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project”. [15126.6(f)]
- Discussion of the "No Project" alternative, and “...If the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives”. [15126.6(e)(2)]
- Discussion and analysis of alternative locations “...that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project”; only these need to be considered for inclusion in the EIR. [15126.6(f)(2)(A)]
- “Prior to approval of the proposed subsequent project, the lead agency shall incorporate all feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives appropriate to the project as set forth in the Master EIR and provide notice in the manner required by §15087. [15177 (d)]

Given the CEQA mandates listed above, this section (1) describes the range of reasonable alternatives to the project; (2) examines and evaluates resource issue areas where significant adverse environmental effects have been identified and compares the impacts of the alternatives to those of the proposed project; and, (3) identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

## B. ALTERNATIVES SELECTION

An alternative screening analysis was implemented as part of the EIR analysis in order to limit the number of alternatives evaluated in detail. The use of an alternative screening analysis provides the detailed explanation of why some of the alternatives were rejected from further analysis and assures that only the environmentally preferred alternatives are evaluated and compared in the EIR. In addition, this screening analysis uses the “rule of reason” methodology as discussed in CEQA (*Guidelines* §15126.6(f)) that requires that EIRs address a range of only those feasible alternatives that are necessary to permit a reasoned choice.

In defining feasibility of alternatives the CEQA *Guidelines* state: “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” (§15126.6(f)(1)). Through the scoping process, if an alternative was found to be infeasible, as defined above, then it was dropped from further consideration. In addition, CEQA states that alternatives should “...attain most of the basic objectives of the project...” (§15126.6(a)). If an alternative was found to not obtain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project, then it was also eliminated.

The basic objectives of the proposed project that were used in the screening of project alternatives included those that were identified in the *East-West Ranch Public Access and Resource Management Plan* and during development of the *Community Park Master Plan*. Objectives identified in the *Management Plan* include the following:

- Strive for minimum disturbance to the natural qualities of the FRP while allowing appropriate public access
- Protect sensitive habitats and species in all areas of the FRP, including coastal bluffs, coastal terrace, pine forest, riparian and creek corridors, wetlands, and other unique and valuable resources
- Create restoration, enhancement, and management guidelines for the long-term protection of natural resources
- Create design standards and management guidelines for long-term public access improvements
- Provide a method for environmentally sound vegetation management
- Create management guidelines for allowed activities on the FRP
- Provide a public trail system that allows balanced and strategic access, and provides linkages to other local trail systems in the community and to the Coastal Trail
- Site and design all improvements in ways that protect sensitive habitats and the scenic and visual quality of the FRP
- Identify a suitable area for an active community park on the East FRP
- Identify methods to access the FRP, including ADA-compliant parking and transit service that provide necessary public access while avoiding undue impacts to surrounding neighborhoods

- Reduce risk and hazards to FRP users and surrounding neighbor properties, including fire protection, erosion, noise, trespassing, and litter
- Provide guidance on implementation activities, including roles and responsibilities of CCSD and Friends of the Fiscalini Ranch Preserve or their successor, operational and maintenance issues, and prioritization of activities

The objectives of the *Community Park Master Plan* are as follows:

- Provide public, athletic, mixed use field space for youth and adult sports
- Lessen the current deficiency of active recreational opportunities in the community of Cambria consistent with the County General Plan
- Respond to community requests for additional active recreational opportunities and public use areas including a minimum of four multi-use sports fields
- Protect sensitive coastal resources consistent with federal, state, and local guidelines
- Provide affordable facilities to residents and visitors of all ages, including a safe and accessible community recreation center

## C. SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

### 1. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

The following alternatives to the proposed project were considered, and rejected, as part of the screening analysis:

#### a. EAST FRP

1. *Reduced Project – Sports Fields Only*: This alternative considers a community park consisting of sports fields, parking, and operational facilities. This alternative does not increase the number of proposed sports fields, but allows for alternative site design to shift fields away from residential areas to minimize noise levels, and allow for additional parking area to accommodate the project. This alternative considers the same water supply alternatives as for the proposed project. This alternative was rejected because it does not meet the CCSD's objective to respond to community requests for diverse recreational opportunities, and provide a public community center.
2. *Reduced Project - No Sports Fields*: This alternative considers development of a mixed-use community park, including development of court facilities, a larger dog park, picnic areas, trails, and a community center. CCSD operational facilities and parking are included. Implementation of this alternative would avoid potential noise impacts, reduce traffic trips, reduce the need for parking, and nearly eliminate the need for water resources. This alternative was considered based on public response to the Notice of Preparation; however, this alternative was rejected because it does not meet the CCSD's objective to provide multi-use sports fields within the community park..

3. Reduced Project – Passive Recreation: This alternative considers a community park supporting passive recreation only, including a dog park, picnic areas, trails, and operational facilities. Implementation of this alternative would minimize noise and traffic impacts, reduce traffic trips and parking demands, and nearly eliminate the need for water resources. This alternative was considered based on public response to the Notice of Preparation; however, this alternative was rejected because it does not meet the CCSD’s objective to provide multi-use sports fields within the community park.
4. Fixed Sports Field – Alternative C: This alternative includes a design similar to the conceptual plan initially considered by the CCSD. This alternative includes fixed designations for the play fields, including two little league baseball fields, one softball field, one soccer field of 1.7 acres and two smaller soccer fields of 1.3 acres each. It also includes basketball, sand volleyball and tennis courts. The active uses on the proposed fields could include soccer, little league baseball, softball and other sports activities. This alternative would provide additional active recreational opportunities and would meet the project objectives; however, it was rejected because it would result in greater impacts than the proposed project, including an inadequate parking area and increased level of noise affecting adjacent noise-sensitive land uses.

#### b. WEST FRP

Onsite Parking: The West FRP Onsite Parking Alternative was proposed to address existing and future parking demands and deficiencies associated with improvements to the West FRP trail system. This alternative considers onsite parking areas at the terminus of South Windsor Drive (south of the existing bluff trail) and by Huntington Drive (near Guildford Drive). The parking areas at each location would be approximately 900 square feet in size, and would accommodate approximately four cars. Parking areas would not be paved, and would consist of compacted soil. Additional features would include rural-style fencing and placement of erosion and pollution control measures such as straw wattles or hay bales along the perimeter.

Based on more in-depth review of the Management Plan, and receipt of additional information following public review of the Draft EIR, the intent of the Management Plan is to prohibit vehicular parking on the West FRP, with the exception of the Highway 1 staging area, and restricted ADA parking.

Based on further review of this alternative, onsite parking is not considered consistent with the Management Plan objectives regarding sensitive habitats. The CCSD recommends that the only parking on the FRP shall be the two existing ADA parking spaces at the northern terminus of the Marine Terrace Trail (Windsor Boulevard North) and the Highway 1 Staging Area. The Public Access and Management Plan called for one onsite ADA parking space at the Huntington Lot; however, since two ADA parking spaces were constructed as part of the Marine Terrace Trail, CCSD staff recommends that parking at the Huntington Lot not be developed.

In addition, based on further review of ranch resources, and input from the community and FFRP members, the CCSD eliminated the mitigation measure specific to construction of additional parking on the West FRP. Mitigation measures specific to public education and alternative transportation remain in the EIR to address this impact.

Based on these reasons, this alternative is rejected from further consideration.

## 2. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED FOR ANALYSIS

The following alternatives to the proposed project were considered feasible as part of the screening analysis:

### a. EAST FRP

1. No Project Alternative: Analysis of this alternative includes the assumption that future development would occur onsite under the Recreation and Open Space land use designations and would likely include development of a community park, trail system, restoration activities, and open space amenities consistent with the adopted *East West Ranch Public Access and Resource Management Plan*. However, ~~the *East West Ranch Public Access and Resource Management Plan* and the *Community Park Master Plan* would not occur as proposed.~~
2. Reduced Project – Alternative A: This alternative considers a community park consisting of limited active recreation facilities, including a multi-use turf area for field sports, playground, dog park, restrooms, storage/maintenance ~~structure~~ facility, paths, parking, landscaping, and natural areas. This alternative does not increase the number of proposed sports fields, but allows for alternative site design to shift fields away from residential areas to minimize noise levels, and allow for additional parking area to accommodate the project. This alternative considers the same water supply ~~alternatives~~ options (i.e., recycled water, desalination) as for the proposed project.
3. Reduced Project – Alternative B: This alternative was designed to meet the objectives of the project, but reduce the area proposed for sports fields and ~~court sports~~ open lawn, and allow for an alternative design to minimize noise impacts, ground disturbance, and reduce traffic trips and parking demands. This alternative considers the same water supply ~~alternatives~~ options (i.e., recycled water, desalination) as for the proposed project.

### b. WEST FRP

4. Onsite Parking: ~~This alternative addresses the existing and future parking demand associated with use of the West FRP trail system. Onsite parking areas are proposed at the terminus of South Windsor Drive and Huntington Drive. This alternative assumes that the *Community Park Master Plan* would be implemented as proposed.~~

~~5.4.~~Offsite Parking: This alternative addresses the existing and future parking demand associated with use of the West FRP trail system, and proposes purchase of off-site properties for development of parking facilities. This alternative assumes that the *Community Park Master Plan* would be implemented as proposed.

c. EAST FRP AND WEST FRP PROJECTS

~~6.5.~~Environmentally Superior Alternative: This is the alternative with the least amount of environmental impacts, considering both the East FRP and West FRP projects.

The following is a qualitative analysis of the No Project, Reduced Project – Alternative A, Reduced Project – Alternative B, West FRP Onsite Parking, and West FRP Offsite Parking alternatives. Table VI-1 shows the components of each alternative. The analysis identifies the level of impact that would result if the alternatives were to be implemented and how they compare to the proposed project. These alternatives would reduce environmental impacts as compared to the proposed project, would meet most of the basic objectives of the proposed project, and are considered feasible for implementation. The alternatives environmental analysis discussion is limited to the environmental issues affected by the proposed alternative; the discussion focuses on whether ~~if~~ the alternative would ~~either~~ avoid, reduce, or create an impact not currently assessed for the proposed project.

**TABLE VI-1  
Community Park Master Plan Proposed Project and Alternative Projects**

Amenity	Proposed Project	Reduced Project Alternative A	Reduced Project Alternative B
Multi-Use Sports Fields <sup>1</sup>	8.2 acres	9.4 acres	8.0 acres
Multi-Use Court Pad <sup>2</sup>	0.17 acre 7,215 square feet	None	16,000-square foot pad
Playground	0.19 acre 8,280 square feet	7,500 square feet	7,500 square feet
Fenced Dog Park	0.58 acre 25,818 square feet	32,700 square feet	32,700 square feet
Native Landscaping	12.5 acres 535,704 square feet	17,500 square feet	17,500 square feet
Picnic Areas and Open Lawn	1.6 acres 71,074 square feet	None	7,000 square feet
Community Center	Size Undetermined	None	Size Undetermined
Restrooms	0.0009 acre 379 square feet	600 square feet	600 square feet
Pump House	850 square feet	850 square feet	850 square feet
Storage/Maintenance	<del>0.0009</del> 10 acre 4,447 square feet	600 square feet	600 square feet
Paths and Trails	1.45 acre 63,267 square feet	2.0 acres	2.0 acres
Parking and Access	146 spaces <del>less than 2.75</del> 1.55 acres <sup>3</sup>	189 spaces 2.75 acres <sup>3</sup>	103 spaces <del>2.0</del> 1.0 acres
Landscaping	See Native Landscape	0.5 acre	0.5 acre
Natural Area	See Native Landscape	7.25 acres	8.25 acres
<sup>1</sup> Baseball, softball, soccer and other sports <sup>2</sup> Basketball, tennis, volleyball and other sports <sup>3</sup> Additional parking proposed to fully accommodate standard demand for sports fields			

## D. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

### 1. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The purpose of describing and analyzing the 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. Under this alternative, the proposed project would not be implemented; however, it is likely the site would be developed with similar uses allowed in the Recreation and Open Space land use categories and consistent with the adopted *East West Ranch Public Access and Resource Management Plan* at some time in the future. In addition, the *Cambria and San Simeon Acres Community Plans* (April 2006) ~~approved by the County Board of Supervisors, and currently under consideration by the Coastal Commission,~~ identifies the FRP as an open space and recreational area, with a community park on the East FRP. [In August 2008, the County of San Luis Obispo North Coast Area Plan was amended to include updated Planning Area Standards for the Cambria and San Simeon urban areas, including the Fiscalini Ranch Preserve \(FRP\).](#)

Disapproval of the proposed project does not preclude development from occurring on the project site [at some point in the future](#), and it can be reasonably assumed that some other project would be proposed under the existing or future zoning; therefore, the No Project Alternative does not mean “no build”, but rather it refers to, “what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services,” (*Guidelines* §15126.6(e)(2)). It can reasonably be assumed the ~~General Plan Amendments proposed by the County of San Luis Obispo for the project site would be approved, and~~ future development would be consistent with the proposed Open Space and Recreation land use categories, and consistent with the [adopted Planning Area Standards adopted by the County of San Luis Obispo, and currently under consideration by the California Coastal Commission](#). Allowed uses are shown in Table VI-2 below for each land use category, pursuant to the ~~*Cambria and San Simeon Acres Community Plan* (April 2006)~~ [North Coast Area Plan \(2008\)](#).

Uses allowed on the FRP, pursuant to the adopted *East West Ranch Public Access and Resource Management Plan* include: hiking, bicycling, ~~controlled~~ dogs [under owner control](#), active recreation (East FRP only), animal grazing under special authorization, equestrian uses, group assembly, special studies, emergency and FRP authorized motor vehicles, wireless telecommunication facilities, utility/service facilities, and the County storage yard. [Approval of a wireless telecommunications facility was pursued; however, the application was ultimately denied and the CCSD and FFRP are no longer proposing a facility within the FRP.](#)

Based on the limited list of uses allowed under the adopted management plan, implementation of the No Project Alternative would result in similar physical effects as the proposed project. The impacts would likely be similar as the proposed project, and the effects of potential alternatives discussed in the sections below. The more intensive land uses would occur on the East FRP in association with active recreation facilities within the Community Park. Selecting the No Project Alternative would not [likely](#) avoid potentially significant impacts in the long-term, [because the \*East-West Ranch Public Access & Resource Management Plan\* calls for active recreation within the East FRP. Some of the effects resulting from implementation of the Community Park Master](#)

Plan may be avoided in the short-term. In order for the property to remain in its current state in the long-term, the adopted *East West Ranch Public Access and Resource Management Plan* would have to be rescinded and land uses changed to open space with no active recreation. This action would be inconsistent with adopted County plans and the *East West Ranch Public Access and Resource Management Plan*. The effects of the No Project Alternative are discussed below; however, it should be noted that implementation of this alternative does not preclude development of the active recreation amenities in the future.

a. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Implementation of this alternative would reduce effects specific to geologic hazards on the East FRP related to liquefaction. Since impacts could be mitigated to insignificance, there would be no benefit to this alternative.

b. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Implementation of this alternative would result in similar impacts to agricultural resources as the proposed project, because a parking area is proposed within the East FRP to serve the needs of the FRP (refer to *East-West Ranch Public Access & Resource Management Plan*).

c. HYDROLOGY

Implementation of the No Project Alternative would avoid implementation of grading and drainage improvements on the East FRP, associated with the community park. Drainage from the East FRP parking area and trail system would need to be managed, pursuant to County Ordinance.

d. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Implementation of this alternative would preserve grassland habitat within the East FRP, and would likely reduce the inadvertent effects of human activity within the East FRP. Implementation of all mitigation measures to reduce potential direct and indirect impacts to sensitive habitats and species are recommended during implementation of the *East-West Ranch Public Access & Resource Management Plan* (i.e., East FRP parking area, trail system, restoration activities).

e. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Based on the lack of documented cultural resources within the East FRP active recreation area, implementation of this alternative would not avoid or reduce effects to cultural resources.

f. AESTHETIC RESOURCES

Implementation of this alternative would reduce potential impacts to aesthetic resources, including visual incompatibility, and potential light and glare associated with security lighting on the community center would be avoided.

**TABLE VI-2  
Allowable Land Uses  
East FRP**

General Land Use	Land Use Category	Specific Land Uses
Coastal Accessways	Recreation, Open Space	Pathways, trails, and overlooks.
Communications Facilities	Recreation, <del>Open Space</del>	Public, commercial, and private electromagnetic and photoelectrical transmission, repeater, and receiving stations for radio, television, telegraph, telephone, data network, and other microwave applications; includes earth stations for satellite-based communications.
Crop Production and Grazing ( <a href="#">Open Space restricted to grazing only</a> )	Recreation, Open Space	Agricultural production including grains, vegetables, fruits, flowers, and seed production, ornamental crops, tree and sod farms, associated crop preparation services and harvesting activities including but not limited to mechanical soil preparation, irrigation system construction, spraying, crop processing and sales in the field not involving a permanent structure; also includes the raising or feeding of beef cattle, sheep and goats by grazing or pasturing.
Fisheries and Game Preserves	Recreation	Resource extraction operations engaged in commercial fishing, and the operation of fish hatcheries, fish and game preserves, and game propagation.
One Caretaker Residence	Recreation, <del>Open Space</del>	A permanent residence that is secondary or accessory to the primary use of the property.
Outdoor Sports and Recreation	Recreation, <del>Open Space</del>	Facilities for various outdoor sports and recreation, including: amusement, theme and kiddie parks; golf courses, golf driving ranges and miniature golf courses; skateboard parks and water slides; go-cart and miniature auto race tracks; recreation equipment rental; health and athletic clubs with predominately outdoor facilities; tennis courts, swim and tennis clubs; play lots, playgrounds and athletic fields; recreation and community centers.
Passive Recreation	Recreation, Open Space	Non-intensive recreational activities such as riding and hiking trails, nature study, and which requires no more than limited structural improvements such as steps, fences, signs.

General Land Use	Land Use Category	Specific Land Uses
Pipelines and Transmission Lines <a href="#">(Open Space restricted to existing only)</a>	Recreation, Open Space	Transportation facilities primarily engaged in the pipeline transportation of crude petroleum; refined products of petroleum; or the pipeline transmission of other commodities; includes pipeline surface and terminal facilities, including pump stations, bulk stations, and surge and storage tanks. Power transmission includes facilities for the transmission of electrical energy for sale, including transmission lines for a public utility company; includes telephone, telegraph, cable television and other communications transmission facilities utilizing direct physical conduits.
Public Assembly and Entertainment	Recreation	Facilities for public assembly and group entertainment such as: public and semi-public auditoriums; exhibition and convention halls; civic theaters, meeting halls and facilities for "live" theatrical presentations or concerts by bands and orchestras; motion picture theaters; amphitheaters; meeting halls for rent and similar public assembly uses.
<a href="#">Public Utility Facilities (restricted to existing only)</a>	<a href="#">Recreation, Open Space</a>	<a href="#">A company [facility] regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission.</a>
Residential Accessory Use	Recreation, <del>Open Space</del>	Includes any use that is customarily part of a residence and is clearly incidental and secondary to a residence and does not change the character of the residential use; includes the storage of vehicles and other personal property, and accessory structures including swimming pools, workshops, studios, greenhouses, garages, and guesthouses (without cooking or kitchen facilities).
Temporary Events	Recreation, Open Space	Any use of a structure or land for an event for a limited period of time where the site is not to be permanently altered by grading or construction of accessory facilities. Events include but are not limited to art shows, rodeos, religious revivals, tent camps, outdoor festivals and concerts.
<a href="#">Water Wells and Impoundments (Open Space restricted to existing only)</a>	Recreation, Open Space	Water extraction uses or structures for small scale domestic or agricultural use including wells, ponds, water tanks and distribution facilities.

#### g. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Implementation of this alternative would reduce the anticipated traffic trips and parking demand that would be generated by use of the active recreation amenities (i.e., sports fields, multi-use courts). Persons would likely use the undeveloped grassland area and trails for recreational activities.

#### h. AIR QUALITY

Implementation of this alternative would reduce the air pollutant emissions generated by construction equipment for development of the active community park. Mitigation would be necessary for all other construction activities, including control of dust during site disturbance. Persons who would have used the community park for active recreation would generate trips out of the area; therefore implementation of the No Project Alternative would not be consistent with the County Clean Air Plan, and would not reduce the effects of greenhouse gas generation on a basin-wide level.

#### i. NOISE

Eliminating the active recreation component from the project would avoid the significant and adverse effects of noise generated by use of the sports fields. Noise may be generated by persons using the East FRP for other recreational activities.

#### j. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Implementation of this alternative would result in similar hazards and hazardous materials impacts as the proposed project, although the elimination of the community center may reduce the potential for unauthorized night-time use of the park and the potential demand for emergency service response.

#### k. WATER SUPPLY

As noted in the EIR, the CCSD does not currently have a water source allocated for development of the community park. Eliminating the sports fields, landscaping, and restrooms from the currently proposed project avoid the need for water supply, and the identified significant, adverse, unavoidable impacts.

#### l. PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Implementation of this alternative would minimize impacts to public services and utilities, because a community center and other public use recreational facilities would not be developed as part of this project. Implementation of County Sheriff recommendations for safe park development would be implemented, although removal of the community center may reduce the potential for activities requiring response by the County Sheriff and other emergency responders.

## 2. REDUCED PROJECT – ALTERNATIVE A

The Reduced Project Alternative A does not include any changes to the [East-West Ranch Public Access and Resource Management Plan](#), including trail improvements and restoration activities. The intent of this alternative is to meet the CCSD's objective of providing public mixed-use field space for active recreation in the community of Cambria. Implementation of this alternative would include removal of the following amenities from the Community Park Master Plan: multi-use court pad (basketball, tennis, volleyball, and other sports), picnic areas, and the community center. The amenities proposed in this alternative include: [increased area for](#) multi-use sports fields, playground, dog park, and natural areas. Infrastructure would include restrooms, a storage/maintenance building, and an expanded parking area (189 spaces). Landscaping, paths, and trails would be located within the community park, and trails would connect to the Cross-town Trail and other trails proposed on the East FRP. Movement of the [water facility \(pumphouse\)](#) would not be affected. While removal of the community center is not consistent with the project objective to provide a community recreation center, this alternative is acceptable for consideration because it is feasible that a community center could be established elsewhere within the community of Cambria.

### a. NO EFFECT

[Compared to the proposed project](#), implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative A would not reduce or create additional impacts in the following issue areas: hydrology, agriculture, cultural resources, air quality, and water supply. [Implementation of this alternative would not avoid significant, adverse, and unavoidable impacts related to water supply.](#)

### b. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Implementation of this alternative, including removal of the community center from the Master Plan, would reduce the potential effects of liquefaction on the East FRP. The reduction in structural area would reduce the liquefaction hazard. Since impacts could be mitigated to insignificant, there would be no benefit to removing the community center.

### c. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Implementation of this alternative would result in more flexibility for avoidance of natural and sensitive habitats, and would minimize impacts to biological resources; however, biological resource impacts could be reduced significantly by implementing mitigation measures.

### d. AESTHETIC RESOURCES

Implementation of this alternative would reduce potential impacts to aesthetic resources, including visual incompatibility, and potential light and glare associated with security lighting on the community center would be avoided.

### e. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Implementation of this alternative would allow for more area to be developed with parking accommodating the sports fields, and would reduce the potential parking impact. Approximately 87 additional parking spaces could be provided to accommodate the maximum anticipated demand.

f. NOISE

The configuration of the multi-use sports field turf area could be re-designed to minimize the effect of noise generated during game events on adjacent residential properties. Proposed fields could be shifted approximately 100 feet towards the northeast to increase the distance between the fields and the shared property line with adjacent residential land uses. Potentially significant noise impacts would be reduced, but would not be avoided if this alternative is implemented.

g. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Implementation of this alternative would result in similar hazards and hazardous materials impacts as the proposed project, although the elimination of the community center may reduce the potential for unauthorized night-time use of the park and the potential demand for emergency service response.

h. PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Implementation of this alternative would minimize impacts to public services and utilities, because a community center and other public use recreational facilities are not proposed. Implementation of County Sheriff recommendations for safe park development would be implemented, although removal of the community center may reduce the potential for activities requiring response by the County Sheriff and other emergency responders.

### 3. REDUCED PROJECT – ALTERNATIVE B

The Reduced Project Alternative B does not include any changes to the *Public Access and Management Plan*. The intent of this alternative is to meet the CCSD's objective of providing public mixed-use field space for active recreation in the community of Cambria, focusing on providing active recreation facilities, while reducing potential impacts associated with the generation of noise and traffic. This proposed alternative reduces the scope of the proposed project by eliminating ~~1.4 acres~~ 0.2 acre of multi-use sports fields and 0.75 acre of parking, ~~and 8,400 square feet of courts~~. The plan includes 8.0 acres of multi-use sports fields and a 16,000-square foot court pad, in addition to other park amenities. Infrastructure would include restrooms, a storage/maintenance building, and parking. Landscaping, paths, and trails would be located within the community park, and trails would connect to the Cross-town Trail and other trails proposed on the East FRP. Movement of the water facility (pumphouse) would not be affected.

a. NO EFFECT

Compared to the proposed project, implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative B would not reduce or create additional impacts in the following issue areas: agriculture, hydrology, cultural resources, aesthetic resources, hazards and hazardous materials, and public services and utilities.

b. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Implementation of this alternative would reduce geology and soils impacts. The effects of liquefaction and shrink-swell would be minimized by the reduction in developed area.

c. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Implementation of this alternative would result in more flexibility for avoidance of natural and sensitive habitats, and would minimize impacts to biological resources.

d. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Implementation of this alternative would reduce the number of traffic trips generated by the community park, and would reduce the need for parking. During any summer weekend, which is considered the worst case scenario, operation of the community park and turf area (potentially supporting up to five games) would generate 1,245 average daily trips including 155.7 peak hour trips. Implementation of this alternative would reduce the cumulative traffic impact by reducing the total number of trips generated by the project.

e. AIR QUALITY

Implementation of this alternative would result in minimized impacts to air quality, due to the reduction in soil disturbance during construction and the 25 percent reduction in trip generation.

f. NOISE

Implementation of this alternative would not entirely avoid potentially significant noise impacts; however, the level of noise generated during sporting events would be reduced because of the reduction in the maximum possible number of fields in operation. In addition, the sports field area could be located up to approximately 200 feet farther from residential areas, providing a greater distance for noise attenuation.

g. WATER SUPPLY

Implementation of this alternative would not entirely avoid potentially significant water supply impacts; however, the demand for water would be reduced. Approximately 8.0 acres of turf and 0.5 acres of landscaping are proposed in this alternative. The water demand would be 21.28 acre feet per year (afy) for turf, 0.5 afy for landscaping, and 2.0 afy for the restrooms. The total demand would be 23.78 afy, which is a 14 percent reduction from the proposed project. Demand for water supply could be reduced further by the use of alternative means of water supply such as recycled water or underground irrigation, or artificial turf, as identified in the project analysis. Implementation of this alternative reduces the impact on water supply; however, due to the current lack of a suitable, functioning water source, the significant adverse impact cannot be avoided.

~~4. WEST FRP — ONSITE PARKING ALTERNATIVE~~

~~The West FRP Onsite Parking Alternative is proposed to address existing and future parking demands and deficiencies associated with improvements to the West FRP trail system. Onsite parking areas are proposed at the terminus of South Windsor Drive by Huntington Drive (near Guildford Drive). Parking areas would not be paved, and would consist of compacted soil. Additional features would include rural-style fencing and placement of erosion and pollution control measures such as straw wattles or hay bales along the perimeter.~~

### a.NO EFFECT

Implementation of the West FRP Onsite Parking Alternative would not reduce or create additional impacts in the following issue areas: hydrology, agriculture, air quality, and water supply.

### b.GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Implementation of this alternative includes an onsite parking area located at the southern terminus of the Bluff Trail, at the end of Windsor Boulevard. As shown in Figure GEO 4, bluff erosion is evident approximately 100 feet from the southeastern property boundary of the FRP and the terminus of Windsor Drive (south). To avoid exacerbation of this erosional feature, establishment of a parking area should be limited to areas above the 25 foot elevation line, and no more than 30 feet from the FRP property boundary. In addition, the parking area shall be constructed with a slight slope towards the street to minimize stormwater discharge towards the bluff. Implementation of this alternative would require development of a site specific erosion control plan including construction monitoring and temporary placement of construction fencing at grading limits during site disturbance activities, implementation of erosion control measures during site disturbance activities, permanent placement of straw wattles or hay bales along the perimeter of the parking area to prevent sediment and incidental hydrocarbon discharge, and perpetual maintenance of the lot to prevent erosion and down gradient sedimentation.

The parking area proposed at the northern trailhead of the Ridge Trail is not located in an area highly susceptible to erosion; however, mitigation measures including temporary erosion control measures and permanent placement of straw wattles or hay bales along the perimeter of the parking area is recommended to avoid erosion and down gradient discharge of sediment and incidental hydrocarbons.

### c.BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

No special status plant species or trees are documented within the proposed parking areas. Similar to the proposed project, numerous special status wildlife species and nesting bird species may be affected during construction activities. Mitigation measures would include a pre-construction survey, construction monitoring, and species sensitivity training to avoid impacts to wildlife. Special status habitat, including potential California Coastal Commission wetlands and Army Corps of Engineer jurisdiction wetlands are present in the vicinity of the parking areas. Due to the unique nature of each site, potential impacts for each alternative parking area are discussed below.

#### 1)Bluff Trail Parking Area

The parking area would be located on seabluff scrub habitat, and would be near coastal wetland habitat. Based on a wetland delineation conducted in 2005 during analysis of the Bluff Trail project, coastal wetlands are located approximately 45 feet northwest from the southern Bluff Trail trailhead. It is feasible to avoid direct disturbance of this wetland by limiting the boundaries of the parking area to areas above the 25 foot elevation line, and no more than 30 feet from the FRP property boundary. In addition, as described in Geology and Soils above, implementation of erosion, sedimentation, and incidental hydrocarbon control measures would prevent indirect impacts to the wetland area.

## 2)Huntington Drive

The adopted *Management Plan* shows an isolated seasonal wetland immediately northeast of the Ridge Trail. It is likely that direct disturbance of this wetland can be avoided by locating the parking area to the southwest of the trail; however, due to natural changes in the hydrology and habitat characteristics on the FRP, a site specific wetland delineation is recommended to determine the actual boundaries of the wetland area. In addition, implementation of erosion, sedimentation, and incidental hydrocarbon control measures would prevent indirect impacts.

### d.CULTURAL RESOURCES

Implementation of this alternative would not result in the direct disturbance of known cultural resource sites; however, the additional area of disturbance may increase the potential for unknown cultural resource discovery. If additional cultural resources are discovered and disturbed during construction of onsite parking areas, potentially significant, but mitigable impacts would occur.

### e.AESTHETIC RESOURCES

Implementation of the Onsite Parking Alternative would result in additional aesthetic impacts associated with the presence of parked cars on the FRP. The impacts associated with additional cars could be mitigated to less than significant by implementing native vegetation screening, limited surfaces to compacted soil, and utilizing natural wood fencing.

### f.TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Implementation of this alternative would result in the creation of additional parking facilities to serve the West FRP, and would minimize the parking demand on public roads. Secondary impacts to sensitive resources including biological resources, geology and soils, cultural resources, and noise are addressed in each applicable section.

### g.AIR QUALITY

Implementation of this alternative may result in additional, short term impacts related to dust generation during construction activities. Operational emissions resulting from trip generation would be similar to the proposed project because this alternative would not result in additional trip generation.

### h.NOISE

Implementation of this alternative would result in the generation of noise from persons parking within lots adjacent to residential areas. The generation of noise would be similar to noise generated by persons parking on local streets, and would not be significant. Additional short-term noise impacts may occur during construction of the parking areas adjacent to residential areas. These impacts can be mitigated by implementing similar noise mitigation measures discussed in the project analysis.

i. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

~~Implementation of this alternative may result in an increase in persons parking or attempting to camp on the West FRP. Such activity may increase the demand for emergency and sheriff response. This impact can be mitigated by the use of gates or chains across parking access locations to inhibit illegal nighttime parking.~~

j. PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

~~As discussed above, implementation of this alternative may result in an increase in undesirable or hazardous activities on the West FRP. Such activity may increase the demand for emergency and sheriff response. This impact can be mitigated by the use of gates or chains across parking access locations to inhibit illegal nighttime parking.~~

**5.4. WEST FRP – OFFSITE PARKING ALTERNATIVE**

The West FRP Offsite Parking Alternative is proposed to address existing and future parking demands and deficiencies associated with improvements to the West FRP trail system. Implementation of this alternative would require additional investigation regarding availability of undeveloped lots near the West FRP and existing and proposed trailheads, and the landowners' willingness to sell. In addition, one lot located near the FRP is owned by the CCSD. Currently undeveloped lots located near the FRP and trailheads include the following:

- Three lots on South Windsor near the Bluff Trail trailhead
- Three lots on North Windsor near the Wallbridge to Ridge Trail trailhead
- One lot on Tipton Street near the Tipton Trail trailhead
- One lot, owned by the CCSD, on Trenton Street near the Forest Loop Trail trailhead

~~Similar to onsite parking alternatives, p~~Parking areas would not be paved, and would consist of compacted soil. Additional features would include rural-style fencing and placement of erosion and pollution control measures such as straw wattles or hay bales along the perimeter.

**a. NO EFFECT**

Compared to the proposed project, implementation of the West FRP Offsite Parking Alternative would not reduce or create additional impacts in the following issue areas: ~~geology and soils,~~ agriculture, hazards and hazardous materials, public services and utilities, and water supply.

**b. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

Implementation of this alternative would require additional areas of disturbance including vegetation removal; however, potential impacts associated with drainage, erosion and sedimentation can be reduced to less than significant by implementation of standard measures identified in the project analysis.

**c. HYDROLOGY**

Implementation of this alternative would result in similar hydrology impacts as the proposed project. None of the lots appear to be located within drainage channels; however site specific

investigation of each lot would be required to ensure that drainage patterns are not significantly affected.

d. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The offsite lots were not surveyed for special-status plant species or wildlife, although it can be expected that similar terrestrial wildlife species may be present on lots adjacent to the FRP. In addition, identified lots on Tipton Street and Trenton Street support Monterey pine forest. Development of these lots would require removal of pine trees, resulting in a new, significant but mitigable impact.

e. CULTURAL RESOURCES

The offsite lots were not surveyed for cultural resources. No historic structures are present on any of the identified lots. Based on the cultural sensitivity of the area, and known surface and subsurface significant historic and prehistoric findings in the area, a site-specific survey would be necessary prior to further investigation regarding use of these lots for parking. It is likely that if resources are present, impacts could be mitigated by avoidance or soil capping. Specific mitigation measures would be identified based on the significance and quantity of identified resources.

f. AESTHETIC RESOURCES

Implementation of the Offsite Parking Alternative would result in additional aesthetic impacts associated with the presence of clustered parked cars adjacent to the FRP. The impacts associated with additional cars could be mitigated to less than significant by implementing native vegetation screening, limited surfaces to compacted soil, and utilizing natural wood fencing.

g. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Implementation of this alternative would result in the creation of additional parking facilities to serve the West FRP, and would minimize the parking demand on public roads. Secondary impacts to sensitive resources including biological resources, hydrology, geology and soils, air quality, cultural resources, and noise are addressed in each applicable section.

h. AIR QUALITY

Implementation of this alternative may result in additional, short-term impacts related to dust generation during construction activities. Operational emissions resulting from trip generation would be similar to the proposed project because this alternative would not result in additional trip generation.

i. NOISE

Implementation of this alternative would result in the generation of noise from persons parking within lots adjacent to residential areas. The generation of noise would be similar to noise generated by persons parking on local streets, and would not be significant. Additional short-term noise impacts may occur during construction of the parking areas adjacent to residential areas. These impacts can be mitigated by implementing similar noise mitigation measures discussed in the project analysis.

## E. ALTERNATIVES COMPARISON

Table VI-3 summarizes the evaluation of each of the alternatives and was used as a tool to determine which alternatives could avoid or lessen potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed project, and identify which alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. In addition, the matrix also identifies where new or substantially increased potentially significant impacts may be identified for an alternative. The symbol “0” represents impacts that would not be avoided/lessened by the alternative; the symbol “--- “ represents impacts that would potentially be avoided/lessened by the alternative, and; the symbol “+” represents impacts that would potentially be increased by the alternative.

Several components of these alternatives can be adapted to work with the proposed project. A combination of alternatives can be incorporated into the proposed project as deemed necessary to reduce the potential impacts.

**TABLE VI-3  
Alternatives Analysis Impact Comparison**

Impact	Impact Area	Alternative 1 No Project/ Proposed Project	Alternative 2 Reduced Project – Alternative A	Alternative 3 Reduced Project – Alternative B	Alternative 4 Onsite Parking	Alternative 5 Offsite Parking
<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>						
GEO Impact 1 Bluff Trail Erosion	West FRP	0	0	0	0	0
GEO Impact 2 Stormwater runoff.	West FRP	0	0	0	0	0
GEO Impact 3 Trail erosion and sedimentation.	West FRP	0	0	0	+	+
GEO Impact 4 Terrace to Ridge and Creek to Ridge Trails.	West FRP	0	0	0	0	0
GEO Impact 5 Shrink-swell characteristic.	West FRP	0	0	0	0	0
GEO Impact 6 Ground-shaking and liquefaction hazards.	West FRP	0	0	0	0	0
GEO Impact 7 100-year tsunami event.	West FRP	0	0	0	0	0
GEO Impact 8 Stormwater runoff.	East FRP	0	0	0	0	0
GEO Impact 9 Shrink-swell characteristic.	East FRP	0	---	---	0	0
GEO Impact 10 Seismic-induced strong ground shaking.	East FRP	0	---	0	0	0
GEO Impact 11 Liquefaction.	East FRP	---0	---	---	0	0

Impact	Impact Area	Alternative 1 No Project/ Proposed Project	Alternative 2 Reduced Project – Alternative A	Alternative 3 Reduced Project – Alternative B	Alternative 4 Onsite Parking	Alternative 5 Offsite Parking
<b>GEO Impact 12</b> Seismic-induced slope failure.	East FRP	0	0	0	0	0
<b>HYDROLOGY</b>						
<b>HYD Impact 1</b> Drainage patterns and flow rates.	West FRP	0	0	0	0	0
<b>HYD Impact 2</b> Drainage patterns, flow rates, and flooding.	West FRP	0	0	0	0	+
<b>HYD Impact 3</b> Drainage patterns and flow rates.	East FRP	0	0	0	0	0
<b>HYD Impact 4</b> Drainage patterns, flow rates, and flooding.	East FRP	0	0	0	0	0
<b>AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES</b>						
<b>AG Impact 1</b> Prime Agricultural Soils	East FRP	0	0	---	0	0
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>						
<b>BIO Impact 1</b> Impacts to Santa Rosa Creek riparian and wetland habitat.	West FRP	0	0	0	+	0
<b>BIO Impact 2</b> Improvements to trails.	West FRP	0	0	0	0	0
<b>BIO Impact 3</b> Realignment of trails to avoid special status plant species.	West FRP	0	0	0	0	0
<b>BIO Impact 4</b> <a href="#">Construction activities could result in direct disturbance to terrestrial species dens or nests, resulting in a potentially significant impact.</a>	<a href="#">West FRP</a>	<a href="#">0</a>	<a href="#">0</a>	<a href="#">0</a>		<a href="#">+</a>
<b>BIO Impact 5</b> Impacts to Santa Rosa Creek aquatic wildlife species and habitats.	West FRP	0	0	0	0	0
<b>BIO Impact 6</b> Impacts to nesting birds.	West FRP	0	0	0	+	+
<b>BIO Impact 7</b> Impacts to Santa Rosa Creek riparian and wetland habitat.	East FRP	0	---	---	0	0
<b>BIO Impact 8</b> Impacts to sensitive plant species and habitat.	East FRP	0	---	---	0	0

Impact	Impact Area	Alternative 1 No Project/ Proposed Project	Alternative 2 Reduced Project – Alternative A	Alternative 3 Reduced Project – Alternative B	Alternative 4 Onsite Parking	Alternative 5 Offsite Parking
<b>BIO Impact 9</b> <a href="#">Construction activities could result in direct disturbance to terrestrial species dens or nests, resulting in a potentially significant impact.</a>	East FRP	+	0	--		0
<b>BIO Impact 10</b> Impacts to Santa Rosa Creek aquatic wildlife species and habitats.	East FRP	0	0	--	∅	0
<b>BIO Impact 11</b> Impacts to nesting birds.	East FRP	0	0	--	∅	0
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>						
<b>CULT Impact 1</b> Disturbance of archaeological sites.	West FRP	0	0	0	∅	+
<b>CULT Impact 2</b> Realignment of trails to avoid cultural sites.	West FRP	0	0	0	∅	0
<b>CULT Impact 3</b> Disturbance and destruction of unknown subsurface cultural resources.	West FRP	0	0	0	+	+
<b>CULT Impact 4</b> Increased looting of significant cultural materials.	West FRP	0	0	0	∅	0
<b>CULT Impact 5</b> Disturbance of historical artifacts.	West FRP	0	0	0	∅	+
<b>CULT Impact 6</b> Disturbance, destruction, or looting of unknown cultural resources.	West FRP	0	0	0	∅	0
<b>AESTHETIC RESOURCES</b>						
<b>AES Impact 1</b> Wireless telecommunication facilities would degrade visual quality.	Project-wide	0	0	0	∅	0
<b>AES Impact 2</b> Pedestrian bridge over Highway 1 would degrade visual quality.	Project-wide	0	0	0	∅	0
<b>AES Impact 3</b> Trails and access roads could affect natural visual setting.	Project-wide	0	0	0	+	+
<b>AES Impact 4</b> Signage could block scenic views and create visual clutter.	Project-wide	0	0	0	+	+

Impact	Impact Area	Alternative 1 No Project/ Proposed Project	Alternative 2 Reduced Project – Alternative A	Alternative 3 Reduced Project – Alternative B	Alternative 4 Onsite Parking	Alternative 5 Offsite Parking
<b>AES Impact 5</b> Maintenance activities inconsistent with aesthetic goals of <i>Public Access and Management Plan</i> .	Project-wide	0	0	0	0	0
<b>AES Impact 6</b> Screen planting could result in short term visual impacts.	Project-wide	0	0	0	+	+
<b>AES Impact 7</b> Visibility of central staging area could degrade visual quality.	West FRP	0	0	0	0	0
<b>AES Impact 8</b> Visibility of imported fill and topsoil material could result in noticeable earthwork operations.	West FRP	0	0	0	0	0
<b>AES Impact 9</b> Information kiosks could block ocean views.	West FRP	0	0	0	0	0
<b>AES Impact 10</b> Proposed structures and lighting could result visual impacts to the community.	East FRP	0	---	0	0	0
<b>AES Impact 11</b> Relocation of water works and storage yard could result in cluttered views.	East FRP	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</b>						
<b>TC Impact 1</b> Increase in visitors to the FRP and vehicle trips w/in adjacent neighborhoods.	Project-wide	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TC Impact 2</b> Increased demand for parking w/in adjacent neighborhoods.	West FRP	0	0	0	–	---
<b>TC Impact 3</b> Parking demand would exceed proposed supply.	East FRP	0	---	---	0	0
<b>TC Impact 4</b> Generation of peak hour trips and traffic.	Cumulative	0	---	---	0	0
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>						
<b>AQ Impact 1</b> PM <sub>10</sub> emissions could result in short and long-term impacts.	Project-wide	0	---	---	+	+
<b>AQ Impact 2</b> Grading activities could exceed significance thresholds.	Project-wide	0	---	---	0	0

Impact	Impact Area	Alternative 1 No Project/ Proposed Project	Alternative 2 Reduced Project – Alternative A	Alternative 3 Reduced Project – Alternative B	Alternative 4 Onsite Parking	Alternative 5 Offsite Parking
<b>AQ Impact 3</b> Earth moving activities would result in exposure of naturally occurring asbestos.	Project-wide	0	0	0	0	0
<b>NOISE</b>						
<b>N Impact 1</b> Temporary production of noise levels ranging from 70 to 95 dBA at a distance of approximately fifty feet.	West FRP	0	0	0	+	+
<b>N Impact 2</b> Potential for construction of future stationary noise sources near existing noise-sensitive land uses.	West FRP	0	0	0	0	0
<b>N Impact 3</b> Exposure of existing sensitive residential receptors to temporary construction-related noise impacts.	East FRP	0	0	0	0	0
<b>N Impact 4</b> Generation of stationary noise levels excluding acceptable thresholds.	East FRP	---	---	---	0	0
<b>HM Impact 1</b> Increase in service calls and area necessary to patrol.	Project-wide	0	---	0	+	0
<b>HM Impact 2</b> Threat of accidental fire may increase.	Project-wide	0	0	0	+	0
<b>WATER SUPPLY</b>						
<b>WS Impact 1</b> Direct impact to long-term water supply resources during prolonged drought conditions.	East FRP	0---	0	---	0	0
<b>WS Impact 2</b> Capacity and quality of onsite wells is unknown.	East FRP	0---	0	---	0	0
<b>WS Impact 3</b> Use of onsite wells may affect Santa Rosa Creek stream flow.	East FRP	0---	0	---	0	0
<b>WS Impact 4</b> Existing demand for water supply currently exceeds the available groundwater supply.	East FRP	0---	0	---	0	0
<b>WS Impact 5</b> Use of treated wastewater may result in unacceptable levels of sodium & chloride on the groundwater basin.	East FRP	0---	0	---	0	0

Impact	Impact Area	Alternative 1 No Project/ Proposed Project	Alternative 2 Reduced Project – Alternative A	Alternative 3 Reduced Project – Alternative B	Alternative 4 Onsite Parking	Alternative 5 Offsite Parking
<b>WS Impact 6</b> Deficient available groundwater supply.	East FRP	0	0	0	0	0
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES</b>						
<b>PSU Impact 1</b> Ability of emergency personnel to efficiently respond to requests for assistance could be reduced.	Project-wide	0	0	0	+	0
<b>PSU Impact 2</b> Emergency access throughout the West FRP and parts of the East FRP is limited.	Project-wide	0	0	0	0	0
<b>PSU Impact 3</b> Potential increase in unsafe behavior.	Project-wide	0	0	0	+	0
<b>PSU Impact 4</b> Increase in risk of wildfire on the FRP.	Project-wide	0	0	0	+	0
<b>PSU Impact 5</b> Increase in locations and opportunities for transient camping and trespassing.	Project-wide	0	0	0	+	0
<b>PSU Impact 6</b> Increase in amount of solid waste generated proportionally to number of visitors.	Project-wide	0	0	0	0	0

## F. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA §15126(d) states that the alternative section of 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...” §15126(d)(4) continues by stating “if the environmental superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.”

During preparation of preliminary environmental analysis as part of the EIR, the CCSD incorporated modifications to the proposed Community Park Master Plan by including many identified feasible mitigation measures in the revised project as described in Chapter III (Project Description). As noted in the alternatives discussion, environmental impacts related to available water supply and proximity to noise-sensitive land uses would be unavoidable, based on implementation of a project that meets identified objectives.

Based on Table VI-3 and the previous discussion, the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the East FRP is the Reduced Project – Alternative B. Implementation of this alternative would not avoid potentially significant adverse noise and water supply impacts; however, these impacts

would be further minimized (compared to the proposed project with mitigation) due to the reduction in active recreational use area while meeting the objectives of the proposed project. It should be noted that the significant adverse impacts can be reduced with this alternative; however, it does not negate the proposed project, and the proposed project can still be considered a viable alternative.

The Environmentally Superior Alternative for the West FRP is the Proposed Project, with mitigation. Implementation of this alternative with recommended mitigation measures would reduce all potentially significant impacts associated with the *Public Access and Management Plan* to less than significant.

**LIST OF ABBREVIATED TERMS**

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Term</b>
CCSD	Cambria Community Services District
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
EIR	Environmental Impact Report

This page intentionally left blank.