

6.1 INTRODUCTION/CEQA REQUIREMENTS

The purpose of the alternatives analysis in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is to describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, and to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[a]).

Section 15126.6(a,b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires consideration of **alternatives that could reduce or eliminate any significant adverse environmental effects of the proposed project**, including alternatives that may be more costly or could otherwise impede the project's objectives. The range of alternatives considered must include those that offer substantial environmental advantages over the proposed project and may be feasibly accomplished in a successful manner considering economic, environmental, social, technological, and legal factors.

Accordingly, this EIR focuses its examination of project alternatives on those that address the potentially significant impacts of the project.

The potentially significant adverse environmental effects of the project that an alternative must address consist of:

- **Land Use impacts**, as identified in Section 4.1 of this report,
- **Air Quality impacts** caused by adding the project-generated pollutants to pollutants created by other local regional sources, and
- **Traffic impacts** caused by the addition of new peak hour vehicle trips.

As discussed in the analysis of the proposed project's potential environmental impacts, all other potential impacts of the project can be reduced to acceptable levels through the implementation of mitigation measures.

6.2 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The following alternatives to the propose project are examined in this EIR. Each alternative is examined in further detail in the following sections.

1. "No Project" Alternative

The project site would be developed as currently proposed without a rezone or general plan amendment. The portion of the project site north of Arcade Creek would be developed with business professional (MP), shopping center (SC) and multi-family residential uses (RD-20). The portion of the project south of Arcade Creek would be developed with multi-family uses and business professional. *This alternative is examined in Section 6.2.1*

2. Reduced Retail Alternative

This alternative proposes a reduction in the amount of retail acreage north of Arcade Creek. The square footage of retail development per acre would remain the same as under the proposed project, however, the uses would be located further north of Arcade Creek.

6.0 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Residential uses (RD-20) would “wrap around” the north side of Arcade Creek south of the commercial uses continuing the development pattern to the east. *This alternative is examined in Section 6.2.2*

3. Single-Family Residential Alternative

This alternative proposes all single-family residential development (RD-5) north of Arcade Creek. No commercial uses are proposed north of the creek. Uses south of Arcade Creek would be the same as those under the proposed project. *This alternative is examined in Section 6.2.3*

4. Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Residential Alternative

This alternative proposes a mixture of single-family and multi-family development units north of Arcade Creek. Multi-family units would be clustered adjacent to Arcade Creek similar to the existing development pattern occurring to the east. Single-family uses would be developed in the area to the north of the multi-family uses and south of Auburn Boulevard. *This alternative is examined in Section 6.2.4*

Note regarding Project Objectives

Table 6.1 contains summaries of the planning project objectives, and the ability of each project alternative to achieve those objectives. *For the complete text of the objectives as provided by the project applicant, please see the Project Description section of this report.* It should be noted that state law includes an alternative’s ability to meet the applicant’s objectives as one of the factors that can be considered in determining whether to examine an alternative. CEQA Section 15126.6(c) states, in part,

“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.”

As shown in **Table 6.1**, Alternatives 3 and 4 (“Single Family” and “Mixed Residential”) do not achieve a number of the basic objectives of the proposed project. While they are examined in this EIR due to their ability to reduce a number of the proposed project’s significant impacts, they are not included in the determination of the “environmentally superior” alternative due to their inability to meet the applicant’s and City’s objectives for the study area, as shown in this EIR and in the Draft General Plan.

**Table 6.1
Comparison of Project Alternatives' Ability to
Achieve Project Objectives**

Project Objective	Alternative			
	1 "No Project"	2 "Reduced Retail"	3 "Single Family"	4 "Single/Multi Family"
Accommodate a variety of uses in response to market conditions and community needs as they may evolve over the buildout period of the project. This may be accomplished by the use of a flexible planning approach.	✓	✓	✗	✗
Accommodate uses that can be economically supported in the marketplace and are financially feasible.	✓	✓/✗	✗	✗
Accommodate a mix of uses that maximize fiscal benefits to the City.	✓	✓/✗	✗	✗
Define specific options for the mix, organization, and physical form and character of development that achieves a distinct and high quality place.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Establish a distinct sense of place and cohesive and integrated development.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Define the expectations of the developer and the City.	✓	✓	✗	✗
Site planning and building design shall be sensitive to and consider opportunities for connections with surrounding land uses.	✗	✓	✓	✓
Design the street network to serve local land uses and not as a conduit for regional and through-trips.	○	✓	○	○
Utilize Arcade Creek as a development amenity incorporating trails, parks, other open space elements, and provide public access from the site's uses.	○	✓	✓	✓
Maintain views to the creek and tree line from Auburn Boulevard at appropriate locations to the extent feasible.	○	✓	○	○
Maintain open space as a development asset.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ensure that adequate infrastructure is provided concurrent with development.	✓	✓	✓	✓

Key to Alternatives

- 1 – No Project - Please see Section 6.2.1 for a detailed discussion of this alternative
- 2 – Reduced Retail - Please see Section 6.2.2 for a detailed discussion of this alternative
- 3 – Single-Family Residential - Please see Section 6.2.3 for a detailed discussion of this alternative
- 4 – Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Residential - Please see Section 6.2.4 for a detailed discussion of this alternative

Key to Symbols

- ✓ - Meets Project Objective
- - Not applicable.
- ✗ - Does not meet Project Objective

6.0 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Table 6.2, below, summarizes how each of the alternatives examined compares with the proposed project for the environmental issues examined in this report:

Table 6.2
Comparison of Environmental Impacts of Project Alternatives

Environmental Issue	Alternative:			
	1 "No Project"	2 "Reduced Retail"	3 "Single Family"	4 "Single/Multi Family"
Land Use/Planning	↑	↓	↓	↓
Population/Employment and Housing	↑	+	+	↓
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	○	○	○	○
Transportation and Circulation	↑	↓	↓	↓
Noise	○	↓	↓	↓
Air Quality	↓	↓	↓	↓
Hydrology and Water Quality	○	○	↓	↓
Geology and Soils	○	○	○	○
Biological Resources	↑	○	○	○
Cultural and Historic Resources	○	○	○	○
Public Services and Utilities	○	○	↑	○
Aesthetics	↑	↑	↓	↓
Utilities and Service Systems	○	○	○	○

Key to Alternatives

- 1 – No Project - Please see Section 6.2.1 for a detailed discussion of this alternative
- 2 – Reduced Retail - Please see Section 6.2.2 for a detailed discussion of this alternative
- 3 – Single-Family Residential - Please see Section 6.2.3 for a detailed discussion of this alternative
- 4 – Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Residential - Please see Section 6.2.4 for a detailed discussion of this alternative

Key to Symbols

- ↑ - Increased impact
- ↓ - Decreased impact
- - No significant difference in impact
- +

Please refer to each alternative's analysis for a discussion of potential impacts.

6.2.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Description of Alternative

This alternative contemplates the impacts that would result if the project site were to be developed with the existing zoning and general plan land use designation.

This alternative assumes that the project site would not be rezoned or subject to a general plan amendment; the project site would be developed with business professional, shopping center, and multi-family residential uses (RD-20).

Potential Environmental Impacts

The following impacts could result from the implementation of this alternative:

Land Use/Planning

The No Project Alternative would result in the development of more high-density multi-family residential development than the proposed project. Whereas the proposed project would develop strictly commercial uses on the portion of the project site north of Arcade Creek, the No Project Alternative proposes a mix of business professional, shopping center and multi-family residential uses in this area. South of the Creek, the No Project Alternative proposes multi-family uses and business professional. This mix of uses is considered more intense than the proposed project that identifies single-family residential, commercial/office multi-family uses south of the Creek. Therefore, land use impacts would be more intense under the No Project Alternative than the proposed project.

Employment and Housing

The No Project Alternative would provide more high-density housing (RD-20) than the proposed project. In addition, housing is proposed on both the north and south sides of Arcade Creek under the No Project Alternative. Correspondingly, the No Project Alternative would most likely result in fewer employment opportunities than the proposed project, as less acreage would be devoted to shopping center. No single-family residential units are proposed under the No Project Alternative so there would be no increase in the amount of single-family housing stock. Therefore, the No Project alternative would result in less beneficial impacts to both housing and employment than the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in any impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials. (Please see the "Hazards" section of this report for further discussion of this topic.)

Transportation/Traffic/Parking

The No Project Alternative includes residential uses that would generate decreased traffic on the project site and surrounding roadways (compared to the commercial uses proposed north of

6.0 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Arcade Creek in the proposed project). The No Project Alternative includes a greater number of multi-family units than the proposed project that could result in slightly lower traffic volumes to the project site than the proposed project. Therefore, impacts to traffic may be slightly less intense under the No Project Alternative than the proposed project.

Noise

Development of the No Project Alternative would result in generally similar short-term construction noise levels, but would result in decreased long-term operational noise levels on the project site (due to the elimination of some noise-generating commercial uses). Short-term noise would occur in association with construction activities. Long-term increase would result primarily from commercial and residential uses.

Air Quality

As with the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would result in decreased air pollution impacts associated with short-term construction emissions and long-term increased traffic generation on the project site. Trips generated by the uses proposed under the No Project Alternative would probably be slightly less than the proposed project because less retail acreage is proposed for the No Project Alternative. With fewer trips, less auto emissions would be produced. Therefore, impacts to air quality for the No Project Alternative would be less than the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The No Project Alternative includes uses that would add significant amounts of impervious surface to the project site. Both the shopping center and business professional uses would add the majority of parking lot and buildings to the northern portion of the project site. In addition, multi-family and single-family uses would also add roadways, pavement and structures to the project site. The introduction of impervious surfaces, as well as urban uses, would result in both increased runoff and increased pollutant levels in waters receiving runoff flows. Residential uses typically have more landscaped areas that allow for water absorption and therefore less runoff. Pollutant types also differ between commercial uses and residential. While parking lots generate oil and grease in runoff, residential uses would typically generate runoff containing pesticides, fertilizers, etc. Because the proposed project includes more commercial uses than the No Project Alternative, impacts to hydrology and water quality would be more intense for the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

Both the No Project Alternative and the proposed project would require earthmoving and grading to accommodate development of the proposed uses. Therefore, impacts to geology and soils for the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

Biological Resources

The No Project Alternative would have to comply with zoning regulations that would guide development adjacent to Arcade Creek. In contrast, the proposed project includes 27.0 acres designated as Open Space/Flood Plain surrounding Arcade Creek as well 5.0 acres of wetland preserve. As a result, a larger buffer area would be created under proposed project that would protect areas surrounding the Creek from development. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in potentially greater impacts to biological resources than the proposed project.

Cultural and Historic Resources

As noted in the Cultural Resources section of this document, no resources (as defined by state law) exist on-site; therefore, no impacts would result from this or any other project alternative.

Public Services and Utilities

Both the No Project Alternative and the proposed project would require similar extension of services and utilities to the project site. Because both the No Project Alternative and the proposed project propose similar land uses, impacts to public services and utilities (e.g. water, wastewater, etc.) would be similar for both alternatives.

Aesthetics

The No Project Alternative would develop the project site without conformance to development guidelines. The proposed project would implement the Stock Ranch Development Guide. The guide includes setback, screening and buffering measures to facilitate the project's visual compatibility with surrounding uses. Therefore, impacts to aesthetics would be greater for the No Project Alternative than for the proposed project.

6.2.2 REDUCED RETAIL ALTERNATIVE

Description of Alternative

This alternative proposes a reduction in the amount of retail acreage north of Arcade Creek. The retail uses would also be separated from Arcade Creek by multi-family residential uses. These residential uses (RD-20) would "wrap around" the north side of Arcade Creek south of the commercial uses continuing the development pattern to the east.

The square footage of retail development per acre would remain the same as under the proposed project; therefore, less land would be developed for commercial uses. No specific reduction in commercial development is considered; this alternative is examined primarily to consider the impacts of reducing the proposed intensity of commercial development.

6.0 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

As noted in **Table 6.2-A**, this alternative may not be able to achieve two project objectives:

- *Accommodate uses that can be economically supported in the marketplace and are financially feasible.*

This objective may not be met by this alternative if the reduction in commercial development made the project economically infeasible—for instance, if the cost of site improvements, infrastructure, etc., could not be supported.

- *Accommodate a mix of uses that maximize fiscal benefits to the City.*

This objective may not be met unless the reduction in commercial development also included a relatively higher percentage of uses that generate higher revenues to the City than typical retail and service uses. Under most foreseeable scenarios, reducing the total amount of commercial development will reduce fiscal benefits to the City of Citrus Heights.

Potential Environmental Impacts

The following impacts could result from the implementation of this alternative:

Land Use/Planning

The Reduced Retail Alternative proposes less retail acreage than the proposed project. While less land area would be consumed for retail uses under the Reduced Retail Alternative, the intensity would be the same as the proposed project. Residential uses are also proposed on the northern side of Arcade Creek under the Reduced Retail Alternative. The proposed project includes only commercial uses on the north side of the Creek. Therefore, the Reduced Retail Alternative would result in less intense impacts to land use than the proposed project.

Employment and Housing

The Reduced Retail Alternative would reduce the amount of retail space as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts to employment (i.e. in terms of job opportunities) would be less than to those of the proposed project. The Reduced Retail Alternative would increase the amount of multi-family residential units in the City. However, the proposed project would provide a mixture of multi-family and single family units. Overall, the proposed project would have a more beneficial impact on both employment and housing than the Reduced Retail Alternative.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impacts associated with this alternative would be essentially the same as those, which would result from the proposed project. (Please see the "Hazards" section of this report for further discussion of this topic.)

Transportation/Traffic/Parking

The reduction of retail acreage proposed under the Reduced Retail Alternative would reduce the amount of commercial trips to the project site compared to the proposed project. The inclusion of multi-family uses instead of all commercial, as included in the proposed project, would result in lower traffic volumes to the site. Therefore, traffic impacts would be less intensive under the Reduced Retail Alternative.

Noise

Development of the Reduced Retail Alternative would result in increased short-term construction noise levels and long-term operational noise levels on the project site. Short-term noise would occur in association with construction activities. Long-term increase would result primarily from commercial and residential uses. Development of the Reduced Retail Alternative would generate the same types of noise as the proposed project. However, retail uses would occur in a more compact area than the proposed project. As a result, noise levels would be expected to be less intense than under the proposed project.

Air Quality

The Reduced Retail Alternative would involve short-term construction related air quality impacts similar to the proposed project. Traffic volumes associated with retail uses under the Reduced Retail Alternative would be lower than the proposed project. Residential traffic volumes may be greater based on the inclusion of more multi-family housing units than under the proposed project, however, this would be offset by the reduction of retail traffic. Therefore, impacts to air quality would be less intense under the Reduced Retail Alternative than the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The reduction of retail acreage proposed under the Reduced Retail Alternative would leave more land available to absorb water following a storm event through lawns, flower beds, etc. included in the multi-family portion of the project. The configuration and types of uses would be similar to the proposed project (e.g. a combination of commercial and residential uses). Both alternatives would result in increased runoff flows as well as increased urban and residential pollutants in runoff flows. Although on-site detention would be included to mitigate this impact. As a result, impacts to hydrology and water quality for the Reduced Retail Alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

While the amount of retail acreage would be reduced under the Reduced Retail Alternative, the amount of acreage disturbed by earthmoving and grading would be similar to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts to geology and soils would be similar for the Reduced Retail Alternative and the proposed project.

6.0 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Biological Resources

The Reduced Retail Alternative would develop less retail acreage than the proposed project. As a result, less area on the project site would be disturbed. While the Reduced Retail Alternative locates retail uses further north of Arcade Creek than the proposed project, it still locates residential uses near the Creek. In contrast, the proposed project includes an open space buffer surrounding Arcade Creek as well as a 5-acre wetland preserve. Both the open space and preserve would protect biologically sensitive areas from development. Therefore, impacts to biological resources would be less intensive under the proposed project than the Reduced Retail Alternative.

Cultural and Historic Resources

As noted in the Historical Resources section of this document, no historical resources (as defined by state law) exist on-site; therefore, no impacts would result from this or any other project alternative.

Public Services and Utilities

Both the Reduced Retail Alternative and the proposed project would require similar extension of services and utilities to the project site. Because both the Reduced Retail Alternative and the proposed project propose similar urban land uses on the project site, impacts to public services and utilities (e.g. water, wastewater, etc.) would be similar for both alternatives. Because the number of housing units would increase (due to the inclusion of housing on the north side of Arcade Creek, impacts to schools would be increased.

Aesthetics

The Reduced Retail Alternative would develop the project site without conformance to development guidelines. The proposed project would implement the Stock Ranch Development Guide. The guide includes setback, screening and buffering measures to facilitate the project's visual compatibility with surrounding uses. Therefore, impacts to aesthetics would be greater for the Reduced Retail Alternative than for the proposed project.

6.2.3 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ALTERNATIVE

Discussion of Alternative

The Single-Family Residential Alternative proposes all single-family residential development north of Arcade Creek. At a density of RD-5, approximately 205 units would be developed. No commercial uses are proposed north of the Creek as part of this alternative. Uses south of Arcade Creek would be the same as those under the proposed project (i.e. park, residential and commercial/office/multi-family).

As noted earlier in this section, this alternative would not meet most of the basic project objectives, and is not considered a feasible alternative (per CEQA Section 15126.6(c)).

The following impacts could result from the implementation of this alternative:

Land Use/Planning

The Single-Family Residential Alternative would introduce a less intensive land use pattern than the proposed project. Eliminating commercial uses north of Arcade Creek and maintaining small areas of commercial on portions of the project site south of the Creek would create a less intensive land use pattern than under the proposed project. Therefore, impacts to land use would be less intensive for the Single-Family Residential Alternative than for the proposed project.

Employment and Housing

While less employment opportunities would be created in association with this alternative than the proposed project, a greater amount of single-family residential units would be added to the City's housing stock than under the proposed project. Overall, the Single-Family Residential Alternative would have a more beneficial impact on housing than the proposed project, but a less beneficial impact on employment.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in any impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials. (Please see the "Hazards" section of this report for further discussion of this topic.)

Transportation/Traffic/Parking

Commercial development typically generates high volumes of vehicle trips. With the elimination of commercial development in the Single Family Residential Alternative, lower traffic volumes would be generated on the site and surrounding roadways. Because residential development would generate lower traffic volumes than commercial development, the Single-Family Residential Alternative would have less intensive impacts to traffic than the proposed project.

Noise

Residential uses proposed on the north side of Arcade Creek in association with the Single-Family Residential Alternative would generate less traffic and thereby less noise than the proposed project. In addition, because no retail uses are included north of the Creek, noise generated in association with retail uses would be eliminated in exchange for noise levels generated by residential uses. Because commercial uses generally result in greater noise levels than residential uses, impacts to noise would be less intensive under the Single-Family Residential Alternative than for the proposed project.

Air Quality

Short-term construction impacts to air quality would be similar for both projects. However, because vehicle traffic would be reduced compared to the proposed project, air quality impacts would also be reduced. Therefore, impacts to air quality would be less intensive under the Single-Family Residential Alternative than under the proposed project.

6.0 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Hydrology and Water Quality

Single-Family residential uses would result in less impervious area than commercial uses. With the elimination of commercial uses north of Arcade Creek, more area of the site would be available to absorb water following a storm event (i.e. through lawns, flower beds, etc.). Commercial uses (e.g. big box retail and parking lots) typically create vast areas of impervious surface. These uses can result in increased runoff flows carrying constituents that can adversely affect water quality. While the Single-Family Residential Alternative would increase impervious surface on the project site, it would not impact hydrologic flows to the same degree as the proposed project. Residential runoff constituents would differ from those of a commercial parking lot (e.g. oil and grease vs. pesticides, lawn fertilizers etc.). However, impacts to water quality would be similar although the make-up of pollutants may differ (i.e. urban vs. residential). Because less runoff would be generated by residential development than commercial development, the Single-Family Residential Alternative would result in less intensive impacts to hydrology than the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

While no commercial development is included on the northern portion of the property, the amount of acreage disturbed by earthmoving and grading would be similar to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts to geology and soils would be similar for the Single-Family Residential Alternative and the proposed project.

Biological Resources

This Single-Family Residential Alternative would develop residential uses north of Arcade Creek. The same area would be developed as proposed under the proposed project. While residential development is considered less intensive than commercial development, comparable areas of the project site would be affected as well as protected through the open space buffer and wetland preserve. Therefore, impacts of the Single Family Residential Alternative to biological resources would be considered similar to the proposed project.

Cultural and Historic Resources

As noted in the Historical Resources section of this document, no historical resources (as defined by state law) exist on-site; therefore, no impacts would result from this or any other project alternative.

Public Services and Utilities

Both the Single-Family Residential Alternative and the proposed project would require similar extension of services and utilities to the project site. However, single-family residential development would generate a greater demand for school, water, wastewater and solid waste service than commercial development. In addition, residential uses would most likely result in greater demand for police and fire service. Overall, the Single-Family Residential Alternative would result in greater impacts to public services and utilities.

Aesthetics

The Single-Family Residential Alternative would develop the project site without conformance to development guidelines. The proposed project would implement the Stock Ranch Development Guide. The Guide includes setback, screening and buffering measures to facilitate the project's visual compatibility with surrounding uses. Commercial uses included under the proposed project scenario would introduce large-scale commercial structures to the project site. In contrast, the Single-Family Residential Alternative would develop the portion of the project site north of Arcade Creek with RD-5. Because many homes and apartments are located in this area already, impacts to aesthetics would be less intensive under the Single-Family residential alternative than under the proposed project.

6.2.4 MIXED SINGLE-FAMILY/MULTI-FAMILY ALTERNATIVE

Description of Alternative

This Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative proposes a mixture of single-family and multi-family development units north of Arcade Creek. No commercial uses are proposed as part of this alternative. Multi-family units would be clustered adjacent to Arcade Creek similar to the existing development pattern occurring to the east. Single-family uses would be developed in the area to the north of the multi-family uses and south of Auburn Boulevard.

As noted earlier in this section, this alternative would not meet most of the basic project objectives, and is not considered a feasible alternative (per CEQA Section 15126.6(c)).

Potential Environmental Impacts

The following impacts could result from the implementation of this alternative:

Land Use/Planning

The Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative would eliminate commercial development from the portion of the project site north of Arcade Creek. Because residential uses are considered less intensive than commercial uses, the Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative would result in less intense land use impacts than the proposed project.

Population and Housing

The Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative would provide a greater amount of housing opportunities than the proposed project. Both single-family residential and multi-family residential are proposed which would result in an increase in overall housing stock for the City. However, because commercial uses north of Arcade Creek have been eliminated, the Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative would not benefit employment. The proposed project, in contrast would beneficially impact both housing and employment.

6.0 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in any impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials. (Please see the "Hazards" section of this report for further discussion of this topic.)

Transportation/Traffic/Parking

Commercial development typically generates high volumes of vehicle trips. With the elimination of commercial development in the Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative, lower traffic volumes would be generated on the site and surrounding roadways. Because residential development would generate lower traffic volumes than commercial development, Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative would have less intensive impacts to traffic than the proposed project.

Noise

Residential uses proposed on the north side of Arcade Creek in association with the Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative would generate less traffic and thereby less noise than the proposed project. In addition, because no retail uses are included north of the Creek, noise generated in association with retail uses would be eliminated in exchange for noise levels generated by single-family and multi-family residential uses. Because commercial uses generally result in greater noise levels than residential uses, impacts to noise would be less intensive under the Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative than for the proposed project.

Air Quality

Short-term construction impacts to air quality would be similar for both projects. However, because vehicle traffic would be reduced compared to the proposed project, air quality impacts would also be reduced. Therefore, impacts to air quality would be less intensive under the Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative than under the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Single-Family residential uses would result in less impervious area than commercial uses. With the elimination of commercial uses north of Arcade Creek, more area of the site would be available to absorb water following a storm event (i.e. through lawns, flower beds, etc.). Commercial uses typically include large areas of impervious surface in the form of buildings and parking lots. These uses drastically reduce the amount of absorption and increase the amount runoff flows carrying constituents that can adversely affect water quality. While the Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative would increase impervious surface on the project site, it would not impact hydrologic flows to the same degree as the proposed project. Residential runoff constituents would differ from those of a commercial parking lot (e.g. oil and grease vs. pesticides, lawn fertilizers etc.). However, impacts to water quality would be similar although the make-up of pollutants may differ (i.e. urban vs. residential). Because less runoff would be generated by residential development than commercial development, the Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative would result in less intensive impacts to hydrology than the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

While no commercial development is included on the northern portion of the property under the Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative, the amount of acreage disturbed by earthmoving and grading would be similar to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts to geology and soils would be similar for the Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative and the proposed project.

Biological Resources

This Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative would develop both single- and multi-family residential uses north of Arcade Creek. The same area would be developed as proposed under the proposed project. While residential development is considered less intensive than commercial development, comparable areas of the project site would be affected as well as protected through the open space buffer and wetland preserve. Therefore, impacts of the Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative to biological resources would be considered similar to the proposed project.

Cultural and Historic Resources

As noted in the Historical Resources section of this document, no historical resources (as defined by state law) exist on-site; therefore, no impacts would result from this or any other project alternative.

Public Services and Utilities

Both the Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative and the proposed project would require similar extension of services and utilities to the project site. However, single- and multi-family residential development would generate a greater demand for schools, water, wastewater and solid waste service than commercial development. In addition, residential uses would most likely result in greater demand for police and fire service. Overall, the Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative would result in greater impacts to public services and utilities than the proposed project.

Aesthetics

The Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative would develop the project site without conformance to development guidelines. The proposed project would implement the Stock Ranch Development Guide. The Guide includes setback, screening and buffering measures to facilitate the project's visual compatibility with surrounding uses. Commercial uses included under the proposed project scenario would introduce large-scale commercial structures to the project site. In contrast, the Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative would develop a combination of high-density multi-family units and single-family homes on the portion of the project site north of Arcade Creek. Because many homes and apartments are located in this area already, impacts to aesthetics would be less intensive under the Mixed Single-Family/Multi-Family Alternative than under the proposed project.